



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>







ANDOVER-HARVARD  
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY











A DICTIONARY  
OF  
CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES.

COMPRISING THE HISTORY, INSTITUTIONS, AND ANTIQUITIES  
OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, FROM THE TIME OF THE  
APOSTLES TO THE AGE OF CHARLEMAGNE.

BY VARIOUS WRITERS.

EDITED BY

SIR WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D.

AND

SAMUEL CHEETHAM, M.A.,

PROFESSOR OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY IN KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON.



IN TWO VOLUMES.—Vol. I.

ILLUSTRATED BY ENGRAVINGS ON WOOD.

LONDON:  
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.  
1893.

*The right of Translation is reserved.*

3326  
7-2

ANDOVER-HARVARD  
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY  
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

A7c.481

30.5.19, 1937

UNIFORM WITH THE PRESENT WORK.



DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY, LITERATURE,  
SECTS, AND DOCTRINES. By VARIOUS WRITERS. Edited by Sir WM.  
SMITH, D.C.L., and HENRY WACE, D.D. In 4 volumes. Medium 8vo.  
3ls. 6d. each.

---

LONDON. PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, STAMFORD STREET  
AND CHURCH LANE.

K4.  
B4R  
95  
S6  
1893  
V.11

## LIST OF WRITERS

### IN THE DICTIONARIES OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES AND BIOGRAPHY.

---

#### INITIALS.

#### NAMES.

- C. B.**      **Rev. CHURCHILL BABINGTON, B.D., F.L.S.,**  
Disney Professor of Archaeology in the University of  
Cambridge; late Fellow of St. John's College.
- H. B—Y.**   **Rev. HENRY BAILEY, D.D.,**  
Warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, and  
Honorary Canon of Canterbury Cathedral; late Fellow  
of St. John's College, Cambridge.
- J. B—Y.**   **Rev. JAMES BARMBY, B.D.,**  
Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham.
- E. W. B.**   **Rev. EDWARD WHITE BENSON, D.D.,**  
Chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral; late Fellow of Trinity  
College, Cambridge.
- C. W. B.**   **Rev. CHARLES WILLIAM BOASE, M.A.,**  
Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.
- H. B.**      **HENRY BRADSHAW, M.A.,**  
Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; Librarian of the  
University of Cambridge.
- W. B.**      **Rev. WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D.,**  
Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; Regius Professor of  
Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford.
- H. B.**      **The late Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A.,**  
Vicar of Pevensey, and Prebendary of Chichester Cathedral.
- L. B.**      **ISAMBARD BRUNEL, D.C.L.,**  
Of Lincoln's Inn; Chancellor of the Diocese of Ely.
- T. R. B.**   **THOMAS RYBURN BUCHANAN, M.A.,**  
Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.
- D. B.**      **Rev. DANIEL BUTLER, M.A.,**  
Rector of Thwing, Yorkshire; late Head Master of the  
Clergy Orphan School, Canterbury.

INITIALS.	NAMES
J. M. C.	Rev. JOHN MOORE CAPES, M.A., of Balliol College, Oxford.
J. G. C.	Rev. JOHN GIBSON CAZENOVE, M.A., late Principal of Cumbræ College, N.B.
C.	Rev. SAMUEL CHEETHAM, M.A., Professor of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London and Chaplain of Dulwich College; late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.
E. B. C.	EDWARD BYLES COWELL, M.A., Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Cambridge.
J. Ll. D.	Rev. JOHN LLEWELYN DAVIES, M.A., Rector of Christchurch, Marylebone; late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
C. D.	Rev. CECIL DEEDES, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene, Oxford.
W. P. D.	Rev. WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D., Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism, Glasgow.
S. J. E.	Rev. SAMUEL JOHN EALES, M.A., Head Master of the Grammar School, Halstead, Essex.
J. E.	Rev. JOHN ELLERTON, M.A., Rector of Hinstock, Salop.
E. S. FF.	Rev. EDMUND S. FFOULKES, B.D., Late Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.
A. P. F.	The Right Rev. ALEXANDER PENROSE FORBES, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin.
W. H. F.	Hon. and Rev. WILLIAM HENRY FREMANTLE, M.A., Rector of St. Mary's, Marylebone; Chaplain to the Arch- bishop of Canterbury.
J. M. F.	Rev. JOHN M. FULLER, M.A., Vicar of Bexley.
C. D. G.	Rev. CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, LL.D.
W. F. G.	The late Rev. WILLIAM FREDERICK GREENFIELD, M.A., Master of the Lower School, Dulwich College.
A. W. H.	The late Rev. ARTHUR WEST HADDAN, B.D., Rector of Barton-on-the-Heath and Honorary Canon of Worcester Cathedral; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.
E. H.	Rev. EDWIN HATCH, M.A., Vice-Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford.

▼

INITIALS.	NAMES.
E. C. H.	Rev. EDWARDS COMERFORD HAWKINS, M.A., Head Master of St. John's School, Leatherhead.
L. H.	Rev. LEWIS HENSLEY, M.A., Vicar of Hitchin, Herts; late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
H.	Rev. FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT, M.A., Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge; Chaplain to the Bishop of Winchester.
H. J. H.	Rev. HENRY JOHN HOTHAM, M.A., Vice-Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.
J. H.	JOHN HULLAH, Late Professor of Music in King's College, London.
W. J.	Rev. WILLIAM JACKSON, M.A., Late Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford; Bampton Lecturer for 1875.
G. A. J.	Rev. GEORGE ANDREW JACOB, D.D., late Head Master of Christ's Hospital, London.
W. J. J.	Rev. WILLIAM JAMES JOSLING, M.A., Rector of Moulton, Suffolk; late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.
L.	Rev. JOSEPH BARBER LIGHTFOOT, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's; Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
R. A. L.	R. A. LIPSIVS, Professor in the University of Kiel.
J. M. L.	JOHN MALCOLM LUDLOW, M.A., Of Lincoln's Inn.
J. R. L.	Rev. JOHN ROBERT LUNN, B.D., Vicar of Marton, Yorkshire; late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
G. F. M.	Rev. GEORGE FREDERICK MACLEAR, D.D., Head Master of King's College School, London.
S. M.	Rev. SPENCER MANSEL, M.A., Vicar of Trumpington, Cambridge; Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
W. B. M.	The late Rev. WHARTON B. MARRIOTT, M.A., Of Eton College; formerly Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.
G. M.	Rev. GEORGE MEAD, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Dublin.



INITIALS.	NAMES.
F. M.	Rev. FREDERICK MEYRICK, M.A., Rector of Blickling, Norfolk; Prebendary of Lincoln Cathedral; Chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln; late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.
W. M.	Rev. WILLIAM MILLIGAN, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen.
G. H. M.	Rev. GEORGE HERBERT MOBERLY, M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury; Rector of Dunstbourne Rouse, Gloucestershire.
H. C. G. M.	Rev. HANDLEY CARR GLYN MOULE, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
I. R. M.	JOHN RICKARDS MOZLEY, M.A., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.
A. N.	ALEXANDER NESBITT, F.S.A., Oldlands, Uckfield.
P. O.	Rev. PHIPPS ONSLOW, B.A., Rector of Upper Sapey, Hereford.
G. W. P.	Rev. GREGORY WALTON PENNETHORNE, M.A., Rector of Ferring, Sussex; late Vice-Principal of the Theological College, Chichester.
W. G. F. P.	WALTER G. F. PHILLIMORE, B.C.L., Lincoln's Inn; Chancellor of the Diocese of Lincoln.
E. H. P. (sometimes P.)	Rev. EDWARD HAYES PLUMPTRE, M.A., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in King's College, London; Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral; Vicar of Bickley; formerly Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford.
DE PRESSENSÉ.	Rev. E. DE PRESSENSÉ, of Paris.
J. R.	Rev. JAMES RAINE, M.A., Prebendary of York; Fellow of the University of Durham.
W. R.	Rev. WILLIAM REEVES, D.D., Rector of Tynan, Armagh.
G. S.	Rev. GEORGE SALMON, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Trinity College, Dublin.
P. S.	Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., Professor of Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.
W. E. S.	Rev. WILLIAM EDWARD SCUDAMORE, M.A., Rector of Ditchingham; late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.
J. S.	Rev. JOHN SHARPE, M.A., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.

INITIALS.	NAMES.
B. S.	BENJAMIN SHAW, M.A., Of Lincoln's Inn; late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
R. S.	REV. ROBERT SINKER, M.A., Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge.
I. G. S.	REV. I. GREGORY SMITH, M.A., Rector of Great Malvern, and Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral; late Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford.
J. S—T.	JOHN STUART, LL.D., Of the General Register-House, Edinburgh.
S.	REV. WILLIAM STUBBS, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History, in the University of Oxford; Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.
C. A. S.	REV. CHARLES ANTHONY SWAINSON, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and Canon of Chichester Cathedral; late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.
E. S. T.	REV. EDWARD STUART TALBOT, M.A., Warden of Keble College, Oxford.
R. St. J. T.	REV. RICHARD ST. JOHN TYRWHITT, M.A., Late Student and Rhetoric Lecturer of Christ Church, Oxford.
E. V.	REV. EDMUND VENABLES, M.A., Canon Residentiary and Precentor of Lincoln Cathedral; Chaplain to the Bishop of London.
W. (sometimes B. F. W.)	REV. BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., Canon of Peterborough; Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
H. W.	REV. HENRY WACE, M.A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History, King's College, London.
G. W.	REV. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D., Rector of Ringwood, Hants; late Fellow of King's College Cambridge.
J. W.	REV. JOHN WORDSWORTH, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln; late Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford.
W. A. W.	WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
E. M. Y.	REV. EDWARD MALLET YOUNG, M.A., Assistant Master of Harrow School; Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
H. W. Y.	REV. HENRY WILLIAM YULE, B.C.L., M.A., Rector of Shipton-on-Cherwell, and Vicar of Hampton Gay, Oxon.



## PREFACE.

---

THIS Work is intended to furnish, together with the 'Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, and Doctrines,' which will shortly follow, a complete account of the leading Personages, the Institutions, Art, Social Life, Writings and Controversies of the Christian Church from the time of the Apostles to the age of Charlemagne. It commences at the period at which the 'Dictionary of the Bible' leaves off, and forms a continuation of it: it ceases at the age of Charlemagne, because (as Gibbon has remarked) the reign of this monarch forms the important link of ancient and modern, of civil and ecclesiastical history. It thus stops short of what we commonly call the Middle Ages. The later developement of Ritual and of the Monastic Orders, the rise and progress of the great Mendicant Orders, the Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, the Hagiology and Symbolism, the Canon Law, and the Institutions generally of the Middle Ages, furnish more than sufficient matter for a separate book.

The present Work, speaking generally, elucidates and explains in relation to the Christian Church the same class of subjects that the 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities' does in reference to the public and private life of classical antiquity. It treats of the organization of the Church, its officers, legislation, discipline, and revenues; the social life of Christians; their worship and ceremonial, with the accompanying music, vestments, instruments, vessels, and insignia; their sacred places; their architecture and other forms of Art; their symbolism; their sacred days and seasons the graves or Catacombs in which they were laid to rest.

We can scarcely hope that every portion of this wide and varied field has been treated with equal completeness; but we may venture to assert, that this Dictionary is at least more complete than any attempt hitherto made by English or Foreign scholars to treat in one work the whole archaeology of the early Church. The great

work of Bingham, indeed, the foundation of most subsequent book on the subject, must always be spoken of with the utmost respect but it is beyond the power of one man to treat with the requisite degree of fulness and accuracy the whole of so vast a subject and there is probably no branch of Christian archaeology on which much light has not been thrown since Bingham's time by the numerous scholars and divines who have devoted their lives to special investigations. We trust that we have made accessible to all educated persons a great mass of information, hitherto only the privilege of students with the command of a large library.

In treating of subjects like Church Government and Ritual it is probably impossible to secure absolute impartiality; but we are confident that no intentional reticence, distortion or exaggeration has been practised by the writers in this work.

It has been thought advisable not to insert in the present work an account of the Literature, of the Sects and Heresies, and of the Doctrines of the Church, but to treat these subjects in the 'Dictionary of Christian Biography,' as they are intimately connected with the lives of the leading persons in Church History and could not with advantage be separated from them.

It has not been possible to construct the vocabulary on an entirely consistent principle. Where a well-recognized English term exists for an institution or an object, that term has generally been preferred as the heading of an article. But in many cases obsolete customs, offices, or objects have no English name; and in many others the English term is not really co-extensive with the Latin or Greek term to which it seems at first sight to correspond. The word *Decanus* (for example) has several meanings which are not implied in the English *Dean*. In such cases it was necessary to adopt a term from the classic languages. Cross-references are given from the synonyms or quasi-synonyms to the word under which a subject is treated. The Councils are placed (so far as possible) under the modern names of the places at which they were held, cross-reference being given from the ancient name. In the case of the Saints' Days, the names of the Western saints have been taken from the martyrology of Usuard, as containing probably the most complete list of the martyrs and confessors generally recognized in the West up to the ninth century; the occurrence of these names in earlier calendars or martyrologies is also noted. In the letters A and B, however, the names of Saints are taken principally from the 'Martyrologium Romanum Vetus,' and from the catalogues which bear the names of Jerome and of Bede, without special reference



to Usuard. In the case of the Eastern Church, we have taken from the calendars of Byzantium, of Armenia, and of Ethiopia, those names which fall within our chronological period. This alphabetical arrangement will virtually constitute an index to the principal martyrologies, in addition to supplying the calendar-dates of events which are fixed—as is not uncommonly the case in ancient records—by reference to some festival. The names of persons are inserted in the vocabulary of this Work only with reference to their commemoration in martyrologies or their representations in art, their lives, when they are of any importance, being given in the Dictionary of Biography.

References are given throughout to the original authorities on which the several statements rest, as well as to modern writers of repute. In citations from the Fathers, where a page is given without reference to a particular edition, it refers for the most part to the standard pagination—generally that of the Benedictine editions—which is retained in Migne's *Patrologia*.

At the commencement of this work, the Editorship of that portion which includes the laws, government, discipline, and revenues of the Church and the Orders within it, was placed in the hands of Professor Stubbs; the education and social life of Christians in those of Professor Plumptre; while the treatment of their worship and ceremonial was entrusted to Professor Cheetham; all under the general superintendence of Dr. William Smith. As the work proceeded, however, a pressure of other engagements rendered it impossible for Professors Stubbs and Plumptre to continue their editorship of the parts which they had undertaken; and from the end of the letter C Professor Cheetham has acted as Editor of the whole work, always with the advice and assistance of Dr. William Smith.

In conclusion, we have to express our regret at the long time that has elapsed since the first announcement of the work. This delay has been owing partly to our anxious desire to make it as accurate as possible, and partly to the loss we have sustained by the death of two of our most valued contributors, the Rev. A. W. Haddan and the Rev. W. B. Marriott.



# A

## DICTIONARY

OF

## CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITIES.

---

### A AND Ω

**A and ω.** (See Rev. xiii. 13.) Of these symbolic letters the ω is always given in the minuscule form. The symbol is generally combined with the monogram of Christ. [MONOGRAM.] In Boldetti's *Osservazioni sopra i cimiteri, &c.* Rom. 1720, fol. tav. iii. p. 194, no. 4, it is found, with the more ancient decussated monogram, on a sepulchral cup or vessel. See also De Rossi (*Inscriptiones*, No. 778), where the letters



are suspended from the arms of the St. Andrew's Cross. They are combined more frequently with the upright or Egyptian monogram. Aringhi, *Rom. Subt.* vol. i. p. 381, gives an engraving of a jewelled cross, with the letters suspended by chains to its horizontal arm, as below. And the same form occurs in sepulchral inscriptions in De Rossi, *Inscr. Chr. Rom.* t. i. nos. 661, 686. See also Boldetti, p. 345, and Bottari, tav. xlv. vol. i.



The letters are found, with or without the monogram, in almost all works of Christian antiquity; for instance, right and left of a great cross, on which is no form or even symbolic Lamb, on the ceiling of the apse of St. Apollinare in Classe at Ravenna, circ. A.D. 675. They were worn in rings and sigils, either alone, as in Martigny, s. v. *Anneau*, or with the monogram, as in Boldetti, ms. 21-31, 30-33. On coins they appear to be first used immediately after the death of Constantine. The earliest instances are an aureus nummus of Constantius (Banduri, v. ii. p. 227, *Numismata Imp. Romanorum*, &c.); and another golden coin bearing the effigy of Constantine the Great, with the words "Victoria Maxima." Constantine seems not to have made great use of Christian emblems on his coin till after the defeat of Licinius in 323, and especially after the building of Constantinople. (See Martigny, s. v. *Numismatique*.)

The use of these symbolic letters amounts to a quotation of Rev. xiii. 13, and a confession of faith in our Lord's own assertion of His infinity

and divinity. There is one instance in Martial (*Epig.* v. 28) where A, Alpha, is used jocularly (as A I, vulgarly, with ourselves) for "chief" or "first." But the whole expression in its solemn meaning is derived entirely from the words of Rev. xiii. 13. The import to a Christian is shown by the well-known passage of Prudentius (*Hymnus Omni Hora*, 10, *Cathemerinon*, ix. p. 35, ed. Tübingen, 45):—

"Corde natus ex parentis ante mundi exordium,  
Alpha et Ω cognominatus, ipse fons et celsula,  
Omnium quæ sunt, fuerunt, quæque post futura sunt."

The symbol was no doubt much more frequently used after the outbreak of Arianism. But it appears to have been used before that date, from its occurrence in the inscription on the tomb raised by Victorina to her martyred husband Heraclius in the cemetery of Priscilla (Aringhi, i. 605). It is here enclosed in a triangle, and united with the upright monogram. See also another inscription in Fabretti (*Inscr. antiq. explicatio*, Rom. 1699, fol.), and the cup given in Boldetti from the Callixtine catacomb, tav. iii. no. 4, at p. 194. From these it is argued with apparent truth that the symbol must have been in use before the Nicene Council.\* No doubt, as a convenient symbolic form of asserting the Lord's divinity, it became far more prominent afterwards. The Arians certainly avoided its use (Giorgi, *De Monogram. Christi*, p. 10). It is found on the crucifix attributed to Nicodemus (Angelo Rocca, *Thesaurus Pontificium*, vol. I. 153, woodcut), and on a wooden crucifix of great antiquity at Lucca (Borgia, *De Cruce Veluterna*, p. 33). For its general use as a part of the monogram of Christ, see MONOGRAM. It will be found (see Westwood's *Palaeographia Sacra*) in the Psalter of Athelstan, and in the Bible of Alcuin; both in the British Museum. [R. St. J. T.]

**AARON**, the High Priest, commemorated

\* Boldetti: "Quanto alle lettere A and ω, non v'ha dubbio che quei primi Cristiani le pressero dall' Apocalisse." He goes on to say that it is the sign of Christ, not Arian, burial; and that Arians were driven from Rome, and excluded from the Catacombs. Aringhi also protests that those cemeteries were "hand unquam heretico schis matique commercio pollutæ."

Miaziah 1 = March 27 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). Deposition in Mount Hor, July 1 (*Mart. Bedae, Hieron.*). [C.]

**ABACUC.** (1) Habakkuk the Prophet, commemorated Jan. 15 (*Martyrologium Rom. Vetus, Hieron., Bedae*).

(2) Martyr at Rome under Claudius, A.D. 269, commemorated Jan. 20 (*Martyr. Rom. Vetus*). [C.]

### ABBA [ABBAT.]

**ABBAT.** (*Abbas* or *Abba* [-ātis], ἀββᾶς, ἄββα, in low Latin sometimes *Abas*, Ital. *Abate*, Germ. *Abt*, from the Chaldee and Syriac form of the common Semitic word for Father, probably adopted in that form either by Syriac monks, or through its N. T. use.) A name employed occasionally in the East, even so late as the 10th century, as a term of respect for any monks (*Cassian., Collat.* i. 1, A.D. 429; *Reg. S. Columb.* vii., A.D. 609; Jo. Mosch., *Prat. Spir.*, A.D. 630; Epiphani. Hagiop., *De Loc. SS.*, A.D. 956; Byzant. auth. ap. Du Cange, *Lex. Inf. Graec.*; Bulteau, *Hist. Mon. d'Orient*, 819: and, similarly, ἀββαδίων, ἄββαδίσκιον, ψευδάββας, κλεπτάββας, for an evil or false monk, Du Cange, *ib.*); and sometimes as a distinguishing term for a monk of singular piety (*Hieron., in Epist. ad Gal.* c. 4; in *Matt.* lib. iv. in c. 23); but ordinarily restricted to the superior of a monastery, *Pater* or *Princeps Monasterii*, elective, irremovable, single, absolute. Replaced commonly among the Greeks by Ἀρχιμανδρίτης [ARCHIMANDRITA], Ἡγούμενος, or more rarely Κοινοβιάρχης; the first of which terms however, apparently by a confusion respecting its derivation, came occasionally to stand for the superior of more monasteries than one (*Helyot, Hist. des Ord. Mon.* i. 65):—extended upon their institution to the superior of a body of canons, more properly called *Praepositus*, *Abbas Canonorum* as opposed to *Abbas Monachorum* (e. g. *Conc. Paris.* A.D. 829, c. 37; *Conc. Aquisgr.* II. A.D. 836. canon. c. ii. P. 2, § 1; *Chron. Leod.*); but varied by many of the later monastic orders, as e. g. by Carmelites, Augustinians, Dominicans, Servites, into *Praepositus* or *Prior Conventualis*, by Franciscans into *Custos* or *Guardianus*, by Camaldulensians into *Major*, by Jesuits into *Rector*:—distinguished in the original Rule of Pachomius, as the superior of a combination of monasteries, from the *Pater*, *Princeps*, or *Oecónomus* of each and from the *Praepositi* of the several families of each. Enlarged into *Abbas Abbatum* for the Abbat of Monte Cassino (*Pet. Diac. Chron. Casin.* iv. 60; *Leo Ostiens.*, *ib.* ii. 54), who was vicar of the Pope over Benedictine monasteries (*Privil. Nicol. I. Papae*, A.D. 1059, ap. And. a Nuce ad *Leon. Ostiens.* iii. 12), and had precedence over all Benedictine abbats (*Privil. Paschal. II. Papae*, A.D. 1113, in *Bull. Casin.* ii. 130; *Chart. Lothar. Imp.*, A.D. 1137, *ib.* 157). Similarly a single Abbat of Aniana, Benedict, was made by Ludov. Fius, A.D. 817, chief of the abbats in the empire (*Chron. Farf.* p. 671; Ardo, in *V. Bened.* c. viii. 36); and the Hegumenos of St. Dalmatius in Constantinople was, from the time of St. Dalmatius himself (A.D. 430), ἀρχων or πατήρ μοναστηριῶν, *Abbas Universalis* or Καθολικός, *Exarchus omnium monasteriorum in urbe regia* (*Conc. Constant.* iv., A.D. 536, Act i.; *Conc. Ephes.* iii. A.D. 431; and see Tillem., *Mém. Eccl.* xiv. 322 and *Eustath.* in *V. Ewuch.* n. 18, Jo.

*Cantacuz.* i. 50, Theocterictus in *V. S. Nicetiae*, 43, quoted by Du Cange). Transferred i properly sometimes to the *Praepositus* or *Pri* the lieutenant (so to say) of a monastery, *Ab Secundus* or *Secundarius* (*Reg. S. Bened.* 65; see *Sid. Apoll.* vii. 17), the proper abbat being called by way of distinction *Abbas Major* (*Co Aquisgr.* A.D. 817 c. 31). Transferred also, course of time, to non-monastic clerical office as e. g. to the principal of a body of paroch clergy (i. the *Abbas*, *Custos*, or *Rector*, as distinguished from ii. the *Presbyter* or *Cupellanus*, a iii. the *Sacrista*; Ughelli, *Ital. Sac.* vii. 506, ap. Du Cange); and to the chief chaplain of the king emperor in camp under the Carolingians, *Abbas Castrensis*, and to the *Abbas Curiae* at Vien (Du Cange); and in later times to a particular cathedral official at Toledo (*Beyerlinck, Mag. Theatrum*, s. v. *Abbas*), much as the term cardinal is used at our own St. Paul's; and to the chief of a decan of choristers at Anicia, *Abbas Clericorum* (Du Cange); and later still to the abbat of a religious confraternity, as of St. Y at Paris in 1350 and another in 1362 (*Id.* Adopted also for purely secular and civil office *Abbas Populi* at Genoa, and again of the Genoa in Galata (Jo. Pachym. xiii. 27), of Guilds Milan and Decurions at Brixia; and earlier still *Palatii*, *Clucherii*, *Campanilis*, *Scholaris*, *Esch fardorum* (Du Cange); and compare *Dan* (*Purgat.* xvi.), *Abate del Collegio*. Usurped in course of time by lay holders of monasteries under the system of commendation [see 54], *Abbas Protector*, *Abbas Laicus*, *Archiepiscopus*, *Abba* [or *Abbi*] *Comes*, denominated by happy equivocation in some papal documents *Abbas Irreligiosus*; and giving rise in turn to the *Abbas Legitimus* or *Monasticus* (*Serm. de Tunulati.* *Quintin.*, ap. Du Cange), as a name for the abbat proper (sometimes it was the *Decani*, *Cont. Aimoin.* c. 42; and in Culdee Scotland in the parallel case it was a *Prior*) who took charge the spiritual duties. Lastly, perverted altogether in later days into a mock title, as *Abbas Lactitii Jutenum*, *Fatuorum*, or again *Abbas Bejanorum* (of freshmen, or "Yellow Beaks," at the university of Paris), or *Cornardorum* or *Conardorum* (equally unruly club of older people elsewhere France), until "in vitium libertas excidit et vix dignam lege regi," and the mock abbats accordingly "held their peace" perforce (Du Cange).

The abbat, properly so called, was elected at the beginning by the bishop of the diocese out of the monks themselves (with a vague right of assent on the part of the people also, according to Du Cange); a right confirmed at first by Justinian (*Novell.* v. c. 9, A.D. 534–565); which however, by a subsequent enactment transferred to the monks, the abbat elect to be confirmed and formally blessed by the bishop (*Novell.* cxxi. c. 34). And this became the common law of Western monasteries also (*Reg. S. Bened.*, A.D. 530, c. 64; *Conc. Carthag.*, A.D. 525, in *die IIIa* *Greg. M.*, *Epist.* ii. 41, iii. 23, viii. 15; *Theodo. Poenit.* II. vi. 1 in *Wassersch.* p. 207; *Pseud. Egbert.*, *Poenit. Add.* in *Thorpe*, ii. 235, &c.; "Fratres eligant sibi abbatem," *Aldhelm* ap. *Malm.*, *De G. P.* v. p. 111), confirmed in time by express enactment (*Capit. Car. M. et Lud. P.* I. vi., A.D. 816),—"Quomodo (monachis) ex ipsis sibi eligendi abbates licentiam dederimus."—*Urban. Pap.* ap. *Gratian*, *cap. Alien. caus.* I

qu. 2; and so also *cap. Quoniam Dist. lxi.*—enforcing the episcopal benediction, from *Conc. Nicæa. ii.*, A.D. 787, c. 14. So also *Counc. of Chalchyth*, A.D. 785, c. 5 (monks to elect from their own monastery, or another, with consent of bishop), but *Counc. of Becanceld*, A.D. 694, and of *Chalchyth*, A.D. 816 (bishop to elect abbat or abbas with consent of the "family"). And forms occur accordingly, in both Eastern and Western Pontificals, for the *Benedictio* respectively of an *Hegumenos*, or of an *Abbas*, both *Monachorum* and *Canonicorum*, and of an *Abbat* (see also *Theodor., Poenit. II. iii. 5*, in *Wassersch. p. 204*, &c.; and a special form for the last named, wrongly attributed to Theodore, in *Collier's Records* from the *Ordo Rom.*, and with variations, in *Gerbert*). An abbat of an exempt abbey (in later times) could not resign without leave of the Pope (c. *Si Abbatem*, *Bonif. VIII. in Sext. Decr. I. vi. 36*); and was to be confirmed and blessed by him (*Matt. Par. in an. 1257*). A qualification made in the Benedictine Rule, allowing the choice of a minority if theirs were the *sanus consilium*, necessarily became a dead letter from its impracticability. Bishops, however, retained their right of institution if not nomination in Spain in the 7th century (*Conc. Tolet.*, A.D. 633, c. 50); and the Bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne so late as the time of St. Bernard (*Epist. 58*). See, however, *Caus. xviii.*, qu. 2. The nomination by an abbat of his successor, occurring sometimes in special cases (e.g. St. Bruno), and allowed under restrictions (*Conc. Cabilon. ii.*, A.D. 650, c. 12; *Theodor., Capit. Lecher. c. 71*, in *Wassersch. p. 151*), was exceptional, and was to be so managed as not to interfere with the general right of the monks. So also the founder's like exceptional nominations, as e.g. those made by Aldhelm or Wilfrid. The interference of kings in such elections began as a practice with the system of commendation; but in royal foundations, and as suggested and promoted by feudal ideas, no doubt existed earlier. The consent of the bishop is made necessary to an abbat's election, "*ubi jussio Regis fuerit*," A.D. 794 (*Conc. Francof. c. 17*). The bishop was also to quash an unfit election, under the Benedictine rule, and (with the neighbouring abbats) to appoint a proper person instead (*Reg. Aen. 64*).

Once elected, the abbat held office for life, unless canonically deprived by the bishop; but the consent of his fellow-presbyters and abbats is made necessary to such deprivation by the Council of Tours (*Conc. Turon. ii.*, A.D. 567, c. 7; see also *Excerpt. Pseudo-Egberti*, 65, Thorpe ii. 107). And this, even if incapacitated by sickness (*Blacmar ad Corbeiens.*, ap. Flodoard. iii. 7). Triennial abbats (and abbesses) were a desperate expedient of far later popes, Innocent VIII. (A.D. 1484–1492) and Clement VII. (A.D. 1523–1534).

Like all monks (*Hieron., ad Rustic. 95*; *Cassian., Collat. v. 26*; *Caus. xvi. qu. 1, c. 40*; *Isid. xliii. c. 5*), the abbat was originally a layman ("*Abbas potest esse, et non presbyter: licet potest esse abbas*," *Jo. de Turrecrem., sup. l. ad. lxi.*); and accordingly ranked below all orders of clergy, even the *ostiarius* (*Dist. xciii. c. 5*). In the East, Archimandrites appear to have become either deacons at least, or com-

(inter *Epist. Hormisd. Pap.*, A.D. 514–523, ante *Ep. xxii.*; *Conc. Constantin. iv.*, A.D. 536, Act i.), although not without a struggle: St. Sabas, e.g., A.D. 484, strictly forbidding any of his monks to be priests, while reluctantly forced into the presbyterate himself by the Patriarch of Jerusalem (*Surius, in Vita, 5 Dec.*, cc. xxi. xxv). And Archimandrites subscribe Church Councils in the East, from time to time, from *Conc. Constantin.*, A.D. 448. The term *Ἀββαῶν presbýteroi*, however, in *Nomocan.* (n. 44, ed. Coteler.), appears to indicate the continued existence of abbats not presbyters. In the West, laymen commonly held the office until the end of the 7th century, and continued to do so to some extent or other (even in the proper sense of the office) into the 11th. Jealousy of the priestly order, counterbalanced by the absolute need of priestly ministrations, prolonged the struggle, in the 6th century, whether Western monasteries should even admit priests at all. St. Benedict, A.D. 530, hardly allows a single priest; although, if accepted, he is to rank next the abbat (*l. i. c. 60*). Aurelian of Arles, A.D. 50, allows one of each order, priest, deacon, subdeacon (*Reg. 46*). The *Regula Magistri* (23) admits priests as guests only, "*ne abbates utpote laicos excludant*." St. Gregory, however, A.D. 595, gave a great impulse, as to monastic life generally, so in particular, by the nature of his English mission, to presbyter (and episcopal) abbats. And while Benedict himself, a layman, was admitted to a council at Rome, A.D. 531, as by a singular privilege (*Cave, Hist. Litt. in V. Bened.*); during the next century, abbats occur commonly, 1. at Councils of State, or in Councils of abbats for monastic purposes, in Saxon England and in France; but 2. in purely Church Councils in Spain. Theodore (about A.D. 690) repeats the continental canon, inhibiting bishops from compelling abbats to come to a council without reasonable cause (*Poenit. II. ii. 3*; *Wassersch. p. 203*). And in one case, both *Abbat presbyteri*, and *Abbat* simply, subscribe a Saxon Council or Witenagemot, viz., that of Oct. 12, 803 (*Kemble, C. D. v. 65*), which had for its purpose the prohibition of lay commendations; while abbesses occur sometimes as well, e.g. at Becanceld, A.D. 694 (*Anglo-Sax. Chron.*), and at London, Aug. 1, A.D. 811 (*Kemble, C. D. i. 242*). Lay abbats continued in England A.D. 696 (*Wihtrid's Dooms, § 18*), A.D. 740 (*Egbert's Answ. 7, 11*), A.D. 747 (*Conc. of Clovesho, c. 5*), A.D. 957 (*Aelfric's Can. § 18*,—abbats not an order of clergy). In France, an annual Council of abbats was to be summoned by the bishop every Nov. 1, the presbyters having their own special council separately in May (*Conc. Aurelian. i.*, A.D. 511; *Conc. Autisiod.*, A.D. 578 or 586, c. 7). Abbats, however, sign as representatives of bishops at the Councils of Orleans, iv. and v., A.D. 541, 549. But in Spain, abbats subscribe Church Councils, at first after and then before presbyters (*Conc. Bracar. iii.*, A.D. 572; *Oscens.*, A.D. 588; *Emerit.*, A.D. 666; *Tolet. xii.* and *xiii.*, A.D. 681, 683); occurring, indeed, in all councils from that of Toledo (viii.) A.D. 653. From A.D. 565, also, there was an unbroken succession of presbyter-abbats at Hy, retaining their original missionary jurisdiction over their monastic colonies, even after these colonies had grown into a church, and both needed and had



bishops, although undiocesan (Baed., *H. E.*, iii. 4, v. 24). And clerical abbats (episcopal indeed first, in Ireland, and afterwards presbyteral—see Todd's *St. Patrick*, pp. 88, 89) seem to have been always the rule in Wales, Ireland, and Scotland. In Ireland, indeed, abbats were so identified with not presbyters only but bishops, that the Pope is found designated as "Abbat of Rome" (Todd's *St. Patrick*, 156). Most continental abbats, however (and even their *Praepositi* and *Decani*) appear to have been presbyters by A.D. 817. These officers may bestow the benediction ("quamvis presbyteri non sint"; *Conc. Aquisgr.*, A.D. 817, c. 62). All were ordered to be so, but as yet ineffectually, A.D. 826 (*Conc. Rom.* c. 27). And the order was still needed, but was being speedily enforced by custom, A.D. 1078 (*Conc. Pictav.* c. 7: "Ut abbates et decani [*aliter* abbates diaconi] qui presbyteri non sunt, presbyteri fiant, aut praelationes amittant").

A bishop-abbat was forbidden in a particular instance by a Council of Toledo (xii., A.D. 681, c. 4), but permitted subsequently as (at first) an exceptional case at Lobes near Liège, about A.D. 700, (conjecturally) for missionary purposes among the still heathen Flemish (D'Achery, *Spicil.* ii. 730); a different thing, it should be noted, from bishops resident in abbeys under the abbat's jurisdiction ("Episcopi monachi," according to a very questionable reading in Baed. *H. E.* iv. 5), as in Ireland and Albanian Scotland, and in several continental (mostly exempt) abbeys (St. Denys, St. Martin of Tours, &c.), and both at this and at later periods in exempt abbeys generally (Du Cange, voc. *Episcopi Vagantes*: Todd's *St. Patrick*, 51 sq.); although in some of these continental cases the two plans seem to have been interchanged from time to time, according as the abbat happened to be either himself a bishop, or merely to have a monk-bishop under him (Martene and Durand, *Thes. Nov. Anecd.* i. *Pref.* giving a list of Benedictine Abbatial bishops; Todd, *ib.*). In Wales, and in the Scottish sees in Anglo-Saxon England (e.g. Lindisfarne), and in a certain sense in the monastic sees of the Augustinian English Church, the bishop was also an abbat; but the latter office was here appended to the former, not (as in the other cases) the former to the latter. So, too, "Antistes et abbas," in Sidon. Apoll. (xvi. 114), speaking of two abbats of Lerins, who were also Bishops of Riez. Possibly there were undiocesan bishop-abbats in Welsh abbeys of Celtic date (Rees, *Welsh SS.* 182, 266). Abbats sometimes acted as *chorepiscopi* in the 9th century: v. Du Cange, voc. *Chorepiscopus*. The abbats also of Catania and of Monreale in Sicily at a later period were always bishops (diocesan), and the latter shortly an archbishop, respectively by privilege of Urban II., A.D. 1088–1099, and from A.D. 1176 (Du Cange). So also at Fulda and Corbey in Germany.

We have lastly an abbat who was also *ex officio* a cardinal, in the case of the Abbat of Clugny, by privilege of Pope Calixtus II., A.D. 1119 (Hug. Mon. *ad Fontium Abb. Clun.*, ap. Du Cange).

The natural rule, that the abbat should be chosen from the seniors, and from those of the monastery itself (*Reg. S. Serap.* 4, in Holsten. p. 15), became in time a formal law (*Decret. Bonif. VIII.* in 6 *de Elect.*—Abbat to be an already professed monk; *Capit. Car. M. et Lud.*

*Pii*, i. tit. 81, "ex seipsis," &c., as above quo *Concil. Rotom.*, A.D. 1074, c. 10): although limitation to one above twenty-five years of no earlier than Pope Alexander III. (*Conc. teran.* A.D. 1179). In the West, however, rule was, that "Fratres eligant sibi abbat de ipsis si habent, sin autem, de extraneis" (Theodor., *Capit. Dach.* c. 72, in Wassersch 151; and so also St. Greg., *Epist.* ii. 41, viii. while in the East it seems to be spoken of as privilege, where an abbey, having no fit of its own, might choose a *ξενόκουπτης*—tensured elsewhere (Leunclav. *Jus Graeco.* p. 222).

Repeated enactments prove at once the rule of one abbat to one monastery, and (as time on) its common violation (Hieron. *ad Rustic Reg. S. Serap.* 4, and *Regulae* passim; *Venetic.*, A.D. 465, c. 8; *Agath.*, A.D. 506, c. 57; *Epaon.*, A.D. 517, cc. 9, 10; and so, in East, *Justinian*, L. I. tit. iii.; *De Episc.* l. 39. Balsamon *ad Nomocan.* tit. i. c. 20,—“Si non mittitur alicui ut sit clericus in duabus ecclesiis nec praefectus seu abbas duobus monasteriis praerit”). No doubt such a case as that of Wilfrid of York, at once founder and Abbat of Hexham and Ripon, or that of Aldhelm, at once (for a like reason) of Malmesbury, Farnham, and Bradford, was not so singular as it was in their case both intelligible and excusable. The spirit of the rule obviously does not apply, at least to the early clusters of monasteries under the Rule of St. Pachomius, or to the tens of thousands of monks subject to the government of e.g. St. Macarius or St. Serapion, or to the semi-hierarchical quasi-jurisdiction, possess already mentioned by the Abbats of St. Daniel, of Monte Cassino, or of Clugny, or of Benedict of Aniana. Generals of Orders, and more compact organization of the whole Order into a single body, belong to later times.

The abbat's power was in theory paternal and absolute—"Timeas ut dominum, diligas ut patrem" (*Reg. S. Macar.* 7, in Holsten. p. 25 *Regulae* passim). See also St. Jerome. Evangelist without his order was culpable (*Reg. Basil.*). And to speak for another who hesitated to obey was itself disobedience (*Reg. passim*). The relation of monk to abbat is described as a *libera servitus* (*Reg. S. Orsies.* 19, in Holsten. p. 73); while no monk (not even if he was a bishop, Baed. *H. E.*, iv. 5) could exchange monasteries without the abbat's leave (*Reg. passim* not even (although in that case it was sometimes allowed) if he sought to quit a laxer for a stricter rule (*Reg. PP.* 14, in Holsten. p. 155); indeed he fled from an excommunicated abbat (Gild. *ib.* p. 155, and in D'Ach., *Spicil.* i. 1). In later times, and less civilized regions, it was found necessary to prohibit an abbat from striking or mutilating his monks (*Conc. Fr. A.D.* 794, c. 18). The rule, however, and the canons of the Church, limited this absolute power. And each Benedictine abbat, while bound to keep St. Benedict's rule himself (e.g. *Augustod.* c. A.D. 670), was enjoined also to his monks learn it word for word by heart (*Aquisgr.*, A.D. 817, cc. 1, 2, 80). He was limited practically in the exercise of his authority (1) by the system of *Praepositi* or *Priores*, and usually by himself, but "*consilio et voluntate*

from" (*Reg. Orient.* 3, in Holsten. p. 89; *Reg. S. Bened.* 65), and in Spain at one time by the bishop (*Conc. Tolet.* iv. A.D. 633, c. 51); one in a Benedictine abbey, but in the East sometimes two, one to be at home, the other superintending the monks abroad (*Reg. Orient.* 2, in Holsten. p. 89); and under the Rule of Pachomius one to each subordinate house; a system in some sense revived, though with a very different purpose, in the *Priores non Conventuales* of the dependent *Obedientiae, Cellae, &c.*, of a later Western Abbey; and (2) by that of *Decani* and *Centenarii*, elected by the monks themselves (Hieron. *ad Eustoch.* *Epist.* xviii.; *Reg. Monach.* in *Append. ad Hieron. Opp.* V.; *Reg. passim*; see also Baed. *H. E.* ii. 2), through whom the discipline and the work of the monastery were administered. He was limited also from without by episcopal jurisdiction, more efficiently in the East (*Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, cc. 4, 8, &c. &c.; and so Balsam. *ad Nomocan.* tit. xi., "Episcopis magis subjecti monachi quam monasteriorum praefectis"), but in theory, and until the 11th century pretty fairly in fact, in the West likewise (*Reg. S. Bened.*; *Conc. Agath.*, A.D. 506, c. 38; *Aurelian.* i., A.D. 511, c. 19; *Epaon.*, A.D. 517, c. 19; *Nerd.* A.D. 524, c. 3; *Arelat.* v., A.D. 554, cc. 2, 3, 5; and later still, *Conc. Tull.*, A.D. 859, c. 9; *Rotomag.*, A.D. 878, c. 10; *Augustan.*, A.D. 952, c. 6; and see also Greg. M. *Epist.* vii. 12; x. 14, 33; Hincmar, as before quoted; and *Conc. Paris.* A.D. 615; *Tolet.* iv. A.D. 633; *Carillon.* i. A.D. 650; *Herulf.* A.D. 673, c. 3, in Baed. *H. E.* iv. 5, among others, putting restrictions upon episcopal interference). The French canons on this subject are repeated by Pseudo-Egbert in England (*Excerpt.* 63-65, Thorpe, ii. 106, 107). Cassian, however, in the West, from the beginning, bids monks beware above all of two sorts of folk, women and bishops (*De Instit.* *Concl.* xi. 17). And although exemptions, at first merely defining or limiting episcopal power, but in time substituting immediate dependence upon the Pope for episcopal jurisdiction altogether, did not grow into an extensive and crying evil until the time of the Councils of Rheims and of Rome, respectively A.D. 1119 and 1122, and of the self-declaring ordinances of the Cistercians (*Chart. Chart.* in *Ann. Cisterc.* i. 109) and Premonstratensians, in the years A.D. 1119, 1120, repudiating such privileges but with a sadly short-lived virtue, and of the contemporary remonstrances of St. Bernard (*Lib. 3 De Consid.*, and *Epist.* 7, 42, 179, 180); yet they occur in exceptional cases much earlier. As e. g. the adjustment of rights between Faustus of Lerins and his diocesan bishop at the Council of Arles, c. A.D. 456 (which secured to the abbat the jurisdiction over his lay monks, and a veto against the ordination of any of them, leaving all else to the bishop, Mansi, vi. 917), a parallel privilege to Agaune (St. Maurice in the Valais), at the Council of Châlons A.D. 579, and *privilegia* of Popes, as of Honorius I. A.D. 628 to Bobbio, and of John IV. A.D. 641 to Luxeuil (see Marculf., *Formul.* lib. I. § 1; and Mabill., *Ann. Bened.* xiii. no. 11, and *Append.* n. 18). Even exempt monasteries in the East, i. e. those immediately depending upon a patriarch, were subject to the visitatorial powers of regular officials called *Exarchi Monasteriorum* (Balsam. in *Nomocan.* i. 20; and a form in Greek Pontificals for the ordination of an exarch, Harnack, *Archierat., Pontif. Graec. observ.* i. ad Edict.

*pro Archimandrit.* pp. 570, 587), exercised sometimes through *Apocrisarii* (as like powers of the bishops through the *Defensores Ecclesiarum*); and even to visitations by the emperor himself (Justinian, *Novell.* cxxxiii., cc. 2, 4, 5). The Rule of Pachomius also qualified the abbat's power by a council of the *Majores Monasterii*, and by a tribunal of assessors, *viri sancti*, 5, 10, or 20, to assist in administering discipline (*Reg. S. Pach.* 167, in Holsten. p. 49). And the Rule of St. Benedict, likewise, compelled the abbat, while it reserved to him the ultimate decision, to take counsel with all the brethren (juniors expressly included) in greater matters, and with the *Seniores Monasterii* in smaller ones (*Reg. S. Bened.* 2, 3). The Rule of Columbanus gave him an unqualified autocracy.

The abbat was likewise limited in his power over abbey property, and in secular things, by his inability to interfere in person with civil suits; which led to the appointment of an *Advocatus*, *Vicedominus*, *Oeconomus*, *Procurator* (*Cod. Can. Afric.* A.D. 418 (?), c. 97; Justinian, lib. i. *Cod.* tit. 3, legg. 33, 42; *Cod. Theodos.* lib. ix. tit. 45, leg. 3; St. Greg. *Epist.* iii. 22; *Conc. Nicaen.* ii. A.D. 787, c. 11), revived with greater powers under the title of *Advocatus Ecclesiae*, or *Monasterii*, by Charlemagne (*Capit.* A.D. 813, c. 14; and Lothar., *Capit.* tit. iii. cc. 3, 9, 18, &c.); who from a co-ordinate, frequently proceeded to usurp an exclusive, interest in the monastic revenues. The abbat also was required to give account of the abbey property to both king and bishop, by the Council of Vern (near Paris) A.D. 755; while neither abbat nor bishop separately could even exchange abbey lands in Anglo-Saxon England, but only by joint consent (Theodor., *Poen.* II. viii. 6, in *Wassersch.* p. 208).

Within the abbey and its precincts, the abbat was to order all work, vestments, services (*Reg. S. Bened.* 47, 57; *Regulae passim*); to award all punishments, even to excommunication (*Reg. S. Bened.* 24; Leidrad., *Lugdun. Arch.*, ad *Car. M.* ap. Galland., xiii. 390, restoring to the Abbat of Insula Barbara, "potestatem ligandi et solvendi, uti habuerunt praedecessores sui"; Honorius III. *cap. Dilecta*, tit. *de Major. et Obedientia*, desiring a neighbouring abbat to excommunicate refractory nuns, because their abbess could not; and see Bingham), or to the use of the "ferrum abscissionis" (*Reg. S. Bened.* 28). He was also to be addressed as "Domnus et Abbas" (ib. 63). And while in the East he was specially commanded to eat with the other monks (*Reg. PP.* 11, in Holsten. p. 23), the Rule of Benedict (56) appoints him a separate table "cum hospitibus et peregrinis," to which he might, in case there was room, invite any monk he pleased. The Council of Aix A.D. 817 (c. 27) tried to qualify this practice by bidding abbats "be content" with the food of the other monks, unless "propter hospitem;" and some monasteries kept up a like protest in the time of Peter Damiani and Peter the Venerable; but it continued to be the Western rule. He was ordered also to sleep among his monks by the Council of Frankfort A.D. 794 (c. 13). The abbat was specially not to wear mitre, ring, gloves, or sandals, as being episcopal insignia—a practice growing up in the West in the 10th and 11th centuries, and (vainly) then protested against by the Council of Poitiers A.D. 1100, and by St. Bernard (*Epist.* 42) and Peter of Blois (*Epist.* 90; and see

also Thom. Cantiprat., *De Apibus*, i. 6; *Chron. Casin.* iv. 78). But a mitre is said to have been granted to the Abbat of Bobbio by Pope Theodorus I. A.D. 643 (*Bull. Casin.* I. ii. 2), the next alleged case being to the Abbat of St. Savianus by Sylvester II. A.D. 1000. A staff, however, but of a particular form, and some kind of stockings ("baculum et pedules"), were the special insignia of an abbat in Anglo-Saxon England in the time of Theodore A.D. 668-690, being formally given to him by the bishop at his benediction (*Poenit.* II. iii. 5, in *Wassersch.* p. 204). And the staff was so everywhere. He was also to shave his beard, and of course to be tonsured (*Conc. Bituric.* A.D. 1031, c. 7). His place of precedence, if an ordinary abbat, appears to have been finally fixed as immediately after bishops, among *prælati*, and before archdeacons (see, however, *Decret. Greg.* IX., lib. ii. tit. 1, cap. *Decernimus*); but the list of our English convocations from Archbishop Kemp's Register A.D. 1452 (*Wilk.* I. xi. sq.), though following no invariable rule, appears usually to postpone the abbat and prior to the archdeacon. In Saxon England, he shared in like manner with the king (as did an abbess also) in the "wer" of a murdered "foreigner" (*Laus of Ine*, 23; Thorpe, i. 117). The abbat also was not named in the canon of the mass (Gavant. in *Rubr. Miss.* P. iii. tit. 8; Macr. F.F., *Hierolex*, in *Can. Missae*), except in the case of the abbat of Monte Cassino (Ang. a Nuce, in *notis ad Leo. Ostiens.* ii. 4). But an anniversary was allowed to be appointed for him on his death (e. g. *Conc. Aquisgr.* A.D. 817, c. 73). He was forbidden (as were all monks, at least in France) to stand sponsor for a child (*Conc. Autissiod.* A.D. 578, c. 25; *Greg. M., Epist.* iv. 42), with a notable exception, however, in England, in the case of Abbat Robert of Mont St. Michel, godfather to King Henry II.'s daughter Eleanor (Rob. de Monte *ad an.* 1161), or to go to a marriage (*Conc. Autissiod.*, *ib.*); or indeed to go far from his monastery at all without the bishop's leave (*Conc. Arel.* v. A.D. 554); or to go about with a train of monks except to a general synod (*Conc. Aquisgr.* A.D. 817, c. 59). He of course could not hold property (although it was needful sometimes to prohibit his lending money on usury, Pseudo-Egbert. *Poenit.* iii. 7, in Thorpe, ii. 199); neither could he dispose of it by will, even if it accrued to him by gift or heirship after he became abbat (*Reg. P.P.* 2, in Holsten. p. 22); but if the heirship was within the 4th degree, he was exceptionally enabled to will the property to whom he pleased (Justinian, lib. i. *Cod. tit. de Episc. et Cler.* c. 33). Further, we find bishops and archdeacons prohibited from seizing the goods of deceased abbats (*Conc. Paris.* A.D. 615; *Cabillon.* i. A.D. 650). And later wills of abbats in the West are sometimes mentioned and confirmed, but principally in order to secure to their abbeys property bequeathed to those abbeys (see Thomassin). Privileges of coining money, of markets and tolls, of secular jurisdiction, began certainly as early as Ludov. Pius, or even Pipin (Gieseler, ii. p. 255, notes 5, 6, Eng. Tr.). Others, such as of the title of prince, of the four *Abbatēs Imperii* in Germany (viz., of Fulda—also *ex officio* the empress's chancellor—of Weissenberg, Kempten, Murbach), of the English mitred baronial abbats, and the like, and sumptuary laws limiting the number of their horses and attendants, &c., belong to later

times. An abbat, however, might hunt in England (*Laus of Cnut*, in Thorpe, i. 429). An abbe or an abbess, presiding over a joint house monks and nuns, is noted by Theodore as a peculiar Anglo-Saxon custom:—"Apud Graecos non est consuetudo viris feminas habere monachos neque feminis viros; tamen consuetudinem istam provinciae" (England) "non destruamus" (*Poenit.* II. vi. 8, in *Wassersch.* p. 208). The well-known cases of the Abbesses Hilda and Aelfled of Whitby and of Aebba of Coldingham are instances of the latter arrangement (*Baed. H. E.* iv. 23, 24, 26); and the last of them also of its mischievousness (*Id. ib.* 25). Tynemouth and Wimbour are other instances. But the practice was a Celtic one (e. g. St. Brigid; see Todd, *St. Patrick* pp. 11, 12), not simply Anglo-Saxon; and with Celtic monastic missions, penetrated also into the Continent (e. g. at Remiremont and Poitiers), and even into Spain and into Rome itself (so Montalembert, *Monks of West*, vol. v. p. 297, Eng. Tr.). It is, however, remarkable, that while instances of abbesses ruling monks abounded, abbats ruling nuns rest for us upon the general assertion of Theodore. And the practice, while it died out of the Continent, was not restored in England after the Danish invasion. In the East there was rigorous separation between monks and nuns. And where two such communities were in a way connected, a special enactment prohibited but the two superiors from communication with one another, and placed all possible restrictions upon even their necessary interviews (*Reg. Basil.* in Holsten. p. 158). St. Pachomius established the double order, but put the Nile between his monks and his nuns (*Pallad., Hist. Laus.* cc. 30-42).

Interference by abbats with the ministrations of parochial clergy could scarcely exist until abbats were presbyters themselves, nor did it even (as was naturally the case) reach the extent which it was carried by the friars. We find, however, an enactment of Theodore (*Poenit.* II. 16, in *Wassersch.* p. 209), prohibiting a monastery from imposing penances on the laity, "quia (haec libertas) proprie clericorum est." And much later and more detailed canon, of the 4th Lateran Council (A.D. 1123), forbids abbats impose penance, visit the sick, or administer unction. They were authorized in the East as presbyters, and with the bishop's leave, to confer the tonsure and the order of reader on their own monks (*Conc. Nicaen.* ii. A.D. 787, c. 14). And they could everywhere admit their own monks ("ordinatio monachi"—Theodor., *Poenit.* II. iii in *Wassersch.* p. 204). But encroachments upon the episcopal office, as well as upon episcopal insignia, gradually arose. Even in A.D. 448 abbats were forbidden to give ἀποστόλια (*Conc. Constantin.*,—corrected by Du Cange into ἐπιστόλια—commendatory letters for poor, and see *Conc. Chalcedonian.* ii. c. 13, and *Turon.* ii. c. 6). But by A.D. 1123 it had become necessary to prohibit generally their thrusting themselves into episcopal offices (*Conc. Lateran.* iv. c. 17). And we find it actually asserted by Sever. Binius (in *Can. Apostol.* ap. Labb. *Conc.* i. 54e, on the authority of Bellarmine, *De Eccles.* iv. 8), that two or more "abbates infulati" might by Papal dispensation be substituted for bishops in consecrating a bishop, provided one bishop were there; and Innocent IV. in 1489 empowered an abbat



himself to confer not only the subdiaconate, but the diaconate.

The spiritual abbat was supplanted in Wales (Girald. Camb., *Itin. Camb.*, and repeatedly) and in Scotland (Robertson, *Early Scotl.* i. 329, 339), by the end of the 8th and so on to the 12th century, by the *Advocatus Ecclesiae* (confused sometimes with the *Oeconomus*, who in Welsh and Irish monasteries was a different officer, and managed the internal secular affairs, as the other did the external), called in Scotland *Herenach*, in Ireland *Airchinneach*, who was originally the lay, and gradually became also the hereditary, lessee of the Termon (or abbey) lands, being commonly the founder or his descendant, or one of the neighbouring lords; and who held those lands, receiving a third part of their value in the first instance, but who is found as an hereditary married lay abbat during the period named; e. g. Crinan, the Abbat of Dunkeld, who was grandfather of Shakspeare's Duncan, and one Dunchad, also Abbat of Dunkeld, who died in battle A.D. 961. The case was the same at Abernethy and at Applecross. The spiritual duties devolved upon the bishop and a prior. See also Du Cange (voc. *Advocatus*), for a similar process although to a less degree on the Continent. In Ireland, the *Comarb*, or similar hereditary abbat (or bishop), retained his spiritual character (Todd, *St. Patrick*, pp. 155 sq.). The lay abbats in Northumbria, denounced by Baeda (*Epist. ad Egbert.*), were simply fraudulent imitations of abbats in the proper sense of the word. An entirely like result, however, and to as wide an extent during Carolingian times as in Scotland, ensued abroad from a different cause, viz. from the system of commendation [*COMMENDATA*]; which began in the time of Charles Martel (A.D. 717-741, being approved by *Conc. Leptia* A.D. 743; *Conc. Suession.*, A.D. 744; and see Baron. in *an.* 889, n. 31), with the plausible object of temporarily employing monastic revenues for the pressing needs of warfare with Saracens, Saxons, or other heathens, care being taken to reserve enough to keep up the monastery proper. The nobleman, or the king himself, who led the troops thus raised, became titular abbat. And in Carolingian times, accordingly, most of the great Frank and Burgundian nobles and kings, and sometimes even bishops (e. g. Hatto of Mainz, A.D. 891-912, who enjoyed the reputation of holding twelve abbeys at once), were titular abbats of some great monastery, as of St. Denys or St. Martin, held for life or even by inheritance; the revenues of which were soon diverted to purposes less patriotic than that of supplying the king with soldiers (see a short list by way of specimen in Gieseler, ii. p. 411, note 1, Eng. Tr.). In the East a like system appears to have grown up, although hardly from the same origin, some centuries later; John, Patriarch of Antioch, at the beginning of the 12th century, informing us that most monasteries in his time were handed over to laymen (*χαρισματα* = *beneficiarii*), for life or for two or three descents, by gift of the emperors; while Balsamon (*ad Conc. Nicæen.* c. 13) actually condemns him for condemning the practice. Later abuses of the kind in the West, as in the time of Francis I. of France or of Louis XIV., need here be only alluded to.

(Bingham; Bulteau, *Hist. Mon. d'Orient*; Du Cange; Ant. Dadin, *Ascetic. seu Origg. Rei Monas-*

*tic.*; Ferraris; Helyot, *Hist. des Ordr. Mon.*; Herzog; Hospinian, *De Monach.*; Macri FF., *Hieroglexic.*; Martene, *De Antiq. Monach. Ritibus*; Martigny; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*; Thomassin, *De Benefic.*; Van Espen.) [A. W. H.]

ABBATISSA. [ABBESS.]

ABBESS. (*Abbatissa* found in inscript. of A.D. 569, in Murator. 429. 3, also called *Antistita* and *Majorissa*, the female superior of a body of nuns; among the Greeks, *Ἡγουμένη*, *Ἀρχιμανδρίτις*, *Archimandritissa*, Justinian, *Novell.* *Ἀμμή* or mother, Pallad., *Hist. Laus.*, c. 42, in the time of Pachomius, *Mater monasterii* or *monialium*, see St. Greg. M., *Dial.* IV. 13 [where "Mater" stands simply for a nun]; *Conc. Mogunt.* A.D. 813; *Aquisgr.*, A.D. 816, lib. ii.). In most points subject to the same laws as abbats, *mutatis mutandis*;—elective, and for life (triennial abbesses belonging to years so late as A.D. 1565, 1583); and solemnly admitted by the bishop—*Benedictio Abbatissae* (that for an abbess *monasticam regulam profitentem, capit. ex Canone Theodori Anglorum Episcopi*, is in the *Ordo Romanus*, p. 164, Hittorp.); and in France restricted to one monastery apiece (*Conc. Vern.* A.D. 755); and with *Praepositae*, and like subordinates, to assist them (*Conc. Aquisgr.*, A.D. 816, lib. ii. cc. 24-26); and bound to obey the bishop in all things, whether abbesses of *Monachae* or of *Canonicas* (*Conc. Cabillon.* ii. A.D. 813, c. 65); and subject to be deprived for misconduct, but in this case upon report of the bishop to the king (*Conc. Francof.* A.D. 794); bound also to give account of monastic property to both king and bishop (*Conc. Vern.*, A.D. 755); entitled to absolute obedience and possessed of ample powers of discipline, even to expulsion, subject however to the bishop (*Conc. Aquisgr.* A.D. 816, lib. ii.); and save only that while an abbat could, an abbess could not, excommunicate (Honorius III., cap. *Dilecta, tit. de Major. et Obedientia*); neither could she give the veil or (as some in France appear to have tried to do) ordain (*Capitul. Car. M.* an. 789, c. 74, Anseg. 71); present even at Councils in England (see ABBAT, and compare Lingard, *Antiq.* i. 139; Kemble, *Antiq.* ii. 198; quoted by Montalembert, *Monks of West*, v. 230, Engl. Tr.). While, however, a bishop was necessary to admit and bless an abbat, Theodore ruled in England, although the rule did not become permanent, that a presbyter was sufficient in like case for an abbess (*Poenit.* II. iii. 4, in *Wassersch.*, p. 203). The limitation to forty years old at election is as late as the Council of Trent; Gregory the Great speaks of sixty (*Epist.* iv. 11). An abbess also was not to leave her monastery, in France, save once a year if summoned by the king with the bishop's consent to the king's presence upon monastic business (*Conc. Vern.* A.D. 755; *Cabillon.* ii. A.D. 813, c. 57). Neither was she even to speak to any man save upon necessary business, and then before witnesses and between the first hour of the day and evening (*Conc. Cabillon.* ii. A.D. 813, cc. 55, 56). For the exceptional cases of Anglo-Saxon, Irish, or Continental Irish, abbesses ruling over mixed houses of monks and nuns, see ABBAT. It was noted also as a specially Western custom, that widows as well as virgins were made abbesses (Theod., *Poenit.* II. iii. 7, in *Wassersch.* p. 204). [A. W. H.]

## ABBEY. [MONASTERY.]


**ABBUNA**, the common appellation of the Bishop, Metren, or Metropolitan, of Axum, or Abyssinia, or Ethiopia, not a patriarch, but, on the contrary, appointed and consecrated always by the patriarch of Alexandria, and specially forbidden to have more than seven suffragan bishops under him, lest he should make himself so, twelve bishops being held to be the lowest canonical number for the consecration of a patriarch. In a Council, if held in Greece, he occupied the seventh place, immediately after the prelate of Seleucia. (Ludolf, *Hist. Ethiop.* iii. 7.) [A. W. H.]

**ABDELLA**, martyr in Persia under Sapor, commemorated Apr. 21 (*Martyr. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ABDIANUS**, of Africa, commemorated June 3 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**ABDON**, **ABDO** or **ABDUS**, and **SENNEN**, **SENNES**, or **SENNIA**, Persian princes, martyred at Rome under Decius, A.D. 250, are commemorated July 30 (*Martyrologium Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis*). Proper office in Gregorian *Sacramentary*, p. 116; and Antiphon in the *Lit. Antiphon.* p. 704.

It is related (*Adonis Martyrol.* iii. Kal. Aug.) that their relics were translated in the time of Constantine to the cemetery of Pontianus. There Bosio discovered a remarkable fresco, representing the Lord, seen from the waist upward emerging from a cloud, placing wreaths on the heads of SS. Abdon and Sennen (see woodcut). This is



Abdon and Sennen. (From the cemetery of Pontianus.)

in front of the vault enclosing the supposed remains of the martyrs, which bears the inscription [DEPOSITI]ONIS DIE. The painting is, in Martigny's opinion, not earlier than the seventh century. It is remarkable that the painter has evidently made an attempt to represent the Persian dress. The saints wear pointed caps or hoods, similar to those in which the Magi are sometimes represented; cloaks fastened with a fibula on the breast; and tunics of skin entirely unlike the Roman tunic, and resembling that given to St. John Baptist in a fresco of the Lord's Baptism in the same cemetery of Pontianus (Bottari, *Sculture e Pitture*, tav. xlv.). Some account of the peculiar dress of Abdon and Sennen may be found in Lami's treatise *De Evidentiis Apostolorum*, pp. 121-166.

The gesture of the Lord, crowning the martyrs

## ABJURATION

for their constancy, is found also on the bottoms of early Christian cups [GLASS, CHRISTIAN], where He crowns SS. Peter and Paul, and other saints (Buonarruoti, *Vasi Antichi*, tav. xv. fig. 1, and elsewhere); and on coins of the Lower Empire the Lord is not unfrequently seen crowning two emperors. (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chrétiennes*.) [C.]

**ABECEDARIAN**. The term "Hymnus" or "Psalm Abecedarius" is applied specially to the hymn of Sedulius, "A solis ortus cardine." [ACROSTIC.] [C.]

**ABERCUS** of Jerusalem, *Ἀβέρκος*: *Ἀβερκούριος*, commemorated Oct. 22 (*Cal Byzant.*). [C.]

**ABGARUS**, King, commemorated Dec. 21 (*Cal. Armen.*). [C.]

**ABIBAS**, martyr of Edessa, commemorated Nov. 15 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**ABIBON**, invention of his relics at Jerusalem, Aug. 3 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ABILIUS**, bishop of Alexandria (A.D. 86-96) commemorated Feb. 22 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet.*) Maskarram 1 = Aug. 29 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [C.]

**ABJURATION**—denial, disavowal, or renunciation upon oath. Abjuration, in common ecclesiastical language, is restricted to the renunciation of heresy made by the penitent heretic on the occasion of his reconciliation to the Church. In some cases the abjuration was the only ceremony required; but in others it was followed up by the imposition of hands and by unction. The practice of the ancient Church is described by St. Gregory the Great in a letter to Quiricus and the bishops of Iberia on the reconciliation of the Nestorians. According to this, in cases in which the heretical baptism was imperfect, the rule was that the penitent should be baptized but when it was complete, as in the case of the Arians, the custom of the Eastern Church was to reconcile by the Chrism; that of the Western by the imposition of hands. As, however, the mystery of the Chrism was but the Oriental rite of Confirmation, the practice was substantially identical. (On the question of Re-baptism, see RE-BAPTISM, BAPTISM.) Converts from the Monophysites were received after simple confession, and the previous baptism was supposed to take effect "for the remission of sins," at the moment at which the Spirit was imparted by the imposition of hands; or the convert was reunited to the Church by his profession of faith (St. Greg. *Ep.* 9, 61). A similar rule is laid down by the Quinisext Council, canon 95, which classes with the Arians, the Macedonians, Novatians and others, to be received with the Chrism. The Paulianists, Montanists, Eunomians, and others, are to be re-baptized; to be received Christians, on their profession, the first day; Catechumens the second, and after they have been allowed a place in the Church as hearers for some time, to be baptized. In all cases, the profession of faith must be made by the presentation of a libellus, or form of abjuration, in which the convert renounced and anathematized his former tenets. After declaring his abjuration not to be made on compulsion, from fear, or any other unworthy motive, he proceeded to anathematize the sect renounced, by all its

men; the heresiarcha, and their successors, past, present, and future; he then enumerated the tenets received by them, and, having repudiated them singly and generally, he ended with making profession of the true faith. (Bandinius, *Monumenta* ii. 109-111. But for the whole subject see Martene and Durand, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus* II. liber iii. ch. 6; *Abj. de levi et de vehementi*, later date. See Landon's *Eccl. Dic.*) [D. B.]

**ABLUTION.** A term under which various kinds of ceremonial washing are included. The principal are the following: the washing of the head, as a preparation for unction in baptism, and the washing of the feet, which in some places formed part of the baptismal ceremony [BAPTISM]; the washing of the feet of the poor by exalted persons, which forms part of the ceremony of Maundy Thursday [FEET, WASHING OF]; the lustral ceremony which preceded entrance to a church [CANTHARUS; HOLY WATER]; and the washing of the priest's hands at certain points in the celebration of the liturgy [AQUAMANILE; HANDS, WASHING OF]. [C.]

**ABORTION.** The crime of procuring abortion is little, if at all, noticed in the earliest laws. It is a crime of civilization: the representative of the principle which in a barbarous state of society is infanticide. The oration of Lysias which was pronounced on occasion of a suit on this subject is lost, so that it cannot be decided whether the act was regarded by the Athenians as an offence against society, or merely as a private wrong. It is in the latter aspect that it is chiefly regarded in the civil law. The child unborn represents certain interests, and his life or death may be beneficial or injurious to individuals: thus, it may have been, that a father, by his wife's crime, might lose the *ius trium liberorum*. The case quoted from Cicero pro Cluentio (Dig. xlviii. 19, 39), in which a woman was condemned to death for having procured abortion, having been bribed by the second heir, is clearly exceptional. The only passage in the civil law in which the crime is mentioned without such connexion, is a sentence of Ulpian, in the Pandects (Dig. xlviii. 8, 8, ad legem Cornelianam de Sicariis), where the punishment is declared to be banishment. The horrible prevalence of the practice among the Romans of the Empire may be learned from Juvenal.

It was early made a ground of accusation by the Christians against the heathen. Tertullian denounces the practice as homicidal. "Prevention of birth is a precipitation of murder," *Apol. ix.* Minucius Felix declares it to be *paricide*.

The Council of Ancyra (A.D. 314) having mentioned that the ancient punishment was penance for life, proceeds to limit it to ten years; and the same space of time is given by St. Basil, who condemns the practice in two canons, ii. and viii., alleging the character of the crime as committed against both the mother and the offspring; and declining to accept the distinctions drawn by the lawyers between the degrees of criminality varying with the time of the gestation. The Council of Lerida (324) classes the crime with infanticide, but allows the mother to be received to Communion after seven years' penance even when her sin is complicated with adultery. The Council of Trullo condemns it to the penance

of homicide. Pope Gregory III. in the next century reverts to the ten years' penance, although he differs from St. Basil in modifying the sentence to a single year in cases where the child has not been formed in the womb; this is based on Exod. xxi., and is countenanced by St. Augustine, in *Quaestiones Exodi*, in a passage incorporated by Gratian.

There is thus abundant evidence that the crime was held in extreme abhorrence, and punished with great severity, as pertaining to wilful murder, by the canons of the Church. By the Visigothic law (lib. VI. tit. iii. c. 1), the person who administered a draught for the purpose was punished with death. [D. B.]

**ABRAHAM.** (1) the patriarch, commemorated Oct. 9 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet.*). Also on the 23rd of the month Nahasse, equivalent to August 16. (*Cal. Ethiop.*; Neale, *Eastern Church, Introd.* pp. 805, 815.)

(2) Patriarch and martyr, commemorated Taksas 6 = Dec. 2 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [C.]

**ABRAHAM, ISAAC, AND JACOB** are commemorated by the Ethiopic Church on the 28th of every month of their Calendar. [C.]

**ABRAXAS GEMS.** [See ABRASAX in *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.*]

**ABREHA**, first Christian king of Ethiopia, commemorated Tekemt 4 = Oct. 1 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [C.]

**ABRENUNTIATIO.** [BAPTISM.]

**ABSOLUTION** (Lat. *Absolutio*). (For Sacramental Absolution, see EXOMOLOGESIS.)

1. A short deprecation which follows the Psalms of each Nocturn in the ordinary offices for the Hours. In this usage, the word "absolutio" perhaps denotes simply "ending" or "completion," because the monks, when the Nocturns were said at the proper hours of the night, broke off the chant at this point and went to rest (Macri *Hieroglossicon* s. v.). In fact, of the "Absolutiones" in the present Roman Breviary, only one (that "in Tertio Nocturno, et pro feria iv. et Sabbato") contains a prayer for absolution, in the sense of a setting free from sin.

2. For the Absolution which follows the introductory Confession in most Liturgies and Offices, see CONFESSIO.

3. The prayer for Absolution at the beginning of the office is, in Oriental Liturgies, addressed to the Son: but many of these liturgies contain a second "Oratio Absolutionis," at some point between Consecration and Communion, which is addressed to the Father. For example, that in the Greek St. Basil (Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.* i. 81), addressing God, the Father Almighty ( $\delta \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ ,  $\delta \Pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho \delta \Pi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\rho$ ), and reciting the promise of the Keys, prays Him to dismiss, remit and pardon our sins ( $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\varsigma$ .  $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\chi\acute{\omega}\rho\eta\sigma\omicron\nu \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ ). Compare the Coptic St. Basil (*ib.* i. 22).

4. The word "Absolutio" is also applied to those prayers said over a corpse or a tomb in which remission of the sins of the departed is entreated from the Almighty. (Macri *Hieroglossicon*, s. v.) [C.]

**ABSTINENCE.** Days of abstinence, as they are called, on which persons may take their meals at the ordinary hour, and eat and drink what they please, in any quantity so that they

ascertain from meat alone, belong to modern times. Anciently, fasting and abstinence went together, as a general rule, formed parts of the same idea, and could not be discovered. There may have been some few, possibly, who ate and drank indiscriminately, when they broke their fast, as Socrates (v. 22, 10) seems to imply; but in general, beyond doubt, abstinence from certain kinds of food was observed on fasting days when the fast was over, "abstinentes ab his, quae non rejicimus, sed differimus," as Tertullian says (*De Jejun.* 15). Thus it will be more properly considered under the head of fasting, to which it subserved. [E. S. F.]

#### ABUNA. [ABUNNA.]

ABUNDANTIUS, of Alexandria, commemorated Feb. 26 (*Mart. Hieron.*) [C.]

ABUNDIUS. (1) Martyr at Rome under Decius, commemorated Aug. 28 (*Mart. Rom. l'et. at Bedae*); Aug. 23 (*Mart. Hieronym.*)

(2) The deacon, martyr at Spolito under Diocletian, Dec. 10 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet.*) [C.]

ACACIUS, martyr, commemorated May 7 (*Cal. Byzant.*) [C.]

ACATHISTUS (Gr. ἀκθιστος). A hymn of the Greek Church, sung on the eve of the fifth Sunday in Lent, in honour of the Blessed Virgin, to whose intercession the deliverance of Constantinople from the barbarians on three several occasions was attributed. Meursius assigns its origin more especially to the deliverance of the city from Chosroes, king of the Persians, in the reign of the Emperor Heraclius (638). It is called ἀκθιστος, because during the singing of it the whole congregation stood, while during the singing of other hymns of the same kind they occasionally sat. (Suicer's *Theaurus*, s. v.; Neale's *Eastern Ch. Introd.* 747; Daniel's *Codex Liturg.* iv. 223.)

Francis Junius wrongly supposed this use of the Acathistus to commemorate the journey of Mary and Joseph to Bethlehem. (Macri *Hieroglyphicon*, s. v.)

The word Acathistus is also used to designate the day on which the hymn was used. (*Babae Typicon*, in Suicer, s. v.) [C.]

ACCENTUS ECCLESIASTICUS. One of the two principal kinds (*accentus* and *concentus*) of ecclesiastical music.

1. The consideration of this subject is encumbered by an especial difficulty—the popular, and now all but exclusive application of the word "accent" to emphasis, stress, or *ectus*. Accent, however, claims and admits of a much wider application. Ben Jonson\* speaks of accent as being "with the ancients, a tuning of the voice, in lifting it up, or letting it down,"—a definition not only clear and concise, but thoroughly accordant with the derivation of the word "accent," from *accino*, i. e. *ad cerno*, to sing to. We are all conscious of and affected by the varieties of accent<sup>b</sup> (in this, its etymological and primitive acceptation) in foreign languages spoken by those to whom they are native, as well as in our native language spoken by foreigners, or (perhaps still more) by residents of

parts of Great Britain other than our own. Scottish, Irish, and various provincial accents are not so much the result of different vocalization (i. e. utterances of vowel sounds) as of different gradations in which the Scotch, Irish, and others, "tune their voices."

2. The *Accentus Ecclesiasticus*, called also *mus choraliiter legendi*, is the result of successful attempts to ensure in Public Worship uniformity of delivery consistent with uniformity of music delivered; so as, if not to obliterate, at least to hide individual peculiarities under the veil of catholic "use." It presents a sort of mean between speech and song, continually inclining towards the latter, never altogether leaving hold on the former; it is speech, though also attuned speech, in passages of average importance; it is song, though always distinct and articulate song, in passages demanding more fervid utterance. Though actually more only in concluding or culminating phrases, *Accentus Ecclesiasticus* is always sufficiently chromatic to admit of its being expressed in musical characters, a process to which no attempt (and such attempts have been repeatedly made) has ever succeeded in subjecting pure speech.

3. *Accentus* is probably the oldest, as it is certainly the simplest, form of *Cantus Ecclesiasticus*. Like most art-forms and modes of opera which have subsequently commended themselves on their own account to our sense of beauty, grew in all likelihood out of a physical difficulty. The limited capacity of the so-called "natural" or speaking voice must have been ascertained in a very early period; indeed its recognition confirmed by the well-known practice of the ancient temple, theatre, or forum. The rhetoricians, says Forkel, are, without exception of the same way of thinking; and we may, in their extant works, confidently conclude, neither among the Greeks nor the Romans poetry ever recited but in a tone analogous to that since known as the *accentus ecclesiasticus*. The Abbé du Bos<sup>c</sup> too has demonstrated not only was the theatrical recitation of ancients actually musical—"un véritable chant susceptible de musical notation, and even of instrumental accompaniment"—but that all their public discourses, and even their familiar language, though of course in a lesser degree, took of this character.

4. The advantages resulting from the employment of isochronous sounds (sounds which the result of equal-timed vibrations) would come apparent on the earliest occasion, when a single orator was called upon to fill a large auditorium, and to make himself intelligible even audible, to a large assembly. So, too, simultaneous expression on the part of large numbers, these advantages would at once make themselves felt. In congregational worship a unit (technically, a "unisonous") utterance seems as essential, as conducive to the due and order with which we are enjoined to do

\* *English Grammar*, 1640, chap. viii.

<sup>b</sup> "Ita in dicendo etiam quidem cantus obsequitur."—*Quint.* *Orat.* 16, 57.

\* "Die alten Sprach- und Declamations-Lehrer stimmten eben derselben Meinung, und wir können ihren hinterlassenen Worten mit dem höchsten Grade Wahrscheinlichkeit zuschreiben, dass sowohl bei dem allein als mehreren die meisten Gedächtnisse mit keiner als mit dieser Art von Gesang gemessen wurden und Forkel, *Allgem. Geschichte der Musik*, II, 128.

<sup>c</sup> *Reflexions sur la Poésie*, &c.

things," as is that still more essential uniformity expressed in the term Common Prayer, without which, indeed, congregational worship would seem to be impossible. "Accent," says Ornithoparcus, "hath great affinity with Con-cent, for they be Brothers: because Sonus, or Sound (the King of Ecclesiastical Harmony), is Father to them both, and begat one upon Grammar, the other upon Musick," &c. (He) "so divided his kingdome, that Con-centus might be chief Ruler over all things that are to be sung, as Hymnes, Sequences, Antiphones, Responsories, Introitus, Tropes, and the like: and Accentus over all things which are read; as Gospels, Lectures, Epistles, Orations, Prophecies: For the functions of the Papale Kingdome are not duely performed without Con-cent," &c. "Hence it was that I, marking how many of those Priests (which by the leave of the learned I will say) doe reade those things they have to reade so wildly, so monstrously, so faultily (that they doe not onely hinder the devotion of the faithful, but also even provoke them to laughter and scorning, with their ill reading), resolved after the doctrine of Con-cent to explain the rules of Accent; in as much as it belongs to a Musitian, that together with Con-cent, Accent might also as true heire in this Ecclesiasticall Kingdome be established: Desiring that the praise of the highest King, to whom all honour and reverence is due, might duely be performed."\*


5. The Accentus Ecclesiasticus, or *modus chorali-ter legendi*, must have been perpetuated by tradition only, for many ages. That the rules for its application have been reduced to writing only in comparatively modern times does not in the least invalidate its claim to a high antiquity. On the contrary, it tends to confirm it. That which is extensively known and universally admitted has no need of verification. It is only when traditions are dying out that they begin to be put on record. So long as this kind of recitation was perfectly familiar to the Greeks and Romans there could be no necessity for "noting" it; not till it began to be less so were "accents" (the characters so called) invented for its preservation,—just as the "vowel-points" were introduced into Hebrew writing subsequently to the dispersion of the Jews. The force and accuracy of tradition, among those unaccustomed to the use of written characters, have been well ascertained and must be unhesitatingly admitted; their operation has certainly been as valuable in music as in poetry and history. Strains incomparably longer and more intricate than those now accepted as the ecclesiastical accents have been passed on from voice to voice, with probably but trifling alteration, for centuries, among peoples who had no other method of preserving and transmitting them.

6. The authorities for the application of the Cantus Ecclesiasticus are, as we have said, comparatively modern. Lucas Lossius,<sup>1</sup> a writer frequently quoted by Walther, Kock, and other more recent musical theorists, gives six forms of cadence or close, i.e., modes of bringing to an end a phrase the earlier portion of which had been recited in monotone. According to Lossius,

accent is (1) *immutabilis* when a phrase is concluded without any change of pitch, i.e., when it is monotonous throughout; (2) it is *medius* when on the last syllable the voice falls from the reciting note (technically the dominant) a third; (3) *gravis*, when on the last syllable it falls a fifth; (4) *acutus*, when the "dominant," after the interposition of a few notes at a lower pitch, is resumed; (5) *moderatus*, when the monotone is interrupted by an ascent, on the penultimate, of a second; (6) *interrogativus*, when the voice, after a slight descent, rises scale-wise on the last syllable. To these six forms other writers add one more, probably of more recent adoption; (7) the *finalis*, when the voice, after rising a second above the dominant, falls scale-wise to the fourth below it, on which the last syllable is sounded. The choice of these accents or cadences is regulated by the punctuation (possible, if not always actual) of the passage recited; each particular stop had its particular cadence or cadences. Thus the comma (*distinctio*) was indicated and accompanied by the accentus *immutabilis*, *acutus*, or *moderatus*; the colon (*duo puncta*) by the *medius*; and the full stop (*punctum quadratum ante syllabam capitalem*) by the *gravis*.


7. The following table, from Lossius, exhibits the several accents, in musical notation:—

(1) IMMUTABILIS




Lec - ti - o E - pis - to - lae sanc - ti Pau - li.

(2) MEDIUS.



et o - pe - ra - tur vir - tu - tes in vo - bis:

(3) GRAVIS.



Be - ne - di - cen - tur in te om - nes gen - tes.


(4) ACUTUS.

(5) MODERATUS.



Cum sp! - ri - tu coe - pe - ri - tis nunc, Cum fi - de - li,

(6) INTERROGATIVUS.




ex op - e - ri - bus le - gis an ex au - di - tu fi - de - i?

(7) FINALIS.



a - ni - ma me - a ad te De - us.

The examples given by Ornithoparcus are similar to the above, with two exceptions—(5), the *Moderatus*, which in 'His Micrologus' appears thus:




Il - lu - mi - na - re Je - ru - sa - lem.

And the *Interrogativus*, of which he says: "A speech with an interrogation, whether it have in the end a word of one syllable, or of two syllables, or more, the accent still falls upon the last syllable, and must be acuated. Now the signs of such a speech are, *who*, *which*, *what*, and those which are thus derived, *why*, *wherefore*, *when*, *how*, *in what sort*, *whether*, and such like."

\* Andreas Ornithoparcus, *His Micrologus*. Translated by John Fawcett. 1699. P. 69.

<sup>1</sup> *Eruditione Musicae Practicae*, 1590.






Quantas ha-be-o in-i-qui-ta-tes et pec-ca-ta?

"To these are joynd verbes of asking; as, *I aske, I seeke, I require, I searche, I heare, I see,* and the like."

Some variations too from the above, in the present Roman use, are noticed by Mendelssohn: e.g. in the *Gravis*, where there the voice rises a tone above the dominant, on the penultimate, before falling:—



changing the cadence from a fifth (compare 5) to a sixth; and in the *Interrogaticus*, where the voice falls from the dominant (also on the penultimate) a third:—



To the accentus belong the following forms, or portions of offices of the Latin Church: (1) *Tonus Collectarum seu Orationum*. (2) *Tonus Epistolarum et Evangelii*, including the melodies to which the *Passion* is sung in Passion Week. (3) *Tonus Lectionum solennis et lugubris; Prophetiarum et Martyrologii*. (4) Various forms of Intonation, Benediction, and Absolution used in the Liturgy. (5) Single verses. (6) The Exclamations and Admonitions of the assistants at the altar. (7) The Prefaces; the *Pater Noster*, with its Prefaces; the Benediction, *Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*. [J. H.]

**ACCESS.** 1. The approach of the priest to the altar for the celebration of the Eucharist. Hence the expression "prayer of access" is used as equivalent to the *Εὐχὴ τῆς παραστάσεως*, or prayer of the priest's presenting himself at the altar, in the Greek Liturgy of St. James (Neale's *Eastern Church, Introduction*, i. 360).

2. But the expression "prayer of access," or "prayer of humble access," is more commonly used by English liturgical writers to designate a confession of unworthiness in the sight of God, occurring at a later point of the service; generally between consecration and communion. So that the "prayer of humble access" corresponds to the "Prayer of Inclination" or "of bowing the neck" in the Greek Liturgies. Though words more expressive of "humble access" occur in other places; for instance, in the Greek St. James, where the priest declares: *ἰδοὺ προσ-ῆλθον τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἐπουρανίῳ μυστηρίῳ σὺν ὡς ἄξιός ἐνάρχων* (Daniel's *Codex Lit.*, iv. 88); in the Mozarabic, "Accedam ad Te in humilitate spiritus mei" (*Ib.* i. 71); or in the "Domine et Deus noster, ne aspicias ad multitudinem peccatorum nostrorum" in the Liturgy of Adaeus and Maris (*Ib.* i. 176). Compare CONFESSION. [C.]

**ACCLAMATION.** 1. A term applied by epigraphists to certain short inscriptions, expressed in the second person, and containing a

<sup>s</sup> *Reisebriefe aus den Jahren 1830 bis 1832*, p. 167.

<sup>b</sup> Rhau, *Enchiridion*, 1638; quoted by Arrey von Dommer; Koch's *Musikalisches Lexikon*.

wish or injunction; as, *VIVAS IN DEO* (Martyr, *Thesaurus Vet. Inscript.* 1954, no. 4). For the greater part of these acclamations: sepulchral [EPITAPH], but similar sentences: also seen on AMULETS, on the bottoms of cups [GLASS, CHRISTIAN] found in the Catacombs, and on GEMS. (See the Articles.)

2. The term acclamation is also sometimes applied to the responsive cry or chant of the congregation in antiphonal singing. Compare ACROSTIC (§ 5); ANTIPHON. [C.]

### ACCUSERS, FALSE; HOW PUNISHED

—Those who made false accusations against a person were visited with severe punishment under the canons of several councils.

*In Spain.* The Council of Illiberis (A.D. 306 or 309) refused communion even at the hour of death ("in fine," *al.* "in finem") to any person who should falsely accuse any bishop, priest, or deacon (can. 75).

*In France.* By the 14th canon of the Council of Arles (A.D. 314) those who falsely accuse their brethren were excommunicated for life ("usque ad exitum"). This canon was enacted at the 2nd Council held at the same city (A.D. 443), but permission was given for the restoration of those who should do penance and give satisfaction commensurate with the offence (can. 24). See also CALUMNY. [I. E.]

**ACEPSIMAS**, commemorated Nov. 3 (Cal. Byzant.); Nov. 5 (Cal. Armen.); April 1 (Mart. Rom.). [C.]

**ACERRA** or **ACERNA**. (The latter is possibly the original form, from Acer, maple.) Acerra designated, in classical times, either an incense-box used in sacrifices; or a small altar or incense-burner, placed before the dead. (Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, s. v.) In ecclesiastical latinity also it designates either an incense-box or an incense-burner; "Acethuris, vel thuribulum, vel thurarium." (Papadopolus in Ducange's *Glossary* s. v. 'Acerna.')

It is used in the rubrics of the Gregorian Sacramentary (Corbey MS.) in the office for consecration of a church (p. 428); and in the office for the baptism of a bell (p. 438); the latter in the form Acerna: "tunc ponetur censerium in acerna." In both cases it designates an incense-burner or THURIBLE (q. v.). [C.]

**ACHAICUM CONCILIIUM.**—Two synods of Achaia, in Greece, are recorded: one, A.D. 268, against the Valesians, who, like Origen, interpreted St. Matth. xix. 12, literally; the other, A.D. 359, against the followers of Aetius. [A. W. E.]

**ACHILLEAS** (or Achilles), bishop of Achaia, commemorated Nov. 7 (Martyrol. Rom. Vet.). [C.]

**ACHILLEUS**, the eunuch, martyr at Rome, May 12, A.D. 96. (Martyrol. Rom. Vet., Bedae). [C.]

**ACINDYNUS** (Ἀκίνδυνος) and companion, martyrs, A.D. 346, commemorated Nov. 2 (Cal. Byz.). [C.]

**ACEPHALI** [VAGI CLERICI; AUTOPHAGI].

**ACLEENSE CONCILIIUM** (of Aclense, "Field of the Oak," supposed to be Aycliffe, Durham; Raine's *Priory of Hexham*, i. 38, no. 10. (i.) A.D. 781 (Flor. Wig. in *M. H. B.* 545). [C.]

783 (*Angl.-Sax. Chr.* and *H. Hunt.*, ii. 338, 331). (ii.) A.D. 787 (Kemble, *C. D.*, No. 181). (iii.) A.D. 788, Sept. 29, in the year and month of the murder of Eilfrid of Northumbria, Sept. 21, 788 (*Wilk.* i. 153; *Mansl.* xiii. 823, 826). (iv.) A.D. 789 (*Angl.-Sax. Chr.*, *M. H. S.* 337 "a great year"), in the 8th year of Bribtric, King of Wessex (*H. Hunt.*, ii. 732). (v.) A.D. 804 (Kemble, *C. D.*, No. 188). (vi.) A.D. 805, Aug. 6 (*id.* ii. 180, 181). (vii.) A.D. 810 (*id.* ii. No. 234). *Ibid.* ii. v. and vi. probably, and No. vii. certainly, were at Ockley, in Surrey; or, at any rate, not in the Northumbrian Arden. Nothing more is known of any of these eyodes, or rather Wismgemotes, beyond the dooks (grants of lands) there referred to, in Kemble. [A. W. H.]

**ACOMETAE**, lit. the "sleepers" or "asleeping" (for the theological or moral import of the term v. *Stuor*, *Thesaur. Eccl.* a.v.), a so-called order of monks established in the East about the middle, rather than the commencement, of the 4th century, being altogether unnoticed by *Isidore* and *Sozomen*, the latter a zealous chronicler of monks and monasteries, who bring their history down to A.D. 440; yet mentioned by *Isidore* (iii. 19) as a regularly established order in 483. Later authorities make their founder to have been a certain officer of the imperial household at Constantinople named Alexander, who quitted his post to turn monk, and after having had to shift his quarters in Syria several times, at length returned to Constantinople, to give permanence to the system which he had already commenced on the Euphrates. The first monastery which he founded there was situated near the church of St. Menas. It was composed of 300 monks of different nations, whom he divided into six choirs, and arranged so that one of them should be always employed in the work of prayer and praise day and night without intermission all the year round. This was their peculiar characteristic—and it has been copied in various ways elsewhere since then—that some part of "the house," as Wordsworth (*Excurs.* viii. 185) expresses it, "was evermore watching to God." Alexander having been calumniated for this practice as heretical, he was imprisoned, but regained his liberty, and died, say his biographers, about A.D. 430—it might be nearer the mark to say 450—in a new convent of his own founding on the *Dor*-anellon. Marcellus, the next head of the order but one, brought all the zeal and energy to it of a second founder; and he doubtless found a powerful supporter in Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 458-71, a great master of discipline and promoter of learning amongst the clergy. Then it was that Studius, a noble Roman, and in process of time consul, emigrated to Constantinople, and converted one of the churches there, dedicated to St. John the Baptist, into the celebrated monastery bearing his name, but which he peopled with the Acometae. There was another monastery founded by St. Isaac, in the reign of Theodosius the Great, that also became their mother or later, to which Valens (*Ad. Ev.* iii. 19 and 31) adds a third founded by St. Basilianus. It may have been owing to their connexion with Studius that they were led to correspond with the West. At all events, on the acceptance by Acemius, the patriarch succeeding Gennadius, of the Henoticon of the emperor Zeno, and communion with the schis-

matic patriarch of Alexandria, their "begumen," or president, Cyril lost no time in dispatching complaints of him to Rome; nor were their emissaries slow to accuse the legates of the Pope themselves of having, during their stay at Constantinople, held communion with heretics. The ultimate result was, that the two legates, Vitalis and Miconus, were deprived of their sees, and Acemius himself excommunicated by the Popes Simplicius and Felix. Meanwhile one who had been expelled from their order, but had learnt his trade in their monasteries, Peter the Fuller, had become schismatic patriarch of Antioch, and he, of course, made common cause with their opponents. Nor was it long before they laid themselves open to retaliation. For, under Justinian, their ardent propensities to deny the celebrated proposition, advocated so warmly by the Scythian monks, hesitated about so long at Rome, that one of the Trinity had suffered in the flesh. Their denial of this proposition threw them into the arms of the Nestorians, who were much interested in having it decided in this way. For, if it could be denied that one of the Trinity had suffered, it could not be maintained, obviously, that one of the Trinity had become incarnate. Hence, on the monks sending two of their body, Cyrus and Eulogius, to Rome to defend their views, the emperor immediately despatched two bishops thither, Hypatius and Demetrius, to denounce them to the Pope (*Pap. ad Baron.*, A.D. 533, n. 2). In short, in a letter, of which they were the bearers, to John II., afterwards inserted by him in Lib. I. Tit. "De summa Trinitate" of his Code, he himself accused them of favouring Judaism and the Nestorian heresy. The Pope in his reply seems to admit their heterodoxy, but he entreats the emperor to forgive them at his instance, should they be willing to abjure their errors and return to the unity of the Church. With what success he interceded for them we are not told. During the iconoclastic controversy they seem to have shared exile with the rest of the monks ejected from their monasteries by Constantine Copronymus (*Pap. ad Baron.*, A.D. 798, n. 2); but under the empress Irene the Studium, at all events, was re-peopled with its former alumni by the most celebrated of them all, Theodore, in whose surname "Studites" it has perhaps achieved a wider celebrity than it ever would otherwise have possessed.

In the West a branch of the order long held the abbey of St. Maurice of Agaune in Valais, where they were established by Sigismund, king of Burgundy, and had their institute confirmed by a Council held there A.D. 523. For fuller details see Bonassi's *Hist. du Clerg. anc. et roy.* vol. ii. p. 153 et seq. (Amsterdam, 1716); Bulteau's *Hist. Monast. d'Orient*, iii. 33 (Paris, 1800); Harpin, *De Orig. Monach.* iii. 8; Du Fresnoe, *Gloss. Lat.* a. v.; and *Constant. Christian.* iv. 8 2; Bingham's *Antiq.* vii. 11, 10. [K. S. F.]

**ACOLYTES—ACOLYTHS—ACOLYTHISTS** (*Ἀκούλῳτοι*). One of the minor orders peculiar to the Western Church, although the name is Greek. In the Apostolic age, the only order which existed, in addition to those of bishops, priests, and deacons, was that of deaconesses—widows usually at first, who were employed in such ministrations towards their own sex as were considered unsuitable for men, especially in the East. But about the end of the 2nd

or early in the 3rd century. other new officers below the order of the deacons were introduced, and amongst them this of *Acolytes*, though only in the Latin Church as a distinct order. In the rituals of the Greek Church the word occurs only as another name for the order of sub-deacon.

The institution of the minor orders took its origin in the greater Churches, such as Rome and Carthage, and was owing partly to the supposed expediency of limiting the number of deacons to seven, as first appointed by the apostles, and partly to the need which was felt of assistance to the deacons in performing the lower portions of their office; of which functions, indeed, they appear in many cases to have been important, regarding them as unworthy of their important position in the Church. Tertullian is the earliest writer by whom any of the inferior orders is mentioned. He speaks of Readers, *De Praescr.* c. 41. It is in the epistles of Cyprian that the fuller organization of these orders comes before us (*Epp.* xix., xxviii., lxxv., &c.). It is also stated by his contemporary, Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, that the Church of Rome at that time numbered forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven sub-deacons, forty-two acolyths, and fifty-two exorcists, readers, and doorkeepers (*Ordinarij*). None of these inferior orders, according to St. Basil, were ordained with imposition of hands, but they were simply appointed by the bishop with some appropriate ceremony, to certain subordinate functions of the ministry such as any Christian layman might be commissioned by episcopal authority to perform. The form of ordination employed in the case of *Acolytes* in thus prescribed by a canon of the 4th Council of Carthage. "When any Acolythist is ordained, the bishop shall inform him how he is to behave himself in his office; and he shall receive a candlestick with a taper in it, from the archdeacon, that he may understand that he is appointed to light the candles of the church. He shall also receive an empty pitcher to furnish wine for the Eucharist of the blood of Christ." Hence it appears that the Acolyte's office at that period consisted chiefly in two things, viz., lighting the candles of the church and attending the officiating priest with wine for the Eucharist.

The Acolyte of the ancient Western Church is represented in the later Roman communion by the Ceroferarius or taper-bearer, whose office consists in walking before the deacons or priests with a lighted taper in his hand.

Both in the East and West the minor orders of ancient times were afterwards conferred as merely introductory to the sacred orders of deacon and presbyter, while the duties which had formerly belonged to them were performed by laymen. In the 7th century the readers and singers in the Armenian Church were laymen—in the 8th century the readers, and in the 12th the ostiarii and exorcists were laymen in the Greek Church. Before the year 1300 the four orders of acolyte, exorcist, reader, and ostiarius began to be conferred at the same time in the Western Churches. Not long afterwards it became customary to release the clerks thus ordained from discharging the duties of their orders, which were entrusted to lay clerks. The Councils of Cologne and Trent vainly endeavoured to alter this custom; and laymen continue generally to perform the offices of the ancient orders in the Roman churches to

## ACROSTIC

the present day. In England the same custom has prevailed; and the minor orders having for some centuries become merely titular, were disused in the Reformation of our Churches.

Fuller information on the subject of the minor orders may be found in *Field's Doct. of the Church*, b. v. c. 25; Bingham's *Antiquities*, b. iii.; Thomassin, *Uet. et Nov. Eccl.* pars I. lib. ii. See also Robertson's *History of the Church* and Palmer's *Treatise on the Church of Christ*. [D.B.]

ACONTIUS, cf. Rome, commemorated July 25 (*Mart. Hieron.*) [C.]

ACROSTIC (*Ἀκροστιχίς*, *ἀκροστιχίς*, *ἀκροστιχία*, *Acrostichia*.) A composition in which the first letters of the several lines form the name of a person or thing. The invention is attributed to Epicharmus.

We find several applications of the Acrostic principle in Christian antiquity.

1. The word Acrostic is applied to the well-known formula *IΧΘΥΣ*. [See IΧΘΥC.]

2. Verses in honour of the Saviour were frequently written in the acrostic form; Pope Damasus, for instance, has left two acrostics on the name Jesus (*Serm.* iv. and v.), the former of which runs as follows:

"In rebus tantis Tris conjunctio mundi  
 Bright hominum cœcum lustrare venturo;  
 Suis miles ubi, et mundi cœcum pavore  
 Venit pœcni notum dissolvere fracta.  
 Summus ante cunctis nituit per œcula turba."

The same pope, to whom so many of the inscriptions in the Catacombs are due, composed an acrostic inscription in honour of Constantine the daughter of Constantine. This was originally placed in the apse of the basilica of St. Agnes in the Via Nomentana, and may be seen at Bosio, *Roma Sotterranea*, p. 118. And inscriptions of this kind are frequent. Last the reader should miss the names indicated, an explanation of the acrostic principle is sometimes added to the inscription itself. For instance, to the epitaph of Lucina, Leontia, Ampelia, and Flavi (Muratori, *Thesaurus Novus*, p. 1903, no. 5) are added these verses, which give the key:

"Nominis sanctarum, lector, ad forte requiris,  
 Et omni versu te littera prima docuit."

So the epitaph of a Christian named Agata (Marini, *Fratelli Arcah.* p. 828), ends with the words, "ejus autem nomen capitia versuum"; and another, given by the same authority, and with the words, "le ejus per capita versuum nomen declaratur" Fabretti (*Inscrip. Antiq.* i. 150) gives a similar one, "Revertere per capitia versuum et invenies plenum nomen." Gaxos (*Inscripciones del Piemonte*, p. 91) gives the epitaph of Eusebius of Vercelli, in which the first letters of the lines form the words EVSEBIUS EPI COPVS ET MARTYR; and another acrostic epitaph (p. 114), where the initial letters for the words CELSVS EPISCOPVS (Martigny *Dict. des Antiq. Chret.* 11).

We also find acrostic hymns in Greek. Several of the hymns of Cosmas of Jerusalem, are of this kind; the first, for instance (*Gallandi, Bibliotheca Pat.* xiii. 234), is an acrostic form the words,

*Ἐπεὶ θεὸς ἁποστόλος ἐστὶν οὗτος οὗτος*

3. Those poems, in which the lines or stanzas commence with the letters of the alphabet taken

in order, form another class of acrostic. Such is the well-known hymn of Sedulius, "*A solis ortu cardine*," a portion of which is introduced in the Roman offices for the Nativity and the Circumcision of the Lord; and that of Venantius Fortunatus (*Carm.* xvi.), which begins with the verse "*Agnescent omnes seculum*." St. Augustine composed an Abecedarian Psalm against the Donatists, in imitation of the 119th, with the constant response, "*Omnes qui gradistis de pace, male vrum iudicatis*."

4. A peculiar use of the acrostic is found in the Office-books of the Greek Church. Each Canon, or series of Troparia, has its own acrostic, which is a metrical line formed of the initial letters of the Troparia which compose the Canon. To take the instance given by Dr. Neale (*Eastern Church*, introd. p. 833); the acrostic for the Festival of SS. Proclus and Hilarius is,

*Σοφίας ἀδελφεῖς οὐρανίου δόξατος ἡμῶν.*

The meaning of this is, that the first Troparion of the Canon begins with Σ, the second with Ε, and so on. These lines are generally iambic, as in the instance above; but occasionally Hexameter, as,

*Τὸ ἑκατόντα τὸν ἑκατόντα ἑκατόντα ἡμῶν.*

They frequently contain a play on the name of the feast of the day, as in the instance just given, and in

*Ἄγιος Θεὸς οὐ καταπαύεις ἡμῶν ὄψιν,*

for St. Dorotheos of Tyra. The Troparia are sometimes, but rarely, arranged so as to form an alphabetic acrostic, as on the Eve of the Transfiguration (Neale, *u. s.*).

5. The word ἀποσπρίγμα, in the Apostolical Constitutions (ii. 57, § 5) denotes the verses, or portions of a verse, which the people were to sing responsively to the chapter of the Psalm. "*ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὰ ἀποσπρίγματα ἀποφασαλλόμενος*." The constantly repeated response of the 136th Psalm ("For His mercy endureth for ever"), or that of the "Reverendite omnia Opera" ("Praise Him, and magnify Him for ever"), are instances of what is probably intended in this case. Compare ARISTOTEL, PSALMODY (Blagham's *Antiq.* xiv. 1, § 12).

#### ACROTELEUTIC. [DOXOLOGY; PSALMODY.]

**ACTIO.** A word frequently used to designate the canon of the mass.

The word "*agere*," as is well known, bears in classical writers the special sense of performing a sacrificial act; hence the word "*Actio*" is applied to that which was regarded as the essential portion of the Eucharistic sacrifice; "*Actio dicitur ipse canon, qui in eo sacramenta conficiuntur benedictio*," says Walafrid Strabo (*De Rebus Eccl.* c. 22, p. 850, Migne). Whatever is included in the canon is said to be "*infra actionem*"; hence, when any words are to be added within the canon (as is the case at certain great festivals), they bear in the liturgies the title or rubric "*infra actionem*;" and in printed missals these words are frequently placed before the prayer "*Communicantes*." Compare CAXON. (*Boiss. de Eras Liturgie*, lib. ii. c. 11; Naerl, *Harmonia*, a. v. "*Actio*").

Hieronym of Autun supposes this use of the word "*actio*" to be derived from legal terminology.

"*Missa quoddam iudicium imitatur; unde et canon Actio vocatur*" (lib. i., c. 8); and "*Canon . . . etiam Actio dicitur, quia causa populi in obsequium Deo agitur*" (c. 103). (In *De Causis Glossary*, a. v. "*Actio*.") But this derivation, though adopted by several mediæval writers, does not appear probable. [C.]

**ACTORS AND ACTRESSES.**—The influence of Christianity on social life was seen, as in other things, so specially in the horror with which the members of the Christian Church looked on the classes of men and women whose occupations identified them with evil. Among these were *Actors* and *Actresses*. It must be remembered that they found the drama tainted by the depravity which infected all heathen society, and exhibiting it in its worst forms. Even Augustus sat as a spectator of the "*æcenia adulterii*" of the "*mimi*," whose performances were the favourite amusement of Roman nobles and people (Ovid, *Trist.* ii. 497-520). The tragedies of Aeschylus or Sophocles, or Seneca, the comedies even of Menander and Terence could not compete with plays whose subject was always the "*vitii crimen amoris*," represented in all its baseness and foulness (*Ibid.*). What Ovid wrote of "*obscena*" and "*turpia*" was there acted. The stories of Mars and Venus, the loves of Jupiter with Danaë, Leda, and Ganymede, were exhibited in detail (Cyprian, *De Orat. Dei*, c. 8). Men's minds were corrupted by the very sight. They learnt to imitate their gods. The actors became, in the worst sense of the word, effeminate, taught "*gustus turpes et molles et muliebres exprimeret*" (Cyprian, *Ep.* 2, ed. Gerad. 61, ed. Rigalt). The theatre was the "*sacrarium Veneris*," the "*consistorium impudicitiae*" (*Ibid.* c. 17). Men sent their sons and daughters to learn adultery (Tatian, *Orat. adu. Græc.* c. 22; Tertull. *De Spect.* c. 10). The debasement which followed on such an occupation had been recognized even by Roman law. The more active censors had pulled down theatres whenever they could, and Pompeius, when he built one, placed a Temple of Venus over it in order to guard against a like destruction (*Ibid.* c. 10). The Greeks, in their admiration of artistic culture, had honoured their actors. The Romans looked on them, even while they patronised them, with a consciousness of their degradation. They were excluded from all civil honours, their names were struck out of the register of their tribes; they lost by the "*minutio capitis*" their privileges as citizens (*Ibid.* c. 22; Augustin. *De Civ. Dei*, ii. 14). Trajan banished them altogether from Rome as utterly demoralized.

It cannot be wondered at that Christian writers should almost from the first enter their protest against a life so debased. They saw in it part of the "*pompæ diaboli*," which they were called on to renounce. Tertullian

\* Augustin, who in his youth had delighted in the higher forms of the drama (*Confess.* iii. 3), drawn, after his conversion, a distinction between these ("*spectaculum tolerabilem ludum*") and the obscenity of the mime (*De Civ. Dei*, ii. 8).

† No specific reference to this form of evil is found, in its true, in the N. T. The case had not yet presented itself. It would have seemed as impossible for a Christian to take part in it as to join in actual military.

lian wrote the treatise already quoted specially against it and its kindred evils of the circus and the amphitheatre, and dwells on the inconsistency of uttering from the same lips the avowal of Christian worship, and the praises of the gladiator or the mime. The actor seeks, against the words of Christ, to add a cubit to his stature by the use of the *Collyrium*. He breaks the Divine law which forbids a man to wear a woman's dress (Deut. xxii. 5). Clement of Alexandria reckons them among the things which the Divine Instructor forbids to all His followers (*Paedagog.* iii. c. 77, p. 208). In course of time the question naturally presented itself, whether an actor who had become a Christian might continue in his calling, and the Christian conscience returned an answer in the negative. The case which Cyprian deals with (*Ep.* 2, *ut supra*) implies that on that point there could be no doubt whatever, and he extends the prohibition to the art of teaching actors. It would be better to maintain such a man out of the funds of the Church than to allow him to continue in such a calling. The more formal acts of the Church spoke in the same tone. The Council of Illiberis (c. 62) required a "pantomimus" to renounce his art before he was admitted to baptism. If he returned to it, he was to be excommunicated. The 3rd Council of Carthage (c. 35) seems to be moderating the more extreme rigour of some teachers, when it orders that "gratia vel reconciliatio" is not to be denied to them any more than to penitent apostates. The *Codes Eccles. Afric.* (c. 63) forbids any one who had been converted, "ex qualibet ludicra arte," to be tempted or coerced to resume his occupation. The Council in Trullo (c. 51) forbids both mimes and their theatres, and *ὅτι οὗτοι ἐκτρέφουσιν*, under pain of deposition for clerical, and excommunication for lay, offenders. With one consent the moral sense of the new society condemned what seemed so incurably evil. When Christianity had become the religion of the Empire, it was of course, more difficult to maintain the high standard which these rules implied, and Chrysostom (*Hom.* vi. in Matt., *Hom.* xv. ad Pop. Antioch. *Hom.* x. in Coloss. ii. p. 403, l. 38, 731, 780), complains that theatrical entertainments prevailed among the Christians of his time with no abatement of their evil. At Rome they were celebrated on the entrance of a consul upon his office (Clandian in *Cons. Mall.* 313). On the triumph of the Emperors Theodosius and Arcadius the theatre of Pompeius was opened for performances by actors from all parts of the Empire (*Symmachus*, *Opp.* x. 2, 29). With a strange inversion of the old relations between the old and the new societies, the heathen Zosimus reproaches the Christian Emperor Constantine with having patronised the mimes and their obscenity. The pantomimes or ballets in which the mythology of Greece furnished the subject-matter (Medea and Jason, Perseus and Andromeda, the loves of Jupiter), were still kept up. Women as well as men performed in them (Chrysost., *Hom.* vi. in Thes.), and at Rome the number of actresses was reckoned at 3000. The old infamy adhered to the whole class under Christian legislation. They might not appear in the forum or basilica, or use the public baths. And yet, with a strange inconsistency, the civil power kept them in their degradation rather than deprive the population

of the great cities of the empire of the amusements to which they were so addicted. If the Church sought to rescue them, admitting them to baptism, and after baptism claiming immunity from their degrading occupation, it stepped in to prevent any such conversion, except in extremes (*Cod. Theod.*, *De Sordibus*, xv.). Compare Milman's *History of Christianity*, book iv. c. 2; Chastel, p. 211. Perhaps the fullest collection of every passage in Christian antiquity bearing on the subject is to be found in Frymer's *Hieromastix*. [P.]

ACUTUS, martyr at Naples, commemorated Sept. 19 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

ACUS (accutium, or acubium, acuisia, apina, spinula). Pins made of precious metal, and, in later mediæval times, enriched with jewels, for attaching the archiepiscopal (or papal) pallium to the vestment over which it was worn, i.e. the planeta or casula (the chasuble). The earliest mention of these known to the present writer is in the description given by Joannes Diaconus of the pallium of St. Gregory the Great. Writing himself in the 9th century, he notes it as a point of contrast between the pallium worn by St. Gregory and that customary in his own time, that it was *nullo acutus perforatum*. Their first use, therefore, must probably date between the close of the 6th and the beginning of the 9th century. For details concerning these ornaments at later times, see Bock (*Gesch. der Liturg. Gevänder*, ii. 191). Innocent III. (*De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, lib. I. cap. 63) assigns to these pins, as to every other part of the sacerdotal dress, a certain mystical significance. "Tre acus quæ pallio infinguntur, ante pectus, super humerum, et post tergum, designant communionem proximis, administrationem officii, destrictioremque iudicii." [W. B. M.]

ADAM AND EVE are commemorated in the Ethiopic Calendar on the 6th day of the month Miasiah, equivalent to April 1. The Armenian Church commemorates Adam with Abel on July 25. (Neale, *Eastern Church*, *Intros.* pp. 800, 812.) [C.]

ADAUCTUS or AUDAUCTUS. (1) Martyr at Rome, commemorated Aug. 30 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet.*, *Hiéron.*). Proper collects in Gregorian Sacramentary (p. 127), and Antiphon *Lm. Antiph.* p. 709.

(2) Commemorated Oct. 4 (*M. Hiéron.*). [C.]

ADDERBOURN, COUNCIL near the (A. DEBURNEMER CONCILIIUM), A.D. 705; on the River Nodder, or Adderbourn, in Wiltshire; English bishops and abbots, where a grant from election of their abbat, after Aldhelm's death, made by Bishop Aldhelm to the abbe of Malmesbury, Frome, and Bradford, was confirmed (W. Malm., *De Gest. Pont.* v. pars iii., 1645, Migne; Wilk. i. 69). [A. W. H.]

ADJUTOR, in Africa, commemorated Dec. 17 (*Mart. Hiéron.*). [C.]

ADMONTION. [MONTION.]

ADRIANUS. (1) Martyr by Galerius Nicomedia, commemorated Sept. 8 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet.*, *Hiéron. Badae*); Aug. 28 (*C. Byzant.*); Nov. 6 (*M. Hiéron.*).

(2) Martyr, *Natalis* March 4 (*Mart. Badae*).

(3) July 26 (*M. Hieron.*).

(4) August 8 (*Cal. Armen.*).

[C.]

**ADULTERY.**—We shall attempt to give a general account of laws and customs relating to this topic, dwelling more fully upon such as elucidate the spirit of their several periods, and upon the principles involved in disputable points. Our outline breaks naturally into the three following divisions:—

1. Antecedents of Christian jurisprudence in Church and State on adultery.
2. Nature and classification of the crime.
3. Penalties imposed upon it.

Our quotations from Eastern canonists when compared with civilians are made from the older Latin versions; on occasion the Greek phrases are added. In imperial laws the Latin is commonly the most authentic. These are numbered, first the Book of Codex, next Title, then Law; but in the Digest, where it is usual to subdivide, the Title is distinguished by a Roman numeral.

**I. Antecedents of Christian Jurisprudence in Church and State on Adultery.**—Respecting the series of future differences as regards this and connected subjects traceable in the Apostolic times, Neander has some useful observations (*Planting of the Christian Church*, Bohn's ed. I. 246-9 and 257, 261). Many circumstances, however, kept down these tendencies to opposition. In an age of newly awakened faith, and under the pressure of persecution, living motive took the place of outward law. The revulsion from heathen sins was strong, and filled the souls of converts with abhorrence, while the tender sympathy of their teachers urged men to control themselves, succour the tempted, and pity the fallen. "I am overwhelmed with sadness," writes Polycarp to the Philippians (cap. xi.), "on account of Valens who was made presbyter amongst you, because he thus knows not the place which was given him." This man had fallen into adultery (see Jacobson *in loco*). "I grieve exceedingly both for him and for his wife, to whom may the Lord grant true repentance. Be ye therefore also sober-minded in this matter, and count not such persons as your enemies; but as suffering and wayward members call them back, that you may save the one Body of you all. For so doing ye shall establish your own selves."

Clement of Rome, unlike Polycarp, had no special example to deal with; his warnings are therefore general. In *Ep. i.* 30 and cap. 6 of the 2nd *Ep.*, attributed to him, adultery is stigmatized among the foulest and most heinous sins. His exhortations and promises of forgiveness (i. 7, 8, 9, 50) are likewise general, but their tenour leaves no doubt that he intended to invite all such sinners to repentance. The same declarations of remission to all penitents and the loosing of every bond by the grace of Christ, occur in Ignat. *Ep. ad Philadelph.* 8; and are found in the shorter as well as the longer recension (see Cureton, *Corp. Ignat.* p. 97). In these addresses we seem to catch the lingering tones of the Apostolic age; and all of like meaning and early date should be noted as valuable testimonies. De l'Aubespine (*Bingham*, xvi. 11, 2) asserted that adulterers were never taken back into communion before the time of Cyprian, and, though Bishop Pearson refutes this opinion, he

CHRIST. ANT.

allows that respecting them, together with murderers and idolaters, there was much dispute in the early Church. Beveridge also (*Coel. Can.* vii. 2) believes that its severity was so great as to grant no such sinners reconciliation except upon the very hardest terms.

Of this severe treatment, as well as the difference of opinion alluded to by Pearson, we see various traces; yet the prevailing inclination was to hold out before the eyes of men a hope mingled with fear. Hermas (*Pastor Mandat.* 4, 1 and 3) concedes one, and but one, repentance to those who are unchaste after baptism; for which mildness and a reluctant allowance of second nuptials, Tertullian (*De Pudicit.* 10) styles this book an Adulterers' Friend. Dionysius of Corinth, writing to the churches of Pontus on marriage and continency, counsels the reception of all who repent their transgressions, whatever their nature may be (Euseb. iv. 23). Thus also Zephyrinus of Rome announced, according to Tertullian, "ego et moechiae et fornicationis delicta, poenitentia functis dimitto;" and though quoted in a spirit of hostility and satire, this sentence, which forms a chief reason for the treatise (*De Pudicit.*), probably contains in substance an authentic penitential rule. Of Tertullian's own opinion, since he was at this time a Montanist, it is needless to say more than that, differing from his former views, not far removed from those maintained by Hermas (cf. *De Penitent.* 7-10), he now held adultery to be one of those sins not only excluding for ever from the company of believers, but also (cap. 19) absolutely without hope through our Lord's intercession. Exclusion from the faithful was, however, insisted upon in such cases by some Catholic bishops. Cyprian (*ad Antonian.*), while himself on the side of mercy, tells us how certain bishops of his province had, in the time of his predecessors, shut the door of the Church against adulterers, and denied them penitence altogether. Others acted on the opposite system; yet we are assured that peace remained unbroken—a surprising circumstance, certainly, considering the wealth and intelligence of that province, and the importance of such decisions to a luxurious population. Cyprian hints at no lay difficulties, and simply says that every bishop is the disposer and director of his own act, and must render an account to God (cf. also Cypr. *De Unitate*, several *Epistles*, and *Conc. Carthag. Proloquium*). Hence the determination of one bishop had no necessary force in the diocese of another. So, too, the acts of a local council took effect only within its own locality, unless they were accepted elsewhere. But the correspondence of bishops and churches set bounds to the difficulties which might otherwise have arisen, and prepared the way for General Councils—see, for instance, the fragment (Euseb. v. 25) of the early Synod at Caesarea in Palestine—its object being the diffusion of the Synodical Epistle. United action was also much furthered by the kind of compilation called Codex Canonum, but the first of these (now lost) was formed towards the end of the 4th century. See Dion. *Exig. ap. Justell.* I. 101, and Bevereg., *Pand. Can. Proleg.* vii.

The passages already cited show the strength of Christian recoil from heathen sensuality. In his instructive reply to Celsus (iii. 51) Origen com-

C



pare the attitude of the Church towards backsliders, especially towards the incontinent, with that feeling which prompted the Pythagoreans to erect a cenotaph for each disciple who left their school. They esteemed him dead, and, in precisely the same way, Christians bewail as lost to God, and already dead, those who are overcome with unclean desire or the like. Should such regain their senses, the Church receives them at length, as men alive from death, but to a longer probation than the one converts underwent at first, and as no more capable of honour and dignity amongst their fellows. Yet Origen goes on to state (59-64) the remedial power of Christianity. Taken together these sections paint a lively picture of the treatment of gross transgressors within and without the Christian fold. On the passage in his *De Oratione*, which sounds like an echo of Tertullian, see foot-note in Delarue's ed., vol. i. 256.

Christians might well shrink from what they saw around them. Licentious impurities, countless in number and in kind, were the burning reproaches, the pollution, and the curse of heathendom. It is impossible to quote much on these topics, but a carefully drawn sketch of them will be found in two short essays by Professor Jowett appended to the first chapter of his *Commentary on the Romans*. They demonstrate how utterly unfounded is the vulgar notion that Councils and Fathers meddled unnecessarily with gross and disgusting offences. With these essays may be compared Martial and the Satirists, or a single writer such as Seneca—*unus instar omnium*—e.g. "Hinc decentissimum sponsaliorum genus, adulterium," &c., i. 9; or again, iii. 16, "Nunquid jam ulla repudio erubescit postquam illustres quaedam ac nobiles foeminae, non consulum numero, sed maritorum, annos suos computant? et exeunt matrimonii causa, nubunt repudii? . . . Nunquid jam ullus adulterii pudor est, postquam eo ventum est, ut nulla virum habeat, nisi ut adulterum irritet? Argumentum est deformitatis, pudicitia. Quam invenies tam miseram, tam sordidam, ut illi satis sit unum adulterorum par?" &c. In Valerius Maximus we hear a sigh for departed morals—in Christian writers, from the Apologists to Salvian, a recital of the truth, always reproachful, and sometimes half triumphant. Moreover, as usual, sin became the punishment of sin—Justin Martyr, in his first *Apology* (c. 27 seq.), points out the horrible consequences which ensued from a heathen practice following upon the licence just mentioned. The custom of exposing new-born babes pervaded all ranks of society, and was authorized even by the philosophers. Almost all those exposed, says Justin, both boys and girls, were taken, reared, and fed like brute beasts for the vilest purposes of sensuality; so that a man might commit the grossest crime unawares with one of his own children, and from these wretched beings the State derived a shameful impost. Compare Tertull. *Apolog.* 9, sub fin. Happy in comparison those infants who underwent the *prae* or *post* natal fate, described by Minucius Felix c. 30. To Lactantius (we may remark) are attributed the laws of Constantine intended to mitigate the allied evils of that later age, cf. Milman (*Hist. Christ.* ii. 394). "We," continues Justin (c. 29), "expose not our offspring, lest one of them

should perish and we be murderers; nay, the bringing up of children is the very object of our marriages." There are passages to the same effect in the *Ep. ad Diognet.* c. 5, and Athenag. *Legat. pro Christian.* (c. 33 al. 28), and thus these early apologists adduce a principle laid down amongst the ends of matrimony in the Anglican marriage-service. They no doubt utter the thought of their fellow Christian in opposing to the licence of the age the pure parental instincts, and these are perhaps in every age the most stringent restraints upon adultery.

The standard of contemporary Jewish practice may be divined from the *Dial. cum Trypho* cc. 134 and 141. The Rabbis taught the lawfulness of marrying four or five wives,—if a man were moved by the sight of beauty Jacob example excused him,—if he sinned, the precedent of David assured his forgiveness.

Surrounding evils naturally deepened the impression upon Christians that they were strangers and pilgrims in the world, that their aim must be to keep themselves from being partake in other men's sins; to suffer not as evil doers but as Christians, and to use the Roman law. St. Paul used it, for an appeal on occasion—possible protection, but not a social rule. Hence the danger was Quietism; and they were in fact accused of forsaking the duties of citizens and soldiers—accusations which the Apologists, particularly Tertullian and Origen, answered though with many reserves. The faithful thought that their prayers and examples were the best of services; they shunned sitting judgment on cases involving life and death, imprisonment or torture, and (what is more to our purpose) questions de pudore. On the admission of Christians to magistracy as early as the Antonines, cf. Dig. 50, tit. 2, s. 3, sub fin., with Gottfried's notes. Traces of their aversion from such business appear in some few Councils; e.g. El 56, excludes Duumvirs from public work during their year of office. Tarracon. 4, forbids bishops to decide criminal causes—a rule which has left its mark on modern legislation. Naturally resulting from these influences, was a higher and diffused tone of purity. Obeying human laws, believers transcended them, *Ep. Diognet.* 5, and compare Just. *Apol.* i. 17, s. with 15. He speaks emphatically of the numerable multitude who turned from licentiousness to Christian self-control. The causeless divorce allowed by law led to what Christ forbade: bigamy and adultery, while the latter sin by Him extended to the eye and the heart. In like manner, Athenagoras (*Leg. pro Christ.*) asserts that it was impossible to find a Christian who had been criminally convicted—and that a Christian is an evil-doer except he be a hypocrite—32, 33, al. 27, 28, that impurity of heart is essentially adultery, and that even a slight unchaste thought may exclude from everlasting life. He says, as Justin, that numbers in the Church were altogether continent; numbers, however, lived according to the strictest marriage rules. Athenagoras goes so far (33 al. 28) as to pronounce against all second marriages, because who deprives himself of even a deceased wife taking another is an adulterer. Clement of Alexandria (*Paedag.* ii. 6) quaintly observes that "Non Moechaberis" is cut up by the re-

through "non concupisces," and in the same spirit Commodian (*Instruct.* 48) writes

"Eccum nuncupuli ubi mors est longe vitate :  
Multa sunt Martyria, quae fiunt sine sanguine fuso,  
Alienum non cupere," &c.

Compare other passages on adultery of the heart, Lactant. *Instit.* vi. 23, and *Epit.* 8; Greg. Nazianz., *Hom.* 37 al. 31; and later on, Photius, *Ep.* 139—a remarkable composition.

Another safeguard from licentiousness was the high valuation now set upon the true dignity of woman not only as the help-meet of man but as a partaker in the Divine Image, sharing the same hope, and a fit partner of that moral union in which our Lord placed the intention and essence of the married state. Clement of Alexandria draws a picture of the Christian wife and mother (*Paedag.* iii. 11, p. 250 Sylb. and Potter's Gr. marg.); of the husband and father, (*Strom.* vii. p. 741). Tertullian before him, in the last cap. *ad Uxorem* describes a truly Christian marriage—the oneness of hope, prayer, practice, and pious service; no need of concealment, mutual avoidance, nor mutual vexation; distrust banished, a freeborn confidence, sympathy, and comfort in each other, presiding over every part of their public and private existence.

This language derives additional strength from Tertullian's treatment of mixed marriages. Those contracted before conversion fall under 1 Cor. vii. 10–17 (cf. *ad Uxor.* ii. 2), yet their consequences were most mischievous. He tells us (*ad Scapulam* 3) how Claudius Herminianus, whose wife became a convert, revenged himself by barbarous usage of the Cappadocian Christians. A mixed marriage after conversion is a very great sin, forbidden by 1 Cor. vii. 39 and 2 Cor. vi. 14–16, and Tertullian *ad Uxor.* ii. 3 condemns those who contract it as "stupri reos"—transgressors of the 7th Commandment. Addressing his own wife, he proceeds to describe its serious evils to a woman. When she wishes to attend worship her husband makes an appointment for the baths. Instead of hymns she hears songs, and his songs are from the theatre, the tavern, and the night cellar. Her fasts are hindered by his feasts. He is sure to object against nocturnal services, prison visits, the kiss of peace, and other customs. She will have a difficulty in persuading him that such private observances as crossing and exsufflation, are not magical rites. To these and other remarks, Tertullian adds the sensible arguments, that none but the worst heathens would marry Christian women, and how then could believing wives feel secure in such hands? Their husbands kept the secret of their religion as a means of enforcing subjection; or, if dissatisfied, turned it for the day of persecution and legalized murder. Their own motives were of the baser kind—they married for a handsome litter, slaves, and tall attendants from some foreign country;—luxuries which a faithful man, even if wealthy, might not think proper to allow them. This being the early experience of the Church, we are not surprised to find mixed marriages forbidden in after times *sub poena adulterii*.

We cannot here pass over a history told by Justin Martyr in his *Apol.* ii. 2, and repeated by Eusebius iv. 17, respecting which the learned Bingham has been led into a remarkable mis-

take, copied and added to by Whiston in a note on *Antiq.* xv. 7, 10. A woman married to a very wicked husband, herself as drunken and dissolute as the man, became a convert to the faith. Thoroughly reformed, she tried to persuade him by the precepts of the Gospel and the terrors of eternal fire. Failing in her attempts, and revolted by the loathsome and unnatural compulsion to which her husband subjected her, she thought repudiation would be preferable to a life of impious compliances. Her friends prevailed upon her to wait and hope for the best, but a journey to Alexandria made her husband worse than before, and, driven to despair, she sent him a divorce. Immediately he informed against her as a Christian; a blow which she parried by presenting a petition for delay to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, who granted her request. Upon this her husband, thirsting for revenge, accused her teacher in religious truth, and had the satisfaction of seeing three lives sacrificed in succession to his vengeance.

Bingham (xvi. 11, 6) cites the narrative as an instance of a wife's being allowed by the Church to divorce a husband on the ground of adultery. But the valuable writer, led perhaps by Gothofred (*Cod. Theod.* vol. i. p. 312) has here erred in a matter of fact, for Justin takes some pains to show that the woman's grievance was not adultery at all. Fleury (iii. 49) has apprehended the truth with correctness and expressed it with delicacy. The like case is discussed by an author long called Ambrose in his comment on 1 Cor. vii. 11 (*Ambros. op. ed. Benedict., tom. ii. appendix p. 133 E–F*), and he determines that, under the given circumstances, a woman must separate from her husband, but she must not marry again. The Imperial law also provided a remedy, *Cod. Theod.* 9, tit. 7, s. 3. It is certainly noteworthy that, in telling this brief tragedy, neither Justin nor Eusebius says a word against the wife's seeking relief from the heathen custom of divorce. Yet its license was condemned on all sides. The founder of the Empire strove to check it; and, had the aggrieved woman lived under the first Christian emperor, that resource would have been denied her. Clearly, circumstances justified the wife, but it would seem natural to have mentioned the danger of doing wrong, while pleading her justification. We, in modern times, should say that such cases are exceptional, and the inference from silence is that similar wickedness was not exceptional in those days, and was treated by the Church as a ground of divorce; a mournful conclusion, but one that many facts render probable, e.g. the Imperial law above cited.

From these antecedents our step is brief to laws for the repression of incontinency. The natural beginning was for each community to follow simply the example of St. Paul (1 Cor. v. and 2 Cor. ii.), but, as converts multiplied, it became necessary to prescribe definite tests of repentance which formed also the terms of reconciliation. Such rules had for one object the good of the community, and in this light every offence was a public wrong, and is so looked upon by canon law at this day. But penitence had a second object—the soul's health of the offender—and thus viewed, the same transgression was treated as a moral stain, and censured



according to its intrinsic heinousness, or, in few words, the crime became a sin. This idea, no doubt, entered into the severe laws of Christian princes against adultery, and is an indication of ecclesiastical influence upon them. Framers of canons had in turn their judgment acted upon by the great divines, who were apt to regulate public opinion, and to enforce as maxims of life their own interpretations of Scripture. Sometimes the two characters met in the same person, as in the eminent Gregories, Basil, and others; but where this was not the case, theologians commonly overlooked many points which canonists were bound to consider.

Church lawgivers must indeed always have regard to existing social facts and the ordinary moral tone of their own age and nation. They must likewise keep State law steadily in mind when they deal with offences punishable in civil courts. That they did so in reality, we learn from the Greek Scholia; and hence, when divorce is connected with adultery (particularly as its cause), the Scholiasts trace most canonical changes to foregoing alterations in the laws of the Empire. The reader should reproduce in his mind these two classes of data if he wishes to form a judgment on subjects like the present. We have called attention to the license which tainted pre-Christian Rome. Of the Christian world, homilists are the most powerful illustrators, but the light thrown upon it by canons is quite unmistakable. The spirit prevalent at the opening of the 4th century may be discerned from its Councils, *e.g.* Gangra; one object of which (can. 4) was to defend married presbyters against the attacks made upon them; cf. Elib. 33, and Stanley's account of the later 1 Nic. 3 (*Eastern Ch.* 196-9). Gangra, 14, forbids wives to desert their husbands from abhorrence of married life; 9 and 10 combat a like disgust and contempt of matrimony displayed by consecrated virgins, and 16 is aimed against sons who desert their parents under pretext of piety, *i.e.* to become celibates, something after the fashion of "Corban." An age, where the springs of home life are poisoned, is already passing into a morbid condition, and legislative churgeons may be excused if they commit some errors of severity in dealing with its evils. But what can be said of the frightful pictures of Roman life drawn, somewhat later, by Ammian. Marcell. xiv. 6; xxvii. 3; and xxviii. 4; or the reduced copies of them in Gibbon, chaps. 25 and 31, to which may be added the fiery Epistles of Jerome (*passim*), and the calm retrospect of Milman (*Hist. of Christ.* iii. 230, seq.)? Can any one who reads help reflecting with what intensified irony this decrepit age might repeat the old line of Ennius—

Mulierem: quid potius dicam aut verius quam mulierem?

Or can we feel surprised with violent efforts at coercing those demoralized men and women?

Gibbon, in giving an account of the jurisprudence of Justinian, saw that it could not be understood, particularly on the topic of our article, without some acquaintance with the laws and customs of the earliest periods. To his sketch we must refer the reader, adding only the following remarks:—

1. His opinion upon the barbarity of marital rule has found an echo in Hegel (see *Werke*, Bd. x. p. 348, seq.). F. von Schlegel, though in his

*Concordia* highly praising the conjugal purity of ancient Rome, had already (*Werke*, xiii. 261, 2) blamed that rigid adherence to letter and formula which pervades the system. To such censures Mommsen is thoroughly opposed. In book i. chap. 5, he views the stern simplicity of idea on which all household right was founded as true to nature and to the requirements of social improvement. In chap. 12 he points out how the old Roman religion supplemented law by its code of moral maxims. The member of a family might commit grievous wrong untouched by civil sentence, but the curse of the gods lay henceforth heavy on that sacrilegious head. Mommsen's remarks on religious terrors agree well with the very singular restraints on divorce attributed by Plutarch to Romulus. The impression of ethical hardness is in fact mainly due to the iron logic of Roman lawyers. Father, husband, matron, daughter, are treated as realistic universals, and their specific definitions worked out into axioms of legal right. Yet in application (a fact overlooked by Schlegel) the *summum jus* is often tempered by equitable allowances, *e.g.* a wife accused of adultery had the power of recrimination, Dig. 48, tit. 5, s. 13, § 5; and cf. August. *De Conjug. Adulterin.* ii. 7 (viii.) for a longer extract, and a comment on the rescript. Such facts go far to explain the course pursued by Christian lawgivers.

2. On the vast changes which took place after the 2nd Punic war Gibbon should be compared with Mommsen, b. iii. cap. 13, pp. 884-5.

But neither of these writers, in dwelling on the immoral atmosphere which infected married life, point out any specially sufficient cause why Roman matrons showed such irrepressible avidity for divorce with all its strainings of law its dissolution of sacred maxims, its connection with celibacy in males, and a frightful train of unbridled sensualities. Perhaps the only true light is to be gained from a comparison with ecclesiastical history. We shall see that in later ages of the Church there came about an entire reversal of earlier opinions on the criminal essence and the very definition of adultery and that the ground of complaint at both periods (Pagan and Christian) was one and the same the cause, therefore, may not improbably be on also, *viz.*, the inadequate remedy afforded to women for wifely wrongs. Some particular will be found in our second division, but the question opens a wide field for speculation, outlying our limits, and belonging to the philosophy of history.

3. The parallel between Church and State ought to be carried further. Imperial Rome looking back upon the Republic, felt the decadence of her own conjugal and family ties and wrote her displeasure in the laws of the first Caesars. So, too, when the nobleness of apostolic life ceased to be a substitute for legislation, it sharpened the edge of canonical censure by regretful memories of the better times. The same history of morals led to a sameness in the history of law, the State repeated itself in the Church.

4. Gibbon has a sneer against Justinian for giving permanence to Pagan constitutions. But those laws had always been presupposed by Christian government, both civil and spiritual. The emperors amended or supplemented them

and where bishops felt a need, they petitioned for an Imperial edict—e.g. the canons of three African councils relating to our subject, and noted hereafter, in which the synods decide on such a petition. Then, too, the opposite experiment had been tried. The Codex Theodosianus began with the laws of Constantine (cf. art. *Theodosius* in *Dict. Biograph.*); but when Justinian strove to give scientific form to his jurisprudence he found that completeness could no way be attained except by connecting it with the old framework; and, as we have seen, Gibbon himself felt a similar necessity for the minor purpose of explanation.

Our plan here will therefore be to use the great work of Justinian as our skeleton, and clothe it with the bands and sinews of the Church. We gain two advantages: his incomparable method; and a stand-point at an era of systematic endeavour to unify Church and State. For this endeavour see *Novell.* 131, c. 1, held by canonists to accept all received by Chalcedon, can. 1 (comprehending much on our subject), and *Novell.* 83, extending the powers of bishops on ecclesiastical offences. His example was afterwards followed by the acceptance of Trull. can. 2, adding largely to the list of constitutions upon adultery; cf. *Photii Nomocanon*, tit. i. cap. 2, with *Scholia*, and for the difficulties *Bev. Pand. Can. Proleg.* viii., ix. For harmonies of spiritual and civil law as respects breaches of the 7th Commandment see *Antiocheni Nomoc.*, tita. xli. and xlii., and *Photii Nomoc.* tit. ix. 29, and tit. xiii. 5 and 6. Both are in *Justellus*, vol. ii.

After A.D. 305 the Church was so frequently engaged in devising means for upholding the sanctity of the marriage tie that every step in the reception of canons concerning it forms a landmark of moral change. Such an era was the reign of Justinian; it was an age of great code makers—of Dionysius Exiguus and Joannes Antiochenus. Numbers of local constitutions became transformed into world-wide laws; the fact, therefore, never to be overlooked respecting canons on adultery, is the extent of their final acceptance.

We now come to Division II., and must consider at some length the definition of adultery strictly so called. On this point a revolution took place of no slight significance in the great antithesis between East and West. Details are therefore necessary.

II. *Nature and Classification of the Crime.*—Neglecting an occasional employment of the words *fornicatio* (on which see first of following references), we find (*Dig.* 48, tit. 5, s. 6, § 1, *Papinian*), "Adulterium in nupta committitur stuprum vero in virginem viduamve." Cf. same tit., 34, *Justinian*, and *Dig.* 1, tit. 12, s. 1, § 5, *Ulpian*; see *Inst. Antiq.* and *Irissonius de Verb. Signif.* l. c. v. for distinctions and Greek equivalents.

The offending wife is thus regarded as the real criminal; and her paramour, whether married or unmarried, as the mere accomplice of her crime. She is essentially the *adultera*, and he, because of his complicity with a married woman, becomes an *adulter*. If the woman is unmarried, the condition of the man makes no difference—the offence is not adultery.

This was also the position of the Mosaic code—see *Lev.* xx. 10, compared with *Deut.* xxii. 22. It is not easy to perceive how the law could

stand otherwise when polygamy was permitted; cf. *Dict. of Bible, in verbo*. Espousal by both codes (Roman and Jewish) is protected as *quasi* wedlock (*Dig.* 48, tit. 5, s. 13, § 3, *Deut.* xxii. 23, 24). So likewise by Christian canons, e.g. *Trull.* 98. "He who marries a woman betrothed to a man still living is an adulter." Cf. *Basil. can.* 37.

Both in Scripture language and in ordinary Roman life the legal acceptance of the crime is the current meaning of the word. Hosea (iv. 13, 14) distinguishes between the sins of Jewish daughters and wives; and the distinction is kept in the LXX and Vulgate versions. A like distinction forms the point of Horace's "Matronam nullam ego tango;" cf. *Sueton. Oct.* 67 "adulterare matronas." Instances are sufficiently common, but, since (for reasons which will soon appear) it is necessary to have an absolutely clear understanding of the sense attached to the word adulterium (=μοιχεία) during the early Christian period, we note a few decisive references from common usage. *Val. Max.* (under Tiberius) explains (ii. 1, 3) adulteri as "subessores alieni matrimonii." *Quintilian* (under Domitian) defines, *Instit. Orat.* vii. 3, "Adulterium est cum aliena uxore domi coire." *Juvenal* may be consulted through the index. *Appuleius* (under the Antonines), in the well known story *Metamorph.* ix., describes the deed, and refers to the law de Adulteriis.

Christian writers seldom explain words unless used out of their current sense, and when they do so, the explanation is of course incidental. We find an early example in *Athenagoras, De Resur. Mort.* 23. al. 17, where in treating of bodily appetites occurs a designed antithesis. On the one side "legitimus coitus quod est matrimonium"—on the other, "inconcensus alienae uxoris appetitus et cum ea consuetudo—τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ μοιχεία." Another early instance is in the *Shepherd of Hermas, Mandat.* iv., which thus begins: "Mando, ait, tibi, ut castitatem custodias, et non ascendat tibi cogitatio cordis de alieno matrimonio, aut de fornicatione." We have here a twofold division like *Papinian's* above quoted, but instead of opposing stuprum to adulterium (implied in alieno Matrimonio), he employs "fornicatio," an ecclesiastical expression when it has this special meaning. *Origen (Levit.* xx., *Homil.* xi.), in contrasting the punishment of adulterers under the Mosaic and Christian dispensations, assumes the same act to be intended by the laws of both. This passage has often been ascribed to *Cyril of Alexandria*, but *Delarue* (ii. 179, 180) is clear for *Origen*. *Arnobius* (under *Diocletian*) writes, lib. iv. (p. 142, *Varior. ed.*), "Adulteria legibus vindicant, et capitalibus afficiunt eos poenis, quos in aliena comprehenderint foedera genialis se lectuli expugnatione jecisse. Subessoris et adulteri persona," &c.

The canonists, Greek and Latin, use criminal terms like ordinary authors without explanation, and obviously for the same reason. But on our subject the meaning is generally made certain by (1) an opposition of words resembling the examples before quoted; (2) by the case of unmarried women being treated in separate canons; or else (3) by a gradation of penalties imposed on the several kinds of sin.

In the latter half of the 4th century we have again exact ecclesiastical definitions. They are

very valuable, because given by two of the greatest canonists the Church ever produced, and also because they were accepted by can. ii. Trull. Gregory of Nyssa thus distinguishes (*ad Letoium*, resp. 4), "Fornicatio quidem dicatur cupiditatis cujuspiam expletio quae sine alterius fit injuria. Adulterium vero, insidiae et injuria quae alteri affertur." This antithesis is substantially the same with that in the Digest, but Gregory so states it because (as his canon tells us) he is replying to certain somewhat subtle reasoners who argued that these acts of incontinence are in essence identical—a theory which would equalize the offences, and, by consequence, their punishments. The arguments are such as we should call verbal, *e.g.* what the law does not permit, it forbids—the *non proprium* must be *alienum*. He answers by giving the specific division made by the Fathers (as above), and maintains (1) its adaptation to human infirmity, (2) the double sin of adultery, and (3) the propriety of a double penitence. With Gregory, therefore, the canonist prevails over the theologian—he refuses to treat the crime merely as a sin.

In Basil's canon *ad Amphilocho*. 18—which is concerned with lapsed virgins—who had been treated as digamists, and whom Basil would punish as adulterous, we find an incidental definition: "eum, qui cum aliena muliere cohabitavit, adulterum nominamus."

Basil's important 21st canon is summed by Aristenus: "Virum, qui fornicatus est, uxor propria recipiet. Inquinatam vero adulterio uxorem vir dimittet. Fornicator, enim, non adulter est, qui uxori junctus cum soluta" (an unmarried woman) "rem habuerit." Here, again, is the old opposition (as in stuprum and adulterium) the logical essence of the crime turning upon the state of the woman, whether married or sole. But a clause of great value to us is omitted by Aristenus. Basil considers the fornicatio of a married man heinous and aggravated; he says, "eum poenis amplius gravamus," yet adds expressly, "Canonem tamen non habemus qui eum adulterii crimini subiciat si in solutam a Matrimonio peccatum commissum sit." This clear assertion from a canonist so learned and veracious as Basil must be allowed to settle the matter of fact, that up to his time Church law defined adultery exactly in the same manner as the civil law.

It is to be remarked, too, that Basil's answer addresses itself to another kind of difficulty from Gregory's, that, namely, of injustice in the different treatment of unchaste men and women. No objection was of older standing. We almost start to hear Jerome (*Epitaph. Fabiolae*) echoing, as it were, the verses of Plautus; cf. the passage (*Mercator*, iv. 5)—

"Ecce lege dura vivunt mulieres,  
Multoque iniquiore miserae, quam viri . . .  
. . . . Utinam lex esset eadem, quae uxori est viro."

Yet no writer tells more pointedly than Plautus the remedy which Roman matrons had adopted (*Amphitr.* iii. 2)—

"Valeas: tibi habeas res tuas, reddas meas."

As to the legal process by which women compassed this object, it was probably similar to their way of enlarging their powers respecting property and other such matters, on which see Mommsen, book iii. 13.

We now note among divines a desire to impress upon the public mind the other, *i.e.* the purely theological idea that all incontinent persons stand equally condemned. They appear to reason under a mixture of influences—1. A feeling of the absolute unity of a married couple, a healthy bequest from the first age; 2. Indignation at marital license; 3. Desire to find a remedy for woman's wrong; 4. The wish to recommend celibacy by contrast with the "servitude" of marriage.

Lactantius (as might be expected from his date) fixes upon points 1 and 2. He finds fault with the Imperial law in two respects—that adultery could not be committed with any but a free woman, and that by its inequality it tended to excuse the severance of the one married body *Instit.* vi. 23. "Non enim, sicut juris publicatio est; sola mulier adultera est, quae habet alium; maritus autem, etiamsi plures habeat, crimine adulterii solutus est. Sed divina lex ita duos in matrimonium, quod est in corpus unum pari jure conjungit, ut adulter habeatur, quis quis compagem corporis in diversa distraxerit. Cf. next page—"Dissociari enim corpus, et distrahi Deus noluit." It would seem therefore that this Father would really alter the ordinary meaning of the word *adulterium*, and explain the offence differently from its civil-law definition. He would extend it to every incontinent act of every married person, on the ground that by such an act the marriage unity enforced by our Lord is broken. It is true that another view may be taken of the words of Lactantius. The may be considered as rhetoric rather than logic both here and in Epitome 8, where the same line of thought is repeated; but this is a question of constant recurrence in the Fathers, as reminds us of Selden's celebrated saying. The student will in each case form his own judgment; in this instance he may probably think the statement too precise to be otherwise than literal.

The same must be said of Ambrose, who dictum has been made classical by Gratian. Yet it should be observed that he is not always consistent with himself, *e.g.* (*Hexaem.* v. 7) he lays it down that the married are both in spirit and in body one, hence adultery is contrary to nature. We expect the same prefatory explanation from Lactantius, but find the old view: "Nolite quaerere, viri, alienum thorum, nolite insidias alienae copulae. Grave est adulterium et naturae injuria." So again, in *Luc.* lib. 2, *sub init.*, attaches this term to the transgression of espoused woman.

The celebrated passage, one chief support of distinction which has affected the law and language of modern Europe (quoted by Gratian *Decret.* ii. c. 32, q. 4), occurs in Ambrose's Defence of Abraham (*De Abr. Patr.* i. 4). We give it in Gratian for the sake of a gloss: "Nemo blandiatur de legibus hominum" (gloss—quid dicunt quod adulterium non committitur cum soluta sed cum nupta) "Omne stuprum adulterium est: nec viro licet quod mulieri non licet. Eadem a viro, quae ab uxore debetur castitas. Quicquid in ea quae non sit legitima uxor, commissum fuerit, adulterii crimine damnatum." This extract sounds in itself distinct and consecutive. But when the Apology is read as a whole, exactness seems to vanish. It is divi

into three main heads or *defensiones*: 1st, Abraham lived before the law which forbade adultery, therefore he could not have committed it. "Deus in Paradiso licet conjugium laudaverit, non adulterium damnaverit." It is hard to understand how such a sentence could have been written in the face of Matt. xix. 4-9, or how so great an authority could forget that the very idea of *conjugium* implied the wrong of *adulterium*. 2ndly, Abraham was actuated by the mere desire of offspring; and Sarah herself gave him her hand-maiden. Her example (with Leah's and Rachel's) is turned into a moral lesson against female jealousy, and then men are admonished—"Nemo sibi blandiatur," &c., as above quoted. 3rdly, Galat. iv. 21-4, is referred to, and the conclusion drawn, "Quod ergo putas esse peccatum, advertis esse mysterium;" and again "haec quae in figuram contingebant, illis crimini non erant." We have sketched this chapter of Ambrose because of the great place assigned him in the controversy of Western against Eastern Church Law.

Another passage referred to in this Q. "Dicat aliquis," is the 9th section of a sermon on John the Baptist, formerly numbered 65, now 52 (Ed. Bened. App. p. 462), and the work of an Ambrosiaster. But here the *adulterium* (filii testes adulterii) is the act of an unmarried man with his ancilla (distinguished from a concubina, *Decret: l. Dist. 34, "Concubina autem,"* seq.), i.e. a sort of Contubernium is called by a word which brings it within the letter of the 7th Commandment.

Perhaps Ambrose and his pseudonym, like many others, saw no very great difference between the prohibition of sins *secundum litteram* and *secundum analogiam*—as, for example, idolatry is adultery. It seems clear that he did not with Lactantius form an ideal of marriage and then condemn whatever contradicted it. His language on wedlock in Paradise forbids this explanation.

Looking eastwards, there is a famous sermon (37, al. 31) preached by Gregory Nazianzen, in which he blends together the points we have numbered 2, 3, and 4. He starts (vi.) from the inequality of laws. Why should the woman be restrained, the man left free to sin? The Latin version is incorrect; it so renders *καταπορεύειν* as to introduce the *later* notion of *adulterium*. Gregory thinks (*more Aesopi*) that the inequality came to pass because men were the law-makers; further, that it is contrary to (a) the 5th Commandment, which honours the mother as well as the father; (b) the equal creation, resurrection, and redemption of both sexes; and (c) the mystical representation of Christ and His Church. A healthy tone is felt in much of what Gregory says, but (ix.) the good of marriage is described by a definition far inferior in life and spirituality to that of the pagan Modestinus, and (in x.) naturally follows a preference for the far higher good of celibacy. The age was not to be trusted on this topic which formed an underlying motive with most of the great divines.

Chrysostom notices the chief texts in his *Expository Homilies*. For these we cannot afford space, and they are easily found. We are more concerned with his sermon on the *Bill of Divorce* (ed. Bened. iii. 198-209). "It is commonly called adultery," he says in substance, "when a man

wrongs a married woman. I, however, affirm. it of a married man who sins with the unmarried. For the essence of the crime depends on the condition of the injurers as well as the injured. Tell me not of outward laws. I will declare to thee the law of God." Yet we encounter a qualification: the offence of a husband with the unmarried is (p. 207) *μοιχείας ἕτερον εἶδος*. We also find the preacher dwelling with great force upon the lifelong servitude (*δουλεία*) of marriage, and we perceive from comparing other passages that there is an intentional contrast with the noble freedom of celibacy.

Asterius of Amaseia has a forcible discourse (printed by Combefis, and particularly worth reading) on the question: "An liceat homini dimittere uxorem suam, quacunque ex causa?" The chief part of it belongs to our next division, but towards the end, after disposing of insufficient causes, he enters on the nature of adultery. Here (as he says) the preacher stands by the husband. "Nam cum duplici fine matrimonia contrahuntur, benevolentiae ac quaerendorum liberorum, neutrum in adulterio continetur. Nec enim affectui locus, ubi in alterum animus inclinatur; ac sobolis omne decus et gratia perit, quando liberi confunduntur." Our strong Teutonic instincts feel the truth of these words. Asterius then insists on mutual good faith, and passes to the point that the laws of this world are lenient to the sins of husbands who excuse their own license by the plea of privileged harmlessness. He replies that all women are the daughters or wives of men. Some man must feel each woman's degradation. He then refers to Scripture, and concludes with precepts on domestic virtue and example. The sermon of Asterius shows how kindred sins may be thoroughly condemned without abolishing established distinctions. But it also shows a general impression that the distinctions of the Forum were pressed by apologists of sin into their own baser service.

Jerome's celebrated case of Fabiola claims a few lines. It was not really a divorce *propter adulterium*, but parallel to the history told by Justin Martyr. The points for us are the antithesis between Paulus noster and Papinianus (with Paulus Papiniani understood) and the assertion that the Roman law turned upon dignity—i.e. the *matrona* as distinguished from the *ancillula*. Jerome feels most strongly the unity of marriage, and joins with it the proposition that the word Man contains Woman. He therefore says that 1 Cor. vi. 16, applies equally to both sexes. Moreover, the same tendency appears, as in Chrysostom, to depress wedlock in favour of celibacy. Marriage is servitudo, and the yoke must be equal, "Eadem servitus pari conditione censetur." But the word *adulterium* is employed correctly; and in another place (on Hosea, ii. 2) he expressly draws the old distinction—"Fornicaria est, quae cum pluribus copulatur. Adulter, quae unum virum deserens alteri jungitur."<sup>a</sup>

Augustine, like Lactantius, posits an idea of marriage (*De Genesi*, ix. 12 [vii.]). It possesses a Good, consisting of three things—*fides, proles,*

<sup>a</sup> The *innupta* who offends *cum viro conjugato* is not here made an adulteress; Jerome's remedy might have been a specific constitution.



*sacramentum*. "In fide attenditur ne praeter vinculum conjugale, cum altera vel altero concumbatur." But (*Quaest. in Exod.* 71) he feels a difficulty about words—"Item quaeri solet utrum moechiae nomine etiam fornicatio teneatur. Hoc enim Graecum verbum est, quo jam Scriptura utitur pro Latino. Moechos tamen Graeci non nisi adulteros dicunt. Sed utique ista Lex non solis viris in populo, verum etiam feminis data est" (Jérôme, *supra*, thought of this point); how much more by "non moechaberis, uterque sexus astringitur, . . . . Ac per hoc si femina moecha est, habens virum, concumbendo cum eo qui vir ejus non est, etiamsi ille non habeat uxorem; profecto moechus est et vir habens uxorem, concumbendo cum ea quae uxor ejus non est, etiamsi illa non habeat virum." He goes on to quote Matt. v. 32, and infers "omnis ergo moechia etiam fornicatio in Scripturis dicitur—sed utrum etiam omnis fornicatio moechia dici possit, in eisdem Scripturis non mihi interim occurrit locutionis exemplum." His final conclusion is that the greater sin implies the less—a part the whole.

Augustine's sermon (ix. al. 96) *De decem Chordis* is an expansion of the above topics. In 3 (iii.) occurs the clause quoted *Decret.* ii. 32, q. 6. (a quaestio wholly from Augustine)—"Non moechaberis: id est, non ibis ad aliquam aliam praeter uxorem tuam." He adds some particulars reminding us of Asterius. On the 7th Commandment, which Augustine calls his 5th string, he says, 11 (ix.), "In illa video jacere totum pene genus humanum;" and mentions that false witness and fraud were held in horror, but (12) "si quis volutatur cum ancillis suis, amatur, blande accipitur; convertuntur vulnera in joca."

We cannot pass by two popes cited by Gratian. One is Innocent I., whose 4th canon *Ad Exup.* stands at the end of same c. 32, q. 5. "Et illud desideratum est sciri, cur communicantes viri cum adulteris uxoribus non convenient: cum contra uxores in consortio adulterorum virorum manere videantur." The gloss explains "communicantes" of husbands who commit a like sin with their wives. But this may or may not mean that they sinned cum conjugatis, and the words "pari ratione," which follow, to become decisive must be read with special emphasis. The other is the great Gregory, quoted earlier in same q. 5. The passage is from *Greg. Mag. Moralium*, lib. 21, in cap. Jobi xxxi. 9; and as it is truncated in quotation, we give the main line of thought, omitting parentheses: "Quamvis nonnunquam a reatu adulterii nequaquam discrepet culpa fornicationis (Matt. v. 28, quoted and expounded). Tamen plerumque ex loco vel ordine concupiscentis discernitur (instance). In personis tamen non dissimilibus idem luxuriae distinguitur reatus in quibus fornicationis culpa, quia ab adulterii reatu discernitur, praedicatoris egregii lingua testatur (1 Cor. vi. 9)." The difference between the two sins is next confirmed from Job. It is easy to see that the old juridical sense of *adulterium* is not taken away by these expository distinctions.

We now come to the event which gives significance and living interest to our recital of opinions. The canon law of Rome took ground which allied it on this as on other questions with what appeared to be the rights of women. Its treatment of cases arising out of the 7th

Commandment widened the separation of East and West, and left a mark on those barbarian nations which owed their civilization or their faith to pontifical Rome. Our business here is only with a definition, but canonists followed civilians in working their doctrine out to its more remote consequences, and some of these would form a curious chapter in history.

The essence of the pontifical definition is not that a wife is the *adultera*, and her paramour the *adulter*, but that the offence be committed "cum persona conjugata," whether male or female. Hence it comprehends two distinct degrees of criminality. It is called *simplex* in two cases, "cum solutus concumbit cum conjugata, vel conjugatus cum soluta." It is called *duplex* "cum conjugatus concumbit cum conjugata." These distinctions are taken from F. L. Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca* (ed. 1781), in verbo. They rest upon the *Decretum* as referred to by Ferraris, part 2, cause 32, quaest. 4. But the extracts we gave from qs. 5 and 6 should not be neglected.

The *Decretum*, according to C. Butler (*Horae Juridicae Subsecivae*, p. 168), is made up from (1) decrees of councils, (2) letters of pontiffs (3) writings of doctors. But on our subject the last-named is the real source—e.g. q. 4 is from the moral and doctrinal writings of Augustine Ambrose, Jerome, and Gregory I.; q. 6 wholly from Augustine. This is a very noteworthy fact, since it tends to confirm a conclusion that canonists had previously agreed with the civil law so far as concerns its definition of the crime Gratian would never have contented himself with quoting theologians if he could have found councils, or canonical writings accepted by councils, to support his own decisions.

Such, then, is one not unimportant antithesis in the wide divergence between East and West. I would form an interesting line of inquiry (but beyond our province) to use this antithesis as a clue in those mixed or doubtful cases of descent where the main life of national codes and customs is by some held homesprung, by other given to old Rome, and by a third party derived from Latin Christianity.

Through all inquiry on this subject the student must bear in mind that a confusion of thought has followed the change in law; e.g. Ducange, *Glossar.*, s. v., commences his article with a short quotation from Gregory of Nyssa' 4th can. *ad Let.* (explained above), but the sentence cited contains the opinion, not of the saint, but of the objector whom he is answering. Ducange proceeds to trace the same idea through various codes without a suspicion that he has begun by applying to one age the tenets of another. The difficulty of avoiding similar mistakes is greater than at first sight might have been anticipated. In the Dictionnaires of Tre voux, Furetière, Richelet, and Danet, *aroutrie* or *adultère* is explained from papal law or Thoma Aquin., while the citations mostly give the older sense. In Chaucer's *Persones Tale* we find the same word (*aroutrie*) defined after the civilian but soon after he mentions "mo spices" (mo species) taken from the other acceptation. Johnson gives to adultery the papal meaning, but his sole example is from pagan Rome, and modern English dictionary makers are glad to copy Johnson. A still more striking instance

of confounded explanations occurs in a remarkable dialogue between the doctor and his friend, vol. iii. 46, of Croker's *Boswell*.

The natural inference is that the above-mentioned authors were not conversant with the great change of definition undergone by the word adultery and its equivalents. But when those who write on the specialties of church history and antiquities quote Fathers, councils, jurists, and decretals, they ought in reason to note how far the common terms which their catenae link together are or are not used in the same sense throughout. This precaution has been generally neglected as regards the subject of this article, —hence endless confusion.

Immediately upon the nature of the crime (as legally defined) followed its *Classification*. By *Lex Julia*, 48 Dig., i. 1, it was placed among public wrongs. But a public wrong does not necessarily infer a public right of prosecution; see Gothofred's note on *Cod. Theod.* 9, tit. 7, s. 2. —"Aliud est publicum crimen; aliud publica accusatio." For Publica Judicia, cf. Dig. as above and *Institut. Justin.* 4, 18, *sub init.*

Under Augustus the husband was preferred as prosecutor, next the wife's father. The husband was in danger of incurring the guilt of premeditation (*lenocinium*) if he failed to prosecute (48, Dig. v. 2, § 2, and 29, *sub init.*; also 9, *Cod. Just.* 9, 2). He must open proceedings by sending a divorce to his wife (48, Dig. v. 2, § 2; 11, § 10; and 29, *init.*). Thus divorce was made an essential penalty, though far from being the whole punishment. By *Norell.* 117, c. 8, proceedings might commence before the divorce. Such prosecution had 60 days allowed for it, and these must be *dies utiles*. The husband's choice of days was large, as his *libellus* might be presented "de plano," i.e., the judge not sitting "pro tribunali" (48, Dig. v. 11, § 6; and 14, § 2). The husband might also accuse for 4 months further, but not "jure mariti," only "ut quis extraneus" (Goth. on 11, § 6). For example, see Tacit. *Ann.* ii. 85; Labeo called to account by the praetor (cf. Orell. note), for not having accused his wife, pleads that his 60 days had not elapsed. After this time an *extraneus* might intervene for 4 months of available days (tit. of Dig. last quoted, 4, § 1). If the divorced wife married before accusation, it was necessary to begin with the adulterer (2, *init.*; 39, § 3). The wife might then escape through failure of the plaint against him (17, § 6). He was liable for five continuous years even though she were dead (11, § 4; 39, § 2), and his death did not shield her (19, *init.*), but that period barred all accusation against both offenders (29, § 5; and 31; also 9, *Cod. J.* 9, 5). Under Constantine, A.D. 326 (9, *Cod. Theod.* 7, 2, and 9, *Cod. J.* 9, 30), the right of public prosecution was taken away. The prosecutors were thus arranged: husband; wife's relations, i.e. sister, brother, father's brother, mother's brother. This order remained unaltered (see Balsam. *Schol. in Bevereg. Pandect.* i. 408, and *Blustaris Syn-* *tagma*, p. 185).

The Mosaic law, like the Roman, made this a public wrong, and apparently also a matter for public prosecution; compare Deut. xxi. 22, with John viii. 3 and 10. As long as the penalty of death was enforced, the husband was not condoned. But in later times he might

content himself with acting under Deut. xxiv. 1-4. See Matt. i., 19. [Esponsals count as matrimony under Jewish law even more strongly than under Roman; compare Deut. xxii. 23, *seq.*, with 48, Dig. v. 13, § 3]. See also Hosea, ii. 2, iii. 1, and parallel passages.

By canon law all known sins are scandals, and as such public wrongs; cf. Gothofr. marg. annot. on Dig. 48, tit. 1, s. 1; Grat. *Decret.* ii. c. 6, 9, 1; J. Clarus, *Sent. Rec.* v. 1, 6; and on Adultery, Blackstone, iii. 8, 1, and iv. 4, 11. This offence became known to Church authorities in various ways; see Basil 34; Innocent *ad Exup.* 4; and Elib. 76, 78, Greg. Nyss. 4, where confession mitigates punishment. A similar allowance for self-accusation is found in regard of other crimes, e.g. Greg. Thaum. cans. 8 and 9.

The Church agreed with the State in not allowing a husband to condone (Basil, 9 and 21), and on clerks especially (Neocaesarea, 8). Divines who were not canonists differed considerably. Hermas's *Pastor* (Mandat. iv.) allowed and urged one reconciliation to a penitent wife. Augustine changed his mind; compare *De Adulterin. Conjug.* lib. ii. 8 (ix.) with *Retractat.* lib. i. xix. 6. In the first of these places he hesitates between condonation and divorce; opposes forgiveness "per claves regni caelorum" to the prohibitions of law "secundum terrenae civitatis modum," and concludes by advising continence, which no law forbids. In the latter passage he speaks of divorce as not only allowed but commanded. "Et ubi dixi hoc permissum esse, non jussum; non attendi aliam Scripturam dicentem; Qui tenet adulteram stultus et impius est" (Prov. xviii. 22; lxx.).

A public wrong implied civil rights; therefore this offence was the crime of *free* persons (Dig. 48, tit. 5, s. 6 *init.*). "Inter liberas tantum personas adulterium stuprumve passas Lex Julia locum habet." Cf. *Cod. J.* 9, tit. 9, s. 23 *init.* A slave was capable only of Contubernium (see *Servus* and *Matrimonium* in *Dict. Antiq.*). Servitude annulled marriage (Dig. 24, tit. 2, s. 1), or rather made it null from the first (*Norell. Just.* 22, 8, 9, 10). "Ancillam a toro abjicere" is laudable according to Pope Leo I. (*Ad Rustic.* 6). That Christian princes attempted to benefit slaves rather by manumission than by ameliorating the servile condition, we see from the above-quoted *Norell.* and from Harmenop. *Proch.* i. 14; the slave (sec. 1) is competent to no civil relations, and (sec. 6) his state is a quasi-death.

Concubinage was not adultery (Dig. 25, tit. 7, s. 3, § 1); but a concubine might become an adulteress, because, though not an *uxor*, she ought to be a *matrona*, and could therefore, if unfaithful, be accused, not *jure mariti*, but *jure extranei*. For legal conditions, see *Cod. J.* 5, tit. 26 and 27, *Just. Norell.* 18, c. 5; also 74 and 89. Leo (Nov. 91) abolished concubinage on Christian grounds. For the way in which the Church regarded it, cf. Bals., on Basil, 26, and *Conc. Tolet.* i. 17; also August. *Quest. in Genesim*, 90, *De Fid. et Op.* 35 (xix.), and *Serm.* 392, 2. Pope Leo I. (*Ad Rustic.* 4, cf. 6, as given by Mansi) seems to make the legal concubine a mere ancilla; cf. Grat. *Decret. I. Dist.* 34 (ut supra) and *Dict. Antiq.* s. v.

We now come to much the gravest consequence of a classification under public wrongs—its effect on woman's remedy. By *Lex Julia*, the wife has no power of plaint against the husband

for adultery as a public wrong (*Cod. J.* 9. tit. 9, s. 1.). This evidently flows from the definition of the crime, but the glossators' reasons are curious. She cannot complain *jure mariti* because she is not a husband, nor *jure extranei* because she is a woman.

The magistrate was bound by law to inquire into the morals of any husband accusing his wife (*Dig.* 48, tit. 5, s. 13 § 5). This section is from an Antonine rescript quoted at greater length from the *Cod. Gregorian.* by Augustine, *De Conjug. Adulterin.* lib. ii. 7 (viii.). The husband's guilt did not act as a *compensatio criminis*. In England the contrary holds, and a guilty accuser shall not prevail in his suit (see Burns, *Eccl. Law*, art. "Marriage."). But the wife's real remedy lay in the use of divorce which during the two last centuries of the Republic became the common resource of women under grievances real or fancied, and for purposes of the worst kind. There is a graphic picture of this side of Roman life in Boissier's *Cicero et ses Amis*; and for the literature and laws, see "Divortium" in Smith's *Dict. of Antiquities*. Brissonius *de Formulis* gives a collection of the phrases used in divorcing.

Constantine allowed only three causes on either side—on the woman's these were her husband's being a homicide, poisoner, or violator of sepulchres (*Cod. Theod.* 3, tit. 16, s. 1; cf. *Edict. Theodor.* 54). This law was too strict to be maintained; the variations of Christian princes may be seen in *Cod. J.* 5. tit. 17. Theodos. and Valentin. l. 8, added to other causes the husband's aggravated incontinency. Anastasius, l. 9, permitted divorce by common consent; this again "*nisi castitatis concupiscentia*" was taken away by Justinian in his *Novell.* 117, which (cap. 9) allowed amongst other causes the husband's gross unchastity. Justin restored divorce by common consent.

The Church viewed the general liberty to repudiate under the civil law, with jealousy; cf. Greg. Nazianz. *Epp.* 144, 5 (al. 176, 181), and Victor Antiochen. on Mark x. 4-12. But it was felt that women must have some remedy for extreme and continued wrongs, and this lay in their using their legal powers, and submitting the reasonableness of their motives to the judgment of the Church. Basil's Can. 35 recognizes such a process; see under our Div. III. *Spiritual Penalties*, No. 2. Still from what has been said, it is plain that divorce might become a frequent occasion of adultery, since the Church held that a married person separated from insufficient causes really continued in wedlock. Re-marriage was therefore always a serious, sometimes a criminal step. [DIVORCE.]

Marriage after a wife's death was also viewed with suspicion. Old Rome highly valued continence under such circumstances; Val. Max. ii. 1, § 3, gives the fact; the feeling pervades those tender lines which contrast so strongly with Catullus V. ad Lesbiam—

"Occidit mea Lux, meumque Sidus;  
Sed caram sequar; arboreque ut alta  
Sub tellure suos agunt amores,  
Et radicibus implicantur imis:  
Sic nos consociabimur sepulti,  
Et vivis erimus beatiores."

Similar to Val. Max. is Herm. *Mandat.* iv. 4. Gregory Nazianz. (*Hom.* 37, al. 31) says that

marriage represents Christ and the Church and there are not two Christs; the first marriage is law, a second an indulgence, a third swinish. Against marriages beyond two, see Neocaes. 3, Basil, 4, and Leo. *Novell.* 90. Curiously enough, Leo (cf. *Dict. Biog.*) was himself excommunicated by the patriarch for marrying a fourth wife. [DIGAMY.]

III. *Penalties.*—We are here at once met by very singular circumstance. Tribonian attributes to Constantine and to Augustus two suspiciously corresponding enactments, both making death the penalty of this crime, and both inflicting that death by the sword. The founder of the Empire and the first of Christian emperors are thus brought into a closeness of juxtaposition which might induce the idea that lawyer like mythical poets, cannot dispense with epynims.

The Lex Julia furnishes a title to *Cod. Theod.* tit. 7; *Dig.* 48, tit.; and *Cod. J.* 9, tit. 9; but in none of these places is the text preserved, and we only know it from small excerpts. The law of Constantine in *Cod. Theod.* 9, tit. 7, s. 2, contains no capital penalty, but in *Cod. J.* 9, tit. 9, s. 3 after fifteen lines upon accusation, six words are added—"Sacrilegos autem nuptiarum gladii puniri oportet." The word "sacrilegos" used substantively out of its exact meaning is very rare (see Facciolati). For the capital clause ascribed to the Lex Julia, see *Instit.* iv. 18, 4; but this clause has been since the time of Cujacius rejected by most critical jurists and historians, whom some maintain the law of Constantine others suppose a confusion between the great emperor and his sons. Those who charge Tribonian with *emblemata* generally believe him to have acted the harmonizer by authority of Justinian. On these two laws there is a summary of the clause in Selden, *Uxor. Ebr.* iii. 12, with foot reference. Another is the comment in Gothofred's ed. of *Cod. Theod.* vol. iv. 296, 7. Heineccius is not to be blindly trusted, but in *Op.* vol. III. his Syll. xi. *Secta Triboniano-mastigum* contains curious matter, and misled Gibbon into the idea of a regular school of lawyers answering this description. The passages in Cujacius may be traced through each volume by its index. See also Hoffmann *Ad Leg. Jul.* (being Tract iv. in Fellenberg's *Jurisprudentia Antiqua*); Lipsii *Excurs. in Tacit. Ann.* iv.; Orelli, on *Tacit. Ann.* ii. 50; Ortolan *Explication des Instituts*, iii. p. 791; Sande *On the Institutes*, p. 605; *Dict. Antiq.*, "Adulterium"; and *Dict. Biog.*, "Justinianus."

The fact most essential to us is that previous to the Christian emperors generally substituted their own edicts for the provisions of the Lex Julia and that the successors of Constantine were equally diligent in altering his laws. Historians have frequently assumed the contrary. Valesius' note on Socrates, v. 18, may serve as a way of example. The Church could not avoid adapting her canons to the varied states of civil legislation; cf. Scholia on *Can. Apost.* 5, *Trull.* 87, besides many other places. The true state of the case will become plainer if we briefly mention the different ways in which adultery might be legally punished.

1. The *Jus Occidendi*, most ancient in its origin; moderated under the Empire; but not taken away by Christian princes. Compare *Dig.* 48, 5, s. 20 to 24, 32 and 38, with same 48, ti

l. 1, § 5; *Cod. J.* 9, tit. 9, s. 4; and *Pauli Recept. Sentent.* ii. 26. This right is common to most nations, but the remarkable point is that Roman law gave a greater prerogative of homicide to the woman's father than to her husband. For a similar custom and feeling, see Lane's *Modern Egyptians* i. 297. The *Jus Occidendi* under the Old Testament is treated by Selden, *De Jure Nat. et Gent. juxta Discip. Ebraeor.* iv. 3; in old and modern France, by Ducange and Ragueau; in England, by Blackstone and Wharton. There is a provision in Basil's Can. 34 directing that if a woman's adultery becomes known to the Church authorities either by her own confession or otherwise, she shall be subjected to penitence, but not placed among the public penitents, lest her husband, seeing her should surmise what has occurred and slay her on the spot (cf. *Blastaris Syntagma*, letter M, cap. 14). This kind of summary vengeance has often been confounded with the penalty inflicted by courts of law, e.g. its celebrated assertion by Cato in *A. Gell.* x. 23, though his words "sine judicio" ought to have prevented the mistake. Examples of it will be found *Val. Max.* vi. 1, 13; the chastisement of the historian Sallust is described *A. Gell.* xvii. 18; many illustrations are scattered through the satirists, and one, *M. Ann. Senec., Controv.* i. 4, is particularly curious.

2. *The Household Tribunal*, an institution better known because of the details in *Dion. Hal.* ii. 25. The remarks of Mommsen (i. 5 and 12), should be compared with Mr. Hallam's philosophical maxim (*Suppt. to Middle Ages*, art. 54) that the written laws of free and barbarous nations are generally made for the purpose of preventing the infliction of arbitrary punishments. See for the usage *Val. Max.* ii. 9, 2, and *A. Gell.* x. 23, in which latter place the husband is spoken of as the wife's censor, a thought which pervades Origen's remarkable exposition of *Matt.* xii. 8, 9, compared with v. 32 (tomus xiv. 24). The idea itself was likely to be less alien from the mind of the Church because of the patriarchal power which sentenced Tamar to the flames, and the apostolic principle that "the Head of the Woman is the Man." It is plain, however, that all private administration of justice is opposed to the whole tenour of Church legislation. But perhaps the most pleasant example of the Roman Household Court best shows the strength and extent of its jurisdiction. *Pomponia Graecina* (*Tacit. Ann.* xiii. 32) was so tried on the capital charge of foreign superstition, and the noble matron, an early convert, as is sometimes supposed, to Christianity, owed her life to the acquittal of her husband and his family assessors.

3. A far more singular penalty on adultery is mentioned, *Tacit. Ann.* ii. 85, *Sueton. Tib.* 35, and *Merivale*, v. 197. It consisted in permitting a matron to degrade herself by tendering her name to the Aediles for insertion in the register of public women. Tacitus speaks of it as "more inter veteres recepto," and looks back with evident regret upon the ages when such shame was felt to be an ample chastisement. His feeling is shared by *Val. Max.* ii. 1. A like custom subsisted before 1833 among the modern Egyptians, (see Lane, i. 176-7), differing only in the fact that the degradation was compulsory, a custom curiously parallel to a narrative of Socrates, v. 18,

(copied by Nicephorus, xii. 22), who says that there remained at Rome, till abolished by the Christian Emperor Theodosius I., places of confinement called *Sistra*, where women who had been caught in breaking the 7th Commandment were compelled to acts of incontinency, during which the attention of the passers-by was attracted by the ringing of little bells in order that their ignominy might be known to every one. Valesius has a dubious note founded chiefly on a mistake, already observed, as to the constancy of Roman punishments. They really were most variable, and here again Egypt offers a parallel, cf. Lane, i. 462-3. Niebuhr (*Lectures on Roman Hist.* i. 270) thinks the unfixed nature of penalties for numerous offences in Greece and Rome a better practice than the positive enactments of modern times. We now pass to

4. *Judicial Punishments*.—Augustine (*Civ. Dei*, iii. 5) says that the ancient Romans did not inflict death upon adulteresses (cf. *Liv.* i. 28, x. 2, xxv. 2, and xxxix. 18;) those who read Plautus will find divorce described as their usual chastisement. The critics of Tribonian generally believe that Paulus (*Sentent.* ii. 26, 14) gives the text of the *Lex Julia*. It commences with the punishment of the woman, and proceeds to that of her paramour on the principle before noticed of the adultera being the true criminal, and the adulter her accomplice. After Constantine, though the civil law maintains this ancient position, there is an apparent inclination to punish the man as a seducer—a clearly vital alteration, and due probably to Christian influences.

Augustine places the lenity of old Rome towards adulterous women in contrast with the severities exercised on Vestal virgins. His statement is not necessarily impugned by those who rank adultery among capital crimes (e.g. *Cod. J.* 9, tit. 9, s. 9), since by some kinds of banishment "eximitur caput de civitate," and hence the phrase "civil death" (see *Dig.* 48, tit. 1, s. 2; tit. 19, s. 2; tit. 22, s. 3-7). Emperors varied from each other, and from themselves. Augustus exceeded his own laws (*Tacit. Ann.* iii. 24). Tiberius was perverse (*ibid.* iv. 42). Appuleius, under the Antonines, represents the legal penalty as actual death, and seems to imply that burning the adulteress alive was not an unknown thing (*Met.* ix. ut supra). Of Macrinus it is expressly stated (*Jul. Capit.* 12), "Adulterii reos semper vivos simul incendit, junctis corporibus." Alexander Severus held to a capital penalty (*Cod. J.* 9, tit. 9), as above. Paulus was of his council (cf. *Ael. Lamprid.* 25), a fact favouring the supposition that the section (*Recept. Sent.* ii. 26, 14) which mentions a punishment not capital must represent an earlier law. Arnobius, under Diocletian (see *Dict. Biog.*), speaks of adultery as capital (iv. p. 142, ed. Var.). With the above precedents before him, the reader may feel inclined to distrust the charge of new and Mosaic severity brought against Constantine and his successors in chap. 44 of Gibbon, vol. v. p. 322, ed. Milman and Smith.

Whether the disputed penal clause of Constantine be genuine or not, by another law of his (*Cod. J.* 9, tit. 11) a woman offending with a slave was capitally punished, and the slave burned. Constantius and Constans (*Cod. Theod.* 11, tit. 36, s. 4) enacted "pari similique ratione sacrilegos nuptiarum, tanquam manifestos parricidas, in-



suere culeo vivos, vel exurere, judicantem oportet." Compare *Dict. Antiq.* art. *Leges Corneliae*, "Lex Pompeia de Parricidiis," and for burning, *Pauli Sentent. Recept.* v. 24. Baronius (sub fin. Ann. 339) has a note on "Sacrilegos,"—a word which placed the male offender in a deeply criminal light. The execution of the sentence was enforced by clear cases of adultery being excepted from appeal (*Sent. Recept.* ii. 26, 17), and afterwards (*Cod. Theod.* 9, tit. 38, s. 3-8), from the Easter indulgence, when, in Imperial phrase, the Resurrection Morning brought light to the darkness of the prison, and broke the bonds of the transgressor. Yet we may ask, Was the Constantian law really maintained? Just thirty years later, Ammianus (xxviii. 1) gives an account of the decapitation of Cethegus, a senator of Rome; but though the sword was substituted for fire, he reckons this act among the outrages of Maximin, prefect of the city; and how easily a magistrate might indulge in reckless barbarity may be seen by the horrible trial for adultery described by Jerome (*Ad Innocent.*), in which both the accused underwent extreme tortures. Again, though the Theodosian code (in force from A.D. 439) gave apparent life to the Constantian law, yet by a rescript of Majorian (A.D. 459) it is ordered that the adulterer shall be punished "as under former emperors," by banishment from Italy, with permission to any one, if he return, to kill him on the spot (*Novell. Major.* 9). That death in various times and places was the penalty, seems clear from Jerome on Nah. i. 9; the Vandal customs in Salvian, 7; and Can. Wallici, 27. Fines appear in later Welsh, as in Salic and A. S. codes. For these and other punishments among Christianized barbarians, see *Ancient Laws of Wales*; Lindenbrogii *Cod. Leg.*, Wilkins, vol. i., Olaus Mag. *de Gent. Septent.* XIV.; and Ducange s. v. and under *Trotari*.

For Justinian's legislation see his 134th *Novell.* Cap. 10 renews the Constantian law against the male offender, extends it to all abettors, and inflicts on the female bodily chastisement, with other penalties short of death. Cap. 12 contemplates a possible evasion of justice, and further offences, to which are attached further severities. Caps. 9 and 13 contain two merciful provisions. Leo, in his 32nd *Novell.* (cited by Harmenop. as 19th), compares adultery with homicide, and punishes both man and woman by the loss of their noses and other inflictions. For a final summary, cf. Harmenop. *Proch.* vi. 2, and on the punishment of incontinent married men, vi. 3.

*Spiritual penalties* may be thus arranged—1. Against adultery *strictly so called* (Can. Apost. 61 al. 60). A convicted adulter cannot receive orders.—Ancyra, 20. Adultera and adulter (so Schol., husband with guilty knowledge, Routh and Fleury), 7 years' penitence.—Neocaesarea, 1. Presbyter so offending to be fully excommunicated and brought to penitence.—Neocaesarea, 8. The layman whose wife is a convicted adultera cannot receive orders. If the husband be already ordained, he must put her away under penalty of deprivation.—Basil, can. 9. An unchaste wife must be divorced. An unchaste husband not so, even if adulterous; this is the rule of Church custom. [N.B.—We place Basil here because accepted by Trull. 2.]—Basil, 58. The adulter 15 years' penitence; cf. 59, which gives 7 years to simple incontinence, and compare with both can.

7 and Scholia.—Gregor. Nyssa, can. 4, prescribes 18 years (9 only for simple incontinence).—Bas. 27, and Trull. 26, forbid a presbyter who has ignorantly contracted an unlawful marriage before orders to discharge his functions, but do not degrade him.—Basil, 39. An adultera living with her paramour is guilty of continued crime. Trull. forbids her marriage with him, as does also the civil law. Cf. on these marriages Triburiense, 449, and 51.—On intended and incipient sin, compare Neocaesarea, 4, with Basil, 70 (also Scholia) and *Blastaris Syntagma*, cap. xvi.—The synod of Eliberis, though held A.D. 305, was not accepted by any Universal Council, but it represents an important part of the Western Church, and its canons on discipline are strict. The following arrangement will be found useful. Eliberis, 1 Sin of Clerisy. (Cf. Tarracon. 9.)—31. Of you men.—7. Sin, if repeated.—69. Of married men and women.—47. If habitual and with relapse after penitence.—64. Of women continuing with their accomplices; cf. 69.—65. Wives of clerics.—70. Husbands' connivance (F. Mendoza remarks on the antiquity of this sin in Spain).—73. Married men with Jewesses or Pagans.

2. Against Adultery as *under Spiritual but not Civil Law*.—Both canonists and divines joined with our Saviour's precepts, Prov. xviii. 23; Jer. iii (both LXX); 1 Cor. vi. 16, and vii. 11-16 and c. They drew two conclusions: (1) Divorce, except for adultery, is adultery. Under this fell the questions of enforced continence, and of marriage after divorce. (2) To retain an adulterous wife is also adultery—a point disputed by divines, e.g. Augustine, who yielded to the text in Proverbs (*Retract.* i. xix. 6). These divisions should be remembered though the points are often blended in the canons.

Can. Apost. 5. No one in higher orders can cast out his wife on plea of religion. This was altered as regards bishops by Trull. 12, but the change (opposed to African feeling) was not enough to satisfy Rome. It must be remembered that, though divorce was restrained by Constantine, whose own mother had thus suffered (see Eutrop. ix. 22), his law was relaxed by Theod. and Valentin. and their successors, and it was common for a clerk, forced into continence, to repudiate his wife. Trull. 13, opposes the then Roman practice as concerns priests and deacons, and so far maintains, as it says, *Can. Apost.* 5.—The Scholia on these three canons should be read. For the Roman view of the matter compare Binius and other commentators with Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* xl. 50. Cf. Siricius, *Ad Himerium* 7; Innocent I. *Ad Exuperium* 1, and *Ad Maximianum et Severum* Leo I. *Ad Rusticum* 3, and *Ad Anastasium* 4. See also Milman, *Lat. Christ.* i. 97-100. The feeling of Innocent appears most extreme if Jerome's assertion (*Ad Demetriad.*) of this pope's being the predecessor's son is literally meant, as Milman and others believe.—*Can. Apost.* 18, al. 1. On marriage with a cast-out wife; cf. Lev. xxi. 7.—48, al. 47. Against casting out a man for marrying again, or marrying a dismissed woman. "Casting out" and "dismissed" are explained by the Scholiasts in the sense of unlawful repudiations. Sanchez (*De Matrim.* lib. x. *de Divortio* Disp. ii. 2) quotes this canon in the opposite sense and brings no other authority to forbid divorce before Innocent I.; indeed in *Disp.* i. 12, he says "Posterior (excusatio) est, indissolubilitatem"

trimonu non ita arcte in primitiva Ecclesia intellectam esse, quin liceret ex legitima causa, apud Episcopos provinciales probata, libellum repudii dare." F. Mendoza makes a like reserve on Eliberis, 8. It is to be observed that Latin renderings of Greek law terms are apt to be ambiguous; e.g. "Soluta" is sometimes used of a dismissed wife, sometimes of an unmarried woman.—Basil, *Ad Amphilocho.* can 9. The dictum of our Lord applies naturally to both sexes, but it is otherwise ruled by custom [i.e. of the Church, see a few lines further, with Scholia; and on unwritten Church custom having the force of law cf. Photii *Nomoc.* i. 3, and references]. In the case of wives that dictum is stringently observed according to 1 Cor. vi. 16; Jer. iii. 1, and Prov. xviii., latter half of 23 (both in LXX and Vulgate).—If, however, a divorced husband marries again, the second wife is not an adultera, but the first; cf. Scholia. [Here the Latin translator has mistaken the Greek; he renders *ὅτι οὐδα ἐὶ δύνανται* by "nescio an possit," instead of "nescio an non"—so as to give the contrary of Basil's real meaning.] A woman must not leave her husband for blows, waste of dower, incontinence, nor even disbelief (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 16), under penalty of adultery. Lastly, Basil forbids second marriage to a husband putting away his wife, i.e. unlawfully according to Aristenus, Selden, *Us. Ebr.* iii. 31, and Scholia on Trull. 87. On like Scripture grounds Can. 26 of 2nd Synod attributed to St. Patrick, commands divorce of adulteresses, and permits husband to remarry.—Basil, 21, assigns extra penitence to what would now be called simple adultery (then denied by Church custom to be adultery), i.e. the incontinency of a married man. Divorce is next treated as a penalty—an offending wife is an adulteress and must be divorced—not so the husband; cf. can. 9. Basil, unlike Gregory of Nyssa, does not justify in reason the established custom.—35. Alludes to a judgment of the sort mentioned by Sanchez and Mendoza, and referred to above.—Can. 48. Separated wife had better not re-marry.

Carthage, 105 ap. Bev. (in *Cod. Eccl. Afric.* 102).—Divorced persons (i.e. either rightly or wrongly repudiating) to remain unmarried or be reconciled, and an alteration of Imperial law in this sense to be petitioned for. This breathes a Latin rather than an Eastern spirit, and is the same with 2 Milevis (Mileum), 17 (repeated *Conc. Afric.* 69), cf. 1 Arles, 10, and Innocent I., *Ad Erup.* 6. The case is differently determined under differing conditions by Aug. *de Fid. et Oper.* 2 (i.) compared with 35 (xix.).

The Scholiasts hold that the Carthaginian canon was occasioned by facility of civil divorce, but superseded by Trull. 87. Innocent III., with a politic regard for useful forgeries, ordained that earlier should prevail over later canons (cf. Justell. i. 311), but the Greek canonists (as here) maintain the reverse, which is likewise ably upheld and explained by Augustine, *De Bapt.* II. 4, (iii.), and 14 (ix.).

Trull. 87, is made up of Basil's 9, 21, 35, and 48. The Scholia should be read—but they do not notice that, when it was framed, divorce by consent had been restored by Justin, *Novell.* 2 (authent. 140). They are silent because neither this *Novell.* nor all Justinian's 117 were inserted in the Basilica then used; his 134 alone repre-

sented the law (see Photii *Nomoc.* XIII. 4, Sch. 3).—Trull. 87, is so worded as to express desertion, and therefore implies a judicial process, without which re-marriage must be held mere adultery (see on this point, *Blastaris Syntagm.: Gamma*, 13). The "divine" Basil, here highly magnified, is elevated still higher in *Blastaris, Caus. Matrim. ap. Leunclavii Jus Graeco-Roman.* p. 514.

This canon closes the circle of Oecumenical law upon adultery, and on divorce, treated partly as its penalty and partly as its cause. The points of agreement with State law are plain; the divergence is an effect of Church restraint upon divorce, which, if uncanonical, easily led to digamy, and formed *per se* a species of adultery. According to canonists (Photii *Nomoc.* I, 2, Schol. 2), Church law, having a twofold sanction, could not be resisted by Imperial constitutions.

As the ancient mode of thinking on adultery is alien from our own, it seems right to refer the reader to the vindication of its morality by Gregory Nyss. (*Ad Let.* 4).—Gregory is by no means lenient to the incontinency of married or unmarried men with single women; 9 years of penitence with all its attendant infamy made up no trifling chastisement. But he held that the offence of a married woman and her paramour involves three additional elements of immorality—the treacherous, the specially unjust, and the unnatural; or, to put the case another way, he estimated the sin by the strength of the barriers overleaped by passion, and by the amount of selfishness involved in its gratification. So, in modern days, we often speak of an adulteress as an unnatural mother, and visit her seducer with proportionate indignation. Thus viewed, spuriousness of progeny is not a censure by rule of expediency, but a legal test of underlying depravity.

This section may usefully close with examples showing how the ancient position has been overlooked as well as resisted. We saw that Carthage, 105, and its parallels forbade marriage after divorce, whether just or unjust, and that the view of its being adultery had gained ground in the West. Now, three earlier Eliberitan canons uphold the other principle. Can. 8. Against re-marriage of a woman causelessly repudiating. 9. Against re-marriage of a woman leaving an adulterous husband. 10. Against marriage with a man guilty of causeless dismissal. From this last canon, compared with 8 and 9, it appears that the husband divorcing an adulteress may marry again, which by 9 an aggrieved wife cannot do; cf. the parallel, Basil, 9, *supra*. Cotelierius, note 16, 3, to Herm. *Past. Mund.* iv., quotes cans., 9 and 10 as a support to the pseudo-Ambrose on 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11, and construes both to mean that the man is favoured above the woman under like conditions. He is followed by Bingham, xvi. 11, 6, as far as the so-called Ambrose is concerned. But we have sufficiently proved that Church custom did not permit incontinency to be held a like condition in husband and in wife. The pseudo-Ambrose himself misleads his readers—his law agrees with the Basilean canon, but not content with laying down the law, he goes on to reason out the topic—the man's being the head of the woman, &c. The Western Canon ascribed to St. Patrick (*supra*) seems a remarkable contrast to the Latin rule. The fact is equally remarkable

that at no further distance from Eliberis than Arles, and as early as A.D. 314, it was enacted by Can. 10 that young men detecting their wives in adultery should be counselled against marrying others during the lifetime of the adulteresses (cf. *Nantes* 12). Most curious to us are the decrees of Pope Leo I., *Ad Nicet.* 1, 2, 3, 4, which allow the wives of prisoners of war to marry others, but compel them to return to their husbands under pain of excommunication should the captives be released and desire their society. Such instances as these and some before cited illustrate the various modes of affirming an iron bond in marriage, and of resisting the law on adultery, and on divorce as the penalty of adultery (afterwards received in Trullo), ere yet the opposition formed an article in the divergence of Greek and Latin Christendom. With them should be compared the extracts from divines given under Division II. *supra*, which display in its best colours the spirit of the revolution. For other particulars, see DIVORCE.

3. *Constructive Adultery*.—The following are treated as guilty of the actual crime:—Trull. 98. A man marrying a betrothed maiden; cf. Basil, 37, with Schol., and Dig. 48, tit. 5, s. 13, § 3; also Siricius, *Ad Him.* 4.—Elib. 14. Girls seduced marrying other men than their seducers.—Basil, 18. Consecrated virgins who sin and their paramours; cf. his 60. These supersede Ancyra, 19, by which the offence was punished as digamy. See on same, Trull. 4; Elib. 13; Siric. *Ad Him.* 6, Innocent, *Ad Victr.* 12 and 13. Cyprian, *Ad Pompon.*, pronounced it better they should marry—the offender is “Christi Adultera.” Jerome, *Ad Demetriad.* sub fin., perplexes the case for irrevocable vows by declaring, “Quibus aperte dicendum est, ut aut nubant, si se non possunt continere, aut contineant, si nolunt nubere.”—Laod. 10 and 31, accepted by Chalced. i. and Trull. 2, forbid giving sons and daughters in marriage to heretics. Eliberis, 15, 16, 17, enact severe penalties against parents who marry girls to Jews, heretics, and unbelievers, above all to heathen priests. 1, Arles, 11, has same prohibition, so too Agde, 67. By *Cod. Theod.* 16, tit. 8, s. 6 (A.D. 339), Jews must not take Christian women; by *Cod. Theod.* 3, tit. 7, s. 2 (A.D. 388), all marriage between Jew and Christian is to be treated as adultery, a law preserved by Justinian (*Cod. J.* 1, tit. 9, s. 6). Some suppose this phrase simply means treated as a capital offence, but Elib. 15, mentions the risk of *adulterium animae*. The passage in Tertullian, *Ad Ux.* ii. 3, “fideles gentilium matrimonia subeuntes stupri reos esse constat,” &c. (cf. Division I. *supra*) shows how early this thought took hold of the Church. Idolatry from Old Testament times downward was adultery; and divines used the principle 1 Cor. vi. 15, 16, and parallel texts, to prove that marriage with an unclean transgressor involved wife or husband in the sinner’s guilt. Compare Justin Martyr in the history cited Division I., Cyprian, *Testimon.* iii. 62, and Jerome, *Epitaph. Fabiolae*. It would appear therefore that law was thus worded to move conscience, and how hard the task of law became may be gathered from Chalcedon, 14. This canon (on which see Schol. and Routh’s note, *Opusc.* ii. 107) concerns the lower clergy; but the acceptance of Laodicea by Can. 1 had already met the case of lay people. See further under MARRIAGE.

The Church was strict against incitements and scandals. Professed virgins must not live with clerks as sisters. See SUB-INTRODUCTAE. On promiscuous bathing, Trull. 77, Laod. 30; the custom was strange to early Rome, but practice varied at different times (see *Dict. Antiq. Balneae*). On female adornment, Trull. 96, and compare Commodian’s address to matrons, *Inst.* 59, 60.—Elib. 35, forbids women’s night watching in cemeteries, because sin was committed under pretext of prayer. Against theatricals, loose reading, some kinds of revels, dances, and other prohibited things, see Bingham, xvi. 11, 10–17, with the references, amongst which those to Cyprian deserve particular attention.

For the general literature on CANON LAW see that article. Upon civil law there are excellent references under Justinianus, *Dict. Biogr.*, with additional matter in the notes to Gibbon, chap. 44, ed. Smith and Milman, and a summary respecting the *Basilica*, vol. vii. pp. 44, 45. We may here add that Mommsen is editing a text of the *Corpus Juris Civilis*; and the whole Russian code is now being translated for English publication. There is a series of manuals by Ortolan deserving attention: *Histoire de la Législation romaine*, 1842; *Cours de Législation pénale comparée*, 1839–41; *Explication des Instituts*, 1863. Gothofredi *Manuale Juris*, and Windscheid’s *Lehrbuch d. Pandektenrechts* (2nd ed.) may be useful. An ample collection of Councils and Ecclesiastical documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland is being published at Oxford. References on special topics have been fully given above, and will serve to indicate the readiest sources for further information. Curious reader will find interesting matter in Saint Edme, *Dictionnaire de la Pénalité*; Taylor, *On Civil Law* and Duni, *Origine e Progressi del Cittadino e del Governo civile di Roma*, 1763–1764. [W. J.]

ADVENT (*Adventus*, Νῆστελα τῶν Χριστοῦ γέννησιν), is the season of preparation for the Feast of the Nativity, to which it holds the like relation as does Lent to Easter. As no trace of an established celebration of the birth of our Lord is met with before the 4th century [NATIVITY], no earlier origin can be assigned to the ecclesiastical institution of Advent; the statement of Durand (*Rationale divin. off.* vi. 21), which makes this an appointment of St. Peter (unlike other statements of the same kind, it means only that this was an ordinance of the see of St. Peter), may rest, perhaps, on an ancient tradition making Christmas an apostolic institution, but is contrary to all historical testimony, and devoid of probability. Expressions which have been alleged on that behalf from Tertullian, St. Cyprian and other early writers, are evidently meant, not of “Advent” as a Church season, but of the coming of the Lord in the fulness of time. The passage of St. Chrysostom (*Hom.* iii. *ad Ep.* t. xi. 22 B), in which καὶ τῆς προσέδου mentioned in connection with τὰ Ἐκκλησιαστικά (i. the ancient Feast of Nativity and Baptism) as with the Lenten Quadragesima, speaks, as the context manifestly shows, not of the season Advent, but of the fit time (or rather fitness general) for coming to Holy Communion (compare Menard on *Libr. Sacram. S. Gregorii*; *Opp.* t. i. col. 446). Setting aside these supposed testimonies, and that of the Sermons de Adam



alleged as St. Augustine's, but certainly not his, we have two homilies *In* (or *De*) *Adventu Domini*, de eo quod dictum est, *sicut fulgur coruscans*, &c., et de *diabolo in lecto uno*, by St. Maximus, Bishop of Turin, ob. 466. In neither of these sermons is there any indication of Advent as a season, any allusion to Lessons, Gospels, &c., appropriated to such a season, or to the Feast of Nativity as then approaching. And, indeed, the fact that the "Sundays in Advent" are unknown to the Sacramentary of Pope Leo of the same age sufficiently shows that this season was not yet established in the time of Maximus. Among the Homilies (doubtfully) ascribed to this bishop, edited by Mabillon (*Mus. Ital.* t. i. pt. 2), one, hom. vii., preached on the Sunday before Christmas, simply exhorts to a due observance of the feast, and contains no indication of any ecclesiastical rule. Even in the Sermons *de Adventu*, formerly ascribed to St. Augustine, now generally acknowledged to have been written by Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, ob. 542 (*S. Augustini Opp.* t. v. 210, *Ben. Append.* n. 115, 116), there is no distinct recognition of Advent as an established observance. In these, the faithful are exhorted to prepare themselves, several days (*ante plures dies*), for the due celebration of the Nativity, especially of the Christmas Communion, by good works, by guarding against anger and hatred, by modest hospitality to the poor, by strict continence, &c. Still there is no indication of the length of time so to be set apart, nor any reference to Lessons, Gospels, or other matters of Church usage. The preacher urges such preparation, not on the ground of Church observance, but as matter of natural fitness: "Even as ye would prepare for celebrating the birth-day of a great lord by putting your houses in order," &c. "Ideo ab omni inquinamento ante ejus Natalem multis diebus abstinere debetis. Quotiescumque aut Natalem Domini aut reliquas sollemnitates celebrare disponitis, ebrietatem ante omnia fugite," &c. And so in the second sermon: "Et ideo quotiescumque aut dies Natalis Domini, aut reliquas festivitates adveniunt, sicut frequenter admonui, ante plures dies non solum ab infelici concubinarum consortio, sed etiam a propriis uxoribus abstinete: ab omni iracundia," &c. There is indeed a canon cited by Gratian (*Decretal.* xxxiii. qu. 4) as of the Council of Lerida, A.D. 523, prohibiting all marriage from Advent to Epiphany. But this canon is known to be spurious, and does not appear in the authentic copies (see Brun's *Concilia*, t. ii. 20). A similar canon of the Council of Mâcon, (A.D. 581, *ibid.* 242) is undisputed. This (can. ix.) enjoins that from the Feast of St. Martin (Nov. 11) to the Nativity there be fasting on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of each week, and that the canons be then read; also that the sacrifices be offered in the quadragesimal order. (Subsequent councils, after our period, enjoin the observance of this Quadragesima S. Martini as the preparation for Christmas, corresponding to the Lenten Quadragesima before Easter.) It does not appear what were the canons appointed to be read, relating, of course, to the observance of these forty days before Christmas; only, it may be inferred that such canons were, or were supposed to be, in existence, of earlier date than that of Mâcon (in the preface to which council it is said these enact-

ments are not new: "non tam nova quam prisca patrum statuta sancientes" &c.). In the second Council of Tours (A.D. 567), the fast of three days in the week is ordered (can. xvii.) for the months of September, October, and November, and from (1) December to the Nativity, *omni die*. But this is for monks only. St. Gregory, Bishop of Tours, in *De Vitis Patrum*, written between 590 and 595, alleges that Perpetuus, Bishop of Tours (461-490), ordered "a depositione B. Martini usque ad Nat. Dom. terna in septimana jejunia." This may have been one of the *prisca statuta* appealed to; but no trace is extant of any such canon, either in the First Council of Tours, A.D. 460, or in any other Latin council before that of Mâcon. It seems, from all that is certainly known, that Advent took its place among Church seasons only in the latter part of the 6th century. When the Nativity had become established as one of the great festivals, it was felt that its dignity demanded a season of preparation. The number of days or weeks to be so set apart was at first left to the discretion of the faithful: "ante plures dies, multis diebus," as in the above-cited exhortation of Caesarius. Later, this was defined by rule, and first, it seems, in the Churches of Gaul. Yet not everywhere the same rule: thus the oldest Gallican Sacramentary shows three Sundays in Advent, the Gothic-Gallican only two (Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* t. i. pp. 284-288; and *de Liturg. Gallicana*, p. 98, *sqq.*). But the rule that the term of preparation should be a quadragesima (corresponding with that which was already established for Easter), to commence after the Feast of St. Martin, which rule, as has been seen, was not enacted, but reinforced by the canon of Mâcon, 581, implies six Sundays; and that this rule obtained in other Churches appears from the fact that the Ambrosian (or Milan) and Mozarabic (or Spanish) Ordo show six missae, implying that number of Sundays; and the same rule was observed (as Martene has shown) in some of the Gallican Churches. The *Epistola ad Bibianum* falsely alleged to be St. Augustine's account of "the offices of divine worship throughout the year" in his diocese of Hippo (see Bened. *Admonitio* at end of *Opp.* S. Augustini, t. ii.), also attests this for Churches of Gaul, if, as Martene surmises, this was the work of some Gallican writer. It should be remarked that this writer himself makes the *ordo adventus Domini* begin much earlier, at the autumnal equinox, Sept. 25, as being the day of the conception of St. John the Baptist, and so the beginning of the times of the Gospel. "Sed quia sunt nonnulli qui adventum Domini a festivitatem B. Martini Turonensis urbis episcopi videntur insipienter excolere, nos eos non reprehendamus" &c. This *Quadragesima S. Martini* seems to have originated in Gaul, in the diocese of Tours, to which it was specially recommended by the devotion paid to its great saint; an additional distinction was conferred upon his festival in that it marked the beginning of the solemn preparation for the Nativity. So far, we may accept Binterim's conclusion (*Denkwürdigkeiten der christ.-kathol. Kirche*, vol. v., pt. i., p. 166): the rule—not, as he says, of Advent, but—of this Quadragesima is first met with in the diocese of Tours. If, indeed, the *Tractatus de sanctis tribus Quadragesimis*, "unde eas observari ac-

cepimus, quodque qui eas transgrediuntur legem violent" (ap. Cotelier, *Monum. Eccl. Gr.* iii. 425), be, as Cave (*Hist. Lit.*) represents, the work of that Anastasius Sinalta who was patriarch of Antioch, 561, ob. 599; this Quadragesima, under another name ("Q. S. Philippi," or "Fast of the Nativity"), was already observed in the East. But the contents make it plain enough that its author was another and much later Anastasius Sinalta, who wrote after A.D. 787. The observance of the "Quadragesima Apostolorum," and "Quadragesima S. Philippi" (the Feast of St. Philip in the Greek Calendar is November 14) is enjoined upon monks by Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 806. This fast of 40 days before Christmas seems to have been kept up chiefly by the monastic orders in Gaul, Spain, Italy, (Martene *De Rit. Ant. Eccl.*, iii. p. 27); it was observed also in England in the time of Bede (*Hist.* iii. 27; iv. 30), and much later. It was not until the close of the 6th century that the Church of Rome under St. Gregory received the season of preparation as an ecclesiastical rule, restricted, in its proper sense, to the four Sundays before the Nativity (Amalarius *De Eccl. Off.* iii. 40, A.D. 812, and Abbot Berno, *De quibusdam rebus ad Missam pertinentibus*, c. iv. 1014); and this became the general rule for the Western Church throughout the 8th century, and later. And, in fact, four is the number of Sundays in Advent in the Sacramentary of Gregory (*Liber Sacrament. de circulo anni*, ed. Pamelius; and in the *Lectionarium Romanum*, ed. Thomasius). But other and older copies of the *Gregorian Sacramentary* (ed. Menard, 1642, reprinted with his notes in the *Benedictine Opp.* S. Gregorii, t. iii.); the *Comes*, ascribed to St. Jerome; the *Sacramentary of Gelasius*, ob. 496 (a very ancient document, but largely interpolated with later additions); the *Antiquum Kalend. Sacrae Romanae Eccl.* ap. Martene. *Thes. Anecd.* t. v. (in a portion added by a later hand); the *Pontifical of Egbert*, Archbishop of York, ob. 767; a *Lectionary* written for Charlemagne by Paul the Deacon (ap. Mabillon); and other MSS. cited by Martene (*u. s.* iv. 80, ff.), all give five Sundays. Hence, some writers have been led to represent that the practice varied in different Churches, some reckoning four, others five Sundays in Advent—an erroneous inference, unless it could be shown that the first of the five Sundays was designated "Dominica Prima Adventus Domini." The seeming discrepancy is easily explained. The usual ancient names of the four Sundays, counted backwards from the Nativity, are: Dominica i., ante Nat. Domini (our 4th Advent), Dom. ii., Dom. iii., Dom. iv. ante Nat. Domini. To these the next preceding Sunday was prefixed under the style Dom. v. ante Nat. Dom., not as itself a Sunday in Advent, but as the preparation for Advent. So Amalarius and Berno, *u. s.*, and Durandus: "In quinta igitur hebdomada ante Nat. D. inchoatur praeparatio adventus . . . nam ab illa dominica sunt quinque officia dominicalia, quinque epistolae et quinque evangelia quae adventum Domini aperte praedicant." The intention is evident in the Epistle and Gospel for this Sunday, which in the Sarum Missal is designated "dominica proxima ante Adventum," with the rule (retained by our own order from that of Sarum), that these shall always be used for the last Sunday before Advent begins.

After the pattern of the Lenten fast, Advent was marked as a season of mourning in the public services of the Church. The custom of omitting the *Gloria in Excelsis* (replaced by the *Benedicamus Domino*), and also the *Te Deum* and *Ita missa est*, and of laying aside the dalmatic and subdeacon's vestment (which in the 11th and 12th century appears to have been the established rule, Micrologus *De Eccl. Obs.* c. 46; Rupert Abbas Tuit. *de Div. Off.* iii. c. 2), was coming into use during the eighth century. In the Mozarabic Missal, a rubric, dating probably from the end of the 6th century (i.e. from the refashionment of this ritual by Leander or Isidore of Seville), appoints: "In Adventu non dicitur *Gloria in Excelsis* dominicis diebus et feriis, sed tantum diebus festis." And Amalarius, ob. 812 (*De Offic. Sacr.* iii. c. 40), testifies to this custom for times within our period: "Vidi tempore prisco *Gloria in Excelsis* praetermitti in diebus adventus Domini, et in aliquibus locis dalmaticas": and iv. c. 30: "Aliqua de nostro officio reservamus usque ad praesentiam nativitatis Domini, h. e. *Gloria in Excelsis Deo*, et clarum vestimentum dalmaticam; si forte nunc ita agitur ut vidi actitari in aliquibus locis." The Benedictine monks retained the *Te Deum* in Advent as in Lent, alleging the rule of their founder. The *Alleluia* also, and the Sequences, as also the hymns, were omitted, but not in all Churches. In the *Gregorian Antiphonary*, the *Alleluia* is marked for 1 and 3 Advent and elsewhere. In some Churches, the *Miserere* (Ps. li.) and other mournful Psalms were added to or substituted for the ordinary Psalms. For lessons, Isaiah was read all through, beginning on Advent Sunday; when that was finished, the Twelve Minor Prophets, or readings from the Fathers, especially the Epistles of Pope Leo on the Incarnation, and Sermons of St. Augustine, succeeded. The lesson from "the Prophet" ended with the form, "Haec dicit Dominus Deus, Convertimini ad me, et salvi eritis."

In the Greek Church, the observance of a season of preparation for the Nativity is of late introduction. No notice of it occurs in the liturgical works of Theodorus Studites, ob. 826, though, as was mentioned above, the 40-days' fast of St. Philip was enjoined (to monks) by Nicephorus, A.D. 806. This *τεσσαράκονταήμερον*, beginning November 14, is now the rule of the Greek Church (Leo Allat. *de Consensu* iii. 9, 3). Codinus (*De Off. Eccl. et Curiae Constantinop.* c. 7, n. 20) speaks of it as a rule which in his time (cir. 1350) had been long in use. The piece *De Tribus Quadragesimis* above noticed, ascribed to Anastasius Sinalta, Patriarch of Antioch, shows that, except in monasteries, the rule of a 40-days' fast before the Nativity was contested in his time (A.D. 1100 at earliest). And Theodore Balsamon, A.D. 1200, lays down the rule thus:—"We acknowledge but one quadragesima, that before Pascha; the others (named), as this Fast of the Nativity, are each of seven days only. Those monks who fast 40 days, viz. from St. Philip (14 Sept.), are bound to this by their rule. Such laics as voluntarily do the like are to be praised therefor." *Respons. ad qu. 53 Marci Patriarch. Alex.*, and *ad interrog. monachorum*, app. to Photii *Nomocanon*. In the calendar formed from Evangelia Eclogadia of 9th century our 4 Advent is marked "Sunday before the Nativity,"

while the preceding Sundays are numbered from All Saints = our Trinity Sunday. (Assemani *Kalend. Eccl. Univ.*, t. vi. p. 575.) The term "Advent" is not applied to this season: the *κρυπὰς τῆς δευτέρας Παρουσίας* is our Sexagesima.

In the separated Churches of the East, no trace appears, within our period, of an Advent season; unless we except the existing Nestorian or Chaldean rule, in which the liturgical year begins with four Sundays of Annunciation (ἐβραγ-  
γελισμοῦ), before the Nativity (Assemani *Bibliotheca Orient.* t. iii. pt. 2, p. 380 *sqq.*). This beginning of the Church year is distinguished as *Rish phentito*, i.e. initium codicis, from the *Rish shannato*, i.e. new-year's day in October. The Armenian Church, refusing to accept 25th December as the Feast of Nativity, and adhering to the more ancient sense of the Feast of Epiphany as including the Birth of Christ, prepares for this high festival (6th January) by a fast of 50 days, beginning 17th November.

The first Sunday in Advent was not always the beginning of the liturgical year, or circulus totius anni. The Comes and the Sacramentary of St. Gregory begin with IX. Kal. Jan., the Vigil of the Nativity. So does the most ancient Lectionarium Gallicanum; but the beginning of this is lost, and the Vigil is numbered VII., the Nativity VIII. Hence Mabillon (*Liturg. Gallic.* p. 98, 101) infers that it began with the fast of St. Martin (or with the Sunday after it, Dom. VI. ante Nat. Dom.). One text of the *Missale Ambrosianum* begins with the Vigil of St. Martin (ed. 1560). The *Antiphonarius* of St. Gregory begins 1 Advent, and the *Liber Responsalis* with its Vigil. But the earlier practice was to begin the ecclesiastical year with the month of March, as being that in which our Lord was crucified (March 25); a trace of this remains in the notation of the Quatuor Tempora as Jejunium primi, quarti, septimi, decimi mensis, the last of which is the Advent Ember week.

*Literature.*—*De Catholicae Ecclesiae divinis offic. et ministeriis*, Rome, 1590 (a collection of the ancient liturgical treatises of St. Isidore, Alcuin, Amalarius, Micrologus, Petr. Damianus, &c.); Martene, *De Ritu Ant. Ecclesiae et Monasterii*, 1699; Binterim, *Die vorzüglichsten Lehrwürdigkeiten der christ.-katholischen Kirche*, Mainz, 1829 (founded on the work of Pellier, *De Christ. Eccles. Primae Mediae et Novissimae Aetatis Politia*, Neap. 1777); Augusti, *Lehrwürdigkeiten aus der christlichen Archäologie*, Leipzig, 1818; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie u. Kirche*, s. a. Adventszeit, 1853; Rheinwald, *Kirchliche Archäologie*, 1840; Alt, *Der Christliche Cultus*, Abth. ii. *Das Kirchenjahr*, 1860. [H. B.]

**ADVOCATE OF THE CHURCH** (*Advocatus*, or *Defensor*, *Ecclesiae* or *Monasterii*; *ὑπὸδικος*, *ἑκδικος*: and *Advocatio* = the office, and sometimes the fee for discharging it):—an ecclesiastical officer, appointed subsequently to the recognition of the Church by the State, and in consequence (1) of the Church's need of protection, (2) of the disability, both legal and religious, of clergy or monks (*Can. Apost.* xx., lxxxi.; *Constit. Apostol.* ii. 6; Justinian, *Novell.* cxxiii. 6; and see Bingham, vi. 4) either to plead

in a civil court or to intermeddle with worldly business. In its original form it was limited to the duties thus intimated, and took its origin as a distinct and a lay office in Africa (*Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric.* c. 97, A.D. 407, "*Defensores*," to be taken from the "*Scholastici*;" *Conc. Milevit.* ii. c. 16, A.D. 416; *Can. Afric.* c. 64, c. A.D. 424); but received very soon certain privileges of ready and speedy access to the courts from the emperors (*Cod. Theod.* 2. tit. 4. § 7; 16. tit. 2. § 38). It became then a lay office (*defensores*, distinguished in the code from "*coronati*" or tonsured persons), but had been previously, it would seem, discharged by the *oeconomi* (Du Cange). And, as it naturally came to be reckoned almost a minor order, so it was occasionally, it would seem, still held by clerics (Morinus, *De Ordin.*; Bingham). The *advocatus* was to be sometimes asked from the emperors (authorities as above),—as *judices* were given by the Praetors;—but sometimes was elected by the bishop and clergy for themselves (*Cod. lib. i. tit. iv. constit.* 19). The office is mentioned by the Council of Chalcedon, cc. 2, 25, 26, A.D. 451, and is there distinguished both from the clergy and from the *oeconomus*; by Pope Gelasius, *Epist.* ix. c. 2, A.D. 492–496; and by Maxentius (*Resp. ad Hormisd.*) some score of years later. But it had assumed a much more formal shape during this period, both at Constantinople and at Rome. In the former place, as protectors of the Church, under the title of ἑκκλησιέδικοι, there were four officers of the kind: i. the *πρωτέδικος*, who defended the clergy in criminal cases; ii. one who defended them in civil ones; iii. ὁ τοῦ βήματος, also called the *πρωτόπαπας*; iv. ὁ τῆς ἑκκλησίας; increased by the time of Heraclius to ten, and designed in general for the defence of the Church against the rich and powerful (Justinian, *Edict.* xiii., and *Novell.* lvi. and lix. c. 1; and see the passages from Codrinus, Zonaras, Balsamon, &c., in Meursius, *Gloss. Graecobarbarum*, voc. ἑκδικος, and in Suicer). They appear also to have acted as judges over ecclesiastical persons in trifling cases (Morinus). They were commonly laymen (so *Cod. Theod.* as above); but in one case certainly (*Conc. Constantin.*, A.D. 536, act. ii.) an ἑκκλησιέδικος is mentioned, who was also a presbyter; and presbyters are said to have commonly held the office, while later still it was held by deacons (Morinus). In Rome, beginning with Innocent I. (A.D. 402–417, *Epist.* xii. ed. Constant) and his successor Zosimus (*Epist.* i. c. 3), the *Defensores* became by the time of Gregory the Great a regular order of officers (*Defensores Romanae Ecclesiae*), whose duties were—i. to defend Church interests generally; ii. to take care of alms left for the poor; iii. to be sent to held applicants from a distance for Papal protection; iv. to look after outlying estates belonging to St. Peter's patrimony (S. Greg. M., *Epistt.* passim). There were also in Rome itself at that time seven officers of the kind, called *Defensores Regionarii* (*Ordo Roman.*), each with his proper region, and the first of the seven known as the *Primicerius Defensorum* or *Primus Defensor* (St. Greg. *Epistt.*, passim). St. Gregory certainly marks them out as usually laymen, yet in some cases clerics, and generally as holding a sort of ecclesiastical position. And the other Popes who allude to them (as quoted above), are led to do so while treating the question of the steps and



delays to be made in admitting laymen to holy orders, and feel it necessary to say that such restrictions apply "even" to *Defensores*. See also St. Gregory of Tours, *De Vitis Patrum*, c. 6.

The great development of the office, however, took place under Charlemagne; who indeed, and Pipin, were themselves, κατ' ἐξοχήν, "*Defensores Ecclesiae Romanae*." And the German emperors became, technically and by title, *Advocati et Defensores Ecclesiarum* (Charles V. and Henry VIII. being coupled together long afterwards as respectively *ecclesiae*, and *fidei, defensores*). It was then established as a regular office for each church or abbey, under the appellations also occasionally of *Mundiburgi* (or *-burgi*), *Pastores Laici*, and sometimes simply *causidici* or *tutores*; to be nominated by the emperor [Leo IX., however, as Pope appointed (Du Cange)], but then probably for a particular emergency only (*Car. M. Capit.* v. 31, vii. 308); and usually as an office for life, to which the bishops and abbats were themselves to elect (*Conc. Mogunt.* c. 50, A.D. 813,—all bishops, abbats, and clergy, to choose "*vicedominos, praepositos, advocatos, sive defensores*;" *Conc. Rem.* ii. c. 24, A.D. 813,—"*Ut praepositi et vicedomini secundum regulas vel canones constituentur*;" and see also *Conc. Roman.* cc. 19, 20, A.D. 826, and *Conc. Duziac.* ii. P. iii. c. 5. A.D. 871), but "in praesentia comitum" (*Legg. Longobard.* lib. ii. tit. xlvii. § 1, 2, 4, 7), and from the landowners in their own neighbourhood (*cap. xiv. ex Lege Salica, Romana, et Gumbata*,—"Et ipsi [advocati] habeant in illo comitatu propriam haereditatem;" and in a capitular of A.D. 742, we find mention of a "*Graphio*," i. e. count, "*qui est defensor*," Morinus, *De Ordin.*, P. III. p. 307); and this, not only to plead in court or take oath there (sometimes two *advocati*, one to plead, the other to swear, *Legg. Longobard.* ii. xlvii. § 8), but in course of time to hold courts (*placita* or *malla*) as judges in their own district (Du Cange, but A.D. 1020 is the earliest date among his authorities), and generally to protect the secular interests of their own church or abbey. The *Advocatus* was at this time distinguished from the *Vicedominus*, sometimes called *Major Domus*, who ruled the lay dependents of the Church; from the *Praepositus*, who ruled its clerical dependents; and from the *Oeconomus*, who (being also commonly a cleric) managed the interior economy of its secular affairs; although all these titles are occasionally used interchangeably. He was also distinct from the *Cancellarius*, whether in the older sense of that term when it meant an inferior officer of the court, or in the later when it meant a judge (*Bingh.* III. xi. 6, 7). Two circumstances however gradually changed both the relative position of the *Advocatus* to his ecclesiastical clients, and the nature of his functions; the one arising from the mode in which he was remunerated, the other from the mode of his nomination. 1. He was paid in the first instance at this period by sometimes an annual salary, with certain small privileges of entertainment and the like; also, by the third part of the profits of his judicial office (*Tertia pars bannorum, emendarum, legum, compositionum, sc. "placitorum ad quae ab abbate vocatus fuerit," Chron. Sen.* lib. ii. c. 5, in D'Ach. *Spicil.* ii. 613, ed. 1723; *tertius denarius*); but commonly and finally by lands held from the church or abbey, a third of their value belonging to himself

as his portion. And the growth of the feudal tenure, in addition to other obvious influences, gradually converted him through this last circumstance from a dependent into a superior, from a law officer into a military one, and from a beneficiary into an owner, and sometimes into an usurper outright. In the *Ordo Romanus*, is an *Ordo ad armandum Ecclesiae Defensorem vel alium Militem*, beginning with a *benedictio varilli, lanceae, ensis* (p. 178 Hittorp., about the time of Charlemagne). His *subadvocatus*, let us add (the number of whom was limited by various enactments), was to be paid in one instance by the receipt, from each vill of the ecclesiastical property, of one penny, one cock, and one *sextarius* of oats. 2. The nomination to the office, resting originally with the Church itself or with the emperor, was usurped gradually by the founder, and as an hereditary appanage of his own estate, whence followed first an usurpation of the Church property by the lay *Advocatus*, and next an usurpation by the same officer of the right of nominating to the church or abbey. And from the latter of these has arisen the modern use of the word *advocson*, which now means exclusively and precisely that right which the original *advocatus* did not possess; the *jus patronatus* no doubt being attached to the founder of a church from the time of the Council of Orange (c. 10) A.D. 441, and of Justinian (*Novell.* lvii. c. 2, cxxiii. c. 18), A.D. 541, 555; but the combination of foundership with the office of *advocatus* being an accidental although natural combination, belonging to the ninth and following centuries. The earliest charter quoted by Du Cange, in which mention is made of an election (in this case of an abbat) "*assensu et consilio advocati*," is a "*privilegium Rudolphi Episc. Halberstad.*" A.D. 1147. But in Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, the officer analogous to the lay *advocatus* had usurped the position and the very name of abbat long previous to the 12th century [see ABBAT]. And instances of similar usurpation abroad may no doubt be found of a like earlier date (see Robertson's *Early Scotland*). The *advocatio* of a bishopric seems to have included, at least in England, the *custodia* (i. e. the profits) of the property of the see, *sede vacante*; but was a distinct right from that of nomination to the office, the "*dignitas crociae*" (as e. g. in the case between the Welsh Lords Marchers and the English Crown, the former claiming the *custodia* but not the nomination): although the two became in England combined in the Crown. There does not, however, appear to be evidence, that this particular usurpation was laid to the charge of *advocati* abroad during the Carolingian period; although the system of lay abbats, commendatories, &c., and the usurpation of such offices by kings and nobles, led to the same general result of usurpation, there also, by the lay, over the ecclesiastical, functionary. Councils in England put restrictions on these usurpations of lay *domini, advocati, &c.*, as early as the Council of Beccaneld, A.D. 696 × 716 and of Clovesho, A.D. 803 (Councils III. 338, Haddan and Stubbs; Wilk. i. 56, 167). Abroad, the first canon on the subject is that of Rheims (c. 6), A.D. 1148, followed among others by the Councils of Salzburg (c. 24), A.D. 1274 and (c. 12), A.D. 1281. But a check upon them was attempted as early as the 10th century by the Capetian dynasty in France.

The title of *Fideli Defensor*, attached to the Crown of England, and so strangely inverted from the special intent of its original Papal donor, may be taken as the last existing trace of the ancient *Advocatus* or *Defensor Ecclesie*. Unless (with Spelman) we are to give an ancient pedigree to churchwardens, and find the old office still in them. (Bingham; Du Cange; Neuvius, *Gloss. Grammatica*; Morinus, *De Ordinat.*; Thomassin.) [A. W. H.]

#### ADVOCATES, NOT TO BE ORDAINED.

—Amongst the laws which imposed restrictions upon the clergy was one which forbade them, except in certain specified cases, to act as advocates before civil tribunals; since it was considered that any such interference with worldly matters would be inconsistent with the words of St. Paul (2 Tim., ii. 4) "No man that warreth [combats] des [desires] entangleth himself with the affairs of this life." see St. Ambrose, *De Off. Minist.* 1, 36; and Gelasil Pope's *Exposit.* 17, sec. 15). For this reason the 3rd Council of Carthage (A.D. 397) in its 15th canon prohibits all clerics from becoming agents or procurators. The prohibition is repeated in the 3rd canon of the Oecumenical Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), and with the proviso that secular business may be undertaken by the clergy when the bishop directs it for the protection of Church property, or of orphans and widows who are without any one to defend them. This exception was in later times extended to the poor and all others who came under the designation of "misericordiales persone." So likewise were monks forbidden by the 11th canon of the Council of Tarragona (A.D. 516) to undertake any legal business except for the benefit of the monastery and at the command of the abbot.

In France the above-cited provisions of the Council of Chalcedon were repeated by the 16th canon of the Council of Verceil (A.D. 755) and the 10th canon of the Council of Mayence (A.D. 813).

There are many other canons which prohibit the clergy from mixing themselves up with worldly matters, and which therefore forbid, though in exasperated terms, their acting as advocates.

There are also several imperial constitutions to the same effect, as, for instance, one of Theodosius II. (A.D. 414) which he afterwards repeated in the *Code Theodosianus*, A.D. 438 (lib. ii. 2, 45), and which was also inserted in the 1st book (lib. i. c. 17) of the *Code Reptitio Prælectionis* of Justinian (A.D. 529).

Similar provisions are to be found in the 34th title of the *Liber novellorum* of Valentinian III. (A.D. 452), and in the 6th chapter of the 123rd novel of Justinian (A.D. 541).

(Thomassin, *Vetus et nova Ecclesie Disciplina*, De Beneficiis, Pars III. lib. 2, cap. 17-19; Bouix, *Tractatus de Judiciis Ecclesiasticis*, Pars I, c. 4-5.) [I. B.]

#### ADULTUL [DOORKEEPER.]

ADGATER, Saint, commemorated Oct. 24 (*Mart. Roman.*).

ADITHALAS (1) Deacon and martyr, commemorated Nov. 3 (*Cal. Brevit.*).

(2) Martyr, commemorated Sept. 1 (A.). [C.]

ADILLIANUS (1) Saint in Armenia, commemorated Feb. 8 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet., Hieron.*).

(2) Confessor in Africa, Dec. 6 (*Mart. R. V.*).

(3) Confessor, Jan. 8 (*Cal. Brevit.*).

(4) Bishop of Cyzicum, Confessor, Aug. 8 (A.). [C.]

ADILLIUS (1) Martyr in Africa, commemorated May 22 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) Of Sardania, May 28 (A.).

(3) Commemorated June 10 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

ADER. [VETL.]

ADRA. [ERA.]

ADRA, martyr in Rhætia, commemorated Aug. 5 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet.*); Aug. 6 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

AFFIDATIO (*affiance*, Spenser; Fr. *fiançailles*), betrothal. It appears doubtful whether this term came into use within the first nine centuries of the Christian era. It seems rather to belong to the period of fully developed feudalism. The earliest example quoted by Du Cange, from the synodal statutes of the Church of Liège in Martène's *Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum*, is indeed of the year 1287. The forms given in Martène's work, *De Antiquis ecclesiis Ritibus* (see vol. ii. pp. 136, 137), in which the word occurs, from the rituals of Limoges and of Rheims, are palpably more modern yet, to judge from the passages in French which are intermixed in them. [J. M. L.]

AFFINITY (*affinitas*), a relationship by marriage. The husband and wife being legally considered as one person, those who are related to the one by blood are related to the other in the same degree by affinity. This relationship being the result of a lawful marriage, the persons between whom it exists are said to be related *in law*; the father or brother of a man's wife being called his *father-in-law* or *brother-in-law*. The distinction between affinity and consanguinity is derived from the Roman law. The kinsfolk (*cognati*) of the husband and wife become respectively the *affines* of the wife and husband. We have borrowed the words affinity and consanguinity from the Roman law, but we have no term corresponding to *affines*. The Romans did not reckon degrees of *affinitas* as they did of consanguinity (*cognatio*); but they had terms to express the various kinds of *affines*, as *avocus*, father-in-law; *avocula*, mother-in-law.

It has resulted from the Christian doctrine of marriage that persons related by affinity have been always forbidden by the Church to marry within the same degrees as those who are related by blood. The Council of Agde (506) particularises the forbidden degrees as follows (Can. 61):—"A man may not marry his brother's widow, his own sister, his step-mother or father's wife, his cousin-german, any one nearly allied to him by consanguinity, or one whom his near kinsman had married before, the relict or daughter of his uncle by the mother's side, or the daughter of his uncle by the father's side, or his daughter-in-law, i.e. his wife's daughter by a former husband."

This canon is repeated almost verbatim in the Council of Epeuse, and again in the second Council of Tours (566). The same prohibitions are also specified in the Council of Auxerre (578).

Certain spiritual relations have been also included within the prohibited degrees. This restriction, however, was first introduced by



Justinian, who made a law (*Cod. Just.* lib. 5, tit. 4, *de Nuptiis*, leg. 26) forbidding any man to marry a woman for whom he had been godfather in baptism, on the ground that nothing induces a more paternal affection, and, therefore, a juster prohibition of marriage, than this tie, by which their souls are in a divine manner united together.

The Council of Trullo (Can. 53) extends the prohibition to the mother of the godchild: and, by the Canon law afterwards, these spiritual relations were carried still further, so as to exclude from marrying together even the baptiser and the baptised, the catechist and catechumen, and various other degrees of supposed spiritual affinity. Such restrictions, however, of course, could not be maintained in practice, and the dispensing power of the Pope was accordingly extended to meet the necessity. (Bingham; Gibson's *Codex*; Thorndike; Wheatly, *On Common Prayer*.) [D. B.]

#### AFFUSION. [BAPTISM.]

#### AFRICAN CODE. [AFRICAN COUNCILS.]

**AFRICAN COUNCILS.** Under this head we must include whatever Councils were held in Africa—no matter at what places, only distinct from Egypt—for this simple reason: that so many of their canons were so soon thrown together indiscriminately and made one code, which, as such, afterwards formed part of the code received in the East and West. On this African code a good deal has been written by Justellus (*Cod. Eccl. Afric.*, Paris, 1614, 8vo.), who was the first to publish it separately, Bishop Beveridge (*Synod.* vol. ii. p. 202, *et seq.*), De Marca (*Diss. de Vet. Coll. Can.* c. iv.–xi.), and the Ballerini in their learned Appendix to the works of St. Leo (tom. iii. *De Antiq. Col. Diss.*, pars I. c. 3, 21–9), but a good deal also remains unsolved, and perhaps insoluble. Several of the canons contained in it have been assigned to more Councils than one, and several of the Councils differently dated or numbered by different editors or collectors. Perhaps the best edition of it is that published in Greek and Latin by Mansi (tom. iii. pp. 699–843). Not that it was originally promulgated in both languages, though, as Beveridge suggests, the probability is that it had been translated into Greek before the Trullan Council of A.D. 683, by the second canon of which it became part of the code of the Eastern Church. As it stands in Mansi, then, it comprehends, first, the deliberations of the Council of Carthage, A.D. 419; then the canons of the same Synod to the number of 33; then “*canones diversorum conciliorum ecclesiae Africanae*”—in the words of their heading, the first of which is numbered 34, in continuous series with the preceding, and the last 138. However, in reality, the canons proper ought to be said to end with the one numbered 133, at which point Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage, who presided, calls upon the Council to subscribe to all that had gone before, which is accordingly done; he signing first, the primate of Numidia second, the legate from Rome, Faustinus, Bishop of Potenza, third, St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, fourth; and the other bishops—217 or 229, according to the reading selected—in order; and after them all the two presbyter-legates from Rome, who sign last.

This done, the day following, a letter in the name of the whole Synod was addressed to Boni-

face, bishop of Rome, to be despatched by the three legates. This is given at length, and numbered 134. It acquaints him with their objections to the “*commonitorium*” or instructions received by the legates from the late Pope Zosimus, particularly to that part of it bearing upon appeals to Rome in conformity with some supposed canons of Nicaea, which they had not been able to find in any Greek or Latin copy of the acts of that Council in their possession, and therefore beg him to send for authentic copies of them at once from the Churches of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople. This course they had already taken themselves, while recommending it to him; and what follows as canon 135 proves to be a letter from St. Cyril of Alexandria to the same bishops, telling them that in conformity with their request he has sent them, by his presbyter Innocent, faithful copies of the authentic Synod of Nicaea, which they would also find, if they looked for them, in the ecclesiastical history: he does not say by whom.

In the same way canon 136 is a letter from Atticus, patriarch of Constantinople, telling them that he too sends them the canons as defined by Nicene Fathers pure and entire, by their messenger Marcellus the sub-deacon, as they had requested. We can hardly suppose the Synod to have been sitting all the time that it must have taken these messengers to go and return. Next a copy of the Nicene Creed follows, and is numbered 137. It had been already recited and accepted, together with the Nicene canons, in the previous deliberations of the Council, before the resolution to send for authentic copies of both had been carried out. Caecilian, who was Bishop of Carthage at the time of the Council of Nicaea and had attended it, had brought back with him copies of its creed and canons in Latin, which have been preserved with great care by his Church ever since. What follows in the last place, and is numbered 138, cannot have been written earlier than A.D. 422, it being a letter addressed to Celestine, the successor of Boniface, who died that year, “our beloved lord (*θεοπρόπ*) and most honoured brother,” as he is styled, in the name of Aurelius and others whose names are given (St. Augustine's is not one) and the rest of those present in the universal Council of Africa, which they tell him that the canons of which his predecessor had spoken were nowhere to be found in the authentic copies of the Nicene decrees just received from the East; and, further, that in the Council of the Fathers could they find it defined that “any should be despatched as it were from the side of his Holiness,” as had been attempted in this instance. If the last, or 20th Council, as it called, under Aurelius, therefore, has been rightly assigned to A.D. 421,—and Aurelius opens its proceedings by saying that, for reasons well known to his audience, it had been suspended for a space of two years, thus connecting it with the Council of A.D. 419,—either it must have sat the year following as well, or there must have been a 21st Council under Aurelius the year following to indite this epistle, which, as has been observed, could not have been done till the accession of Celestine had become known in Africa, that till towards the end of A.D. 422. And with it the collection of the canons of the African Church brought to a close. Dionysius Exiguus, in his edition, heads them appropriately “the Synod

the Africans at Carthage that enacted 138 canons," meaning of course the Synods of A.D. 419-22 considered as one, where they were passed or confirmed (Migne's *Patrol.*, tom. 67, p. 161 et seq.). Not but there are other collections extant containing fewer or more canons than are included in this. For instance, the Spanish and Isidorian Collections begin with the Synod of Carthage under Gratus, A.D. 348, and end with the Synod of Milevis, A.D. 402, making eight Synods in all, one of Milevis and seven of Carthage (Migne's *Patrol.*, tom. 84, pp. 179-236). In Beveridge (*Synodic.* i. p. 365-72) the synodical letter of a Council of Carthage as far back as A.D. 258 (or 256 according to others) under St. Cyprian, is printed in the form of a canon, and placed, together with the speeches made there by him and others, immediately before the Ancyran canons, as though it had been one of the provincial Councils whose canons had been accepted by the whole Church, which it was not. Earlier far than either of them is the compendium of ecclesiastical canons, African mainly, 232 in all, by Fulgentius Ferrandus, deacon of the Church of Carthage, seemingly drawn from independent sources (Migne's *Patrol.*, tom. 67, p. 949-62). Then earlier still than his were the two books produced by Boniface, Bishop of Carthage, at the Synod held there by him A.D. 525, as having been discovered in the archives of that church, one volume containing the Nicene canons in part, and those which had been passed in Africa before the time of Aurelius; the other volume called "the book of the canons of the time of Aurelius," in which, according to the Ballerini, nine of the Synods of Carthage under Aurelius, and some others of Milevis and Hippo, were contained (Mansi, viii. p. 635-56). Finally, there is a "Breviarium canonum Hipponensium" printed in Mansi, with the comments of the Ballerini upon them, supposed to have been passed in the Synod held there A.D. 393, at which St. Augustine was present, but as a priest; and afterwards inserted in the Council of Carthage, held four years afterwards under Aurelius, amongst its own, and evidently confirmed by the 34th canon of the Synod of A.D. 419, as proposed by one of the bishops named Epigaminus.

The argument drawn by the Ballerini, after elaborately comparing these collections, is unfavourable to the title given by Justellus to the 138 canons above mentioned of the African code: still as designating those canons alone which have been received generally by the East and West, it cannot be called meaningless; and this fact having been made patent by his publication of them, it remains as a matter of antiquarian interest solely to determine what canons belong to what councils. The general account seems to be that there are sixteen Councils of Carthage, one of Milevis, and one of Hippo, whose canons were received and confirmed by the Council of A.D. 419 besides its own (Johnson's *Vade Mecum*, ii. 171); but it is beset with difficulties. The two canons interdicting appeals beyond the sea—28 and 125 according to the Latin numbering, and doubtless 23 and 39 were passed with the same object—have been attributed to a Synod of Hippo by some; but the 22nd canon of the second Synod of Milevis, A.D. 416, to which both Aurelius and St. Augustine subscribed, reads

identical with one of them, and the 34th canon of a Council of Carthage two years later with the other. It is of more practical importance to ascertain whether they steer clear of the Sardican canons, as some maintain; or were framed in antagonism to them, as others. The Sardican canons, it has been said, allowed bishops to appeal to Rome; the African canons forbade priests and all below priests to appeal to Rome. The African fathers carefully abstained from laying the same embargo upon bishops: nay, they undertook to observe the canons cited by Zosimus as Nicene, till authentic copies of the Nicene canons had been obtained from the East. There can be no doubt whatever that all this is delusive. In the discussion that took place on the canons cited in the "Commonitorium," some were for observing them, pending the inquiry; St. Augustine among the number. But when Aurelius called upon the Council to say definitively what it would do, the collective reply was: "All things that were enacted in the Nicene Council are acceptable to us all." And to no more could they be induced to pledge themselves. Then as to the canons, which if they did not frame, they confirmed subsequently; the 28th, according to the Latin numbering, is: "It was likewise agreed that presbyters, deacons, or any of the inferior clergy with causes to try, should they have reason to complain of the judgment of their bishops, might be heard by the neighbouring bishops with consent of their own; and such bishops might decide between them; but should they think they ought to appeal from them likewise, let them not appeal to transmarine tribunals, but to the primates of their provinces, as has also been frequently enacted in regard of bishops. But in case any should think he ought to appeal to places beyond the sea, let him be received to communion by nobody within Africa." The words "sicut et de episcopis saepe constitutum est," are found in all manuscripts of this canon, as it stands here. They are wanting in the 125th. And the meaning is clearly, that there had been earlier canons in abundance passed for regulating episcopal appeals; for instance, the 6th canon of the Council of Constantinople, where it is said that bishops should be brought before the greater Synod of the diocese, in case the provincial Synod should be unable to decide their case. And nothing had occurred to induce them to legislate further for bishops. The present controversy had originated with a simple priest, Apiarius. Accordingly their canons were directed to prevent priests and all below priests in future from doing as he had done. In short, they told Celestine that "the canons of the Nicene Council left all, whether inferior clergy or bishops themselves, to their own metropolitan; it having been wisely and justly considered there that, whatever questions might arise, they ought to be terminated in their own localities." Which was in effect as much as telling him that the genuine Nicene canons were in flat contradiction upon each point to those so designated by his predecessor. Canon 125 is identical with the preceding, except that it omits the clause "sicut et de episcopis," &c., and mentions the African Councils as another legitimate tribunal of appeal besides the primates. Canon 23, that "bishops should not go beyond the sea without leave from their primate," reads very like another outpouring of their sentiments on

the same subject; and canon 39, that "no primate should be called a prince of priests, or pontiff," seems almost borrowed from the well-known invective of St. Cyprian against Stephen. Such, then, is the language of some of the canons of the African code, fairly construed, to which the assent of Rome as well as Constantinople has been pledged. And "it was of very great authority," says Mr. Johnson (*Vade Mecum*, ii. p. 171) in the old English Churches; for many of the "excerptions" of Egbert were transcribed from it.

It only remains to set down the different African Councils in the order in which they are generally supposed to have occurred, with a running summary of what was transacted in each; referring generally for all further information to Mansi, Cave, Beveridge, Johnson, De Marca, the *Art de vérifier les dates*, and the Ballerini. Numbering them would only serve to mislead, at least if attempted in any consecutive series. Cave, for instance, reckons 9 African between A.D. 401 and 603, and as many as 35 Carthaginian between A.D. 215 and 533; but among the latter are included 6 (between A.D. 401 and 410), which he had already reckoned among the 9 African.

CARTHAGE, A.D. 200, 217—Supposed to be one and the same, under Agrippinus, in favour of rebaptizing heretics.

— A.D. 251—Under St. Cyprian; decreed that the lapsed should be received to communion, but not till they had performed their full penance.

— A.D. 252—Against Novatian, who denied that the lapsed were ever to be received to communion again; and Felicissimus, who affirmed they were, even before they had performed their penance.

— A.D. 254, 255—Doubtful in which year; under St. Cyprian, in favour of infant baptism.

— A.D. 256—Under St. Cyprian, approving the consecration by the Spanish bishops of Felix and Sabinus in place of Basil and Martial,—two bishops who had purchased certificates, or "libels," of having sacrificed to idols, and declaring that Stephen, Bishop of Rome, had interposed in favour of the latter unreasonably, from having been duped by them.

— A.D. 256—Another held in the same year—or there may have been several—in favour of rebaptizing all who had received heretical baptism, when St. Cyprian uttered his celebrated invective against Stephen. The question was finally ruled in the 7th of the Constantinopolitan canons. This is the Council whose synodical letter is printed by Beveridge in the form of a canon, immediately before those of Ancyra. It is given in Mansi, i. 922–6; but the speeches belonging to it follow 951–92, under the head of "Concil. Carthag. iii. sub Cypriano episcopo;" what purports to have been the second being given p. 925, and all three supposed to have been held A.D. 256.

CIRTA, A.D. 305—To elect a new bishop in place of one who had been a "traditor;" that is, had surrendered copies of the Scriptures to the Pagan authorities, to which all

present, when they came to be asked, however, pleaded equally guilty.

CARTHAGE, A.D. 312—Of 70 Donatist bishops against Caecilian, bishop of that see.

— A.D. 333—under Donatus, author of the schism; favourable to the "traditores."

— A.D. 348—under Gratus; its acts are comprised in fourteen chapters, of which the first is against rebaptizing any that have been baptized with water in the name of the Trinity. This is probably the Council whose canons are invoked in canon 12 of the African code.

THEVESTE, A.D. 362—Of Donatists quarrelling amongst themselves.

AFRICAN, A.D. 380—Of Donatists, in condemnation of Tichonius, a Donatist bishop.

CARTHAGE, A.D. 386—Confirmatory of the synodical letter of Siricius, Bishop of Rome.

LEPTES, A.D. 386—Passed canons on discipline.

CARTHAGE, A.D. 390—Formerly regarded as two separate Councils, under Genethlius, Bishop of Carthage; made 13 canons, by the second of which bishops, priests, and deacons are required to abstain from their wives and observe continence. Mansi prints what used to be regarded as a second Council of this year twice, iii. pp. 691–8 and 867–76.

— A.D. 393—Of Maximian's (Donatist bishop of Carthage) supporters against Primian (another Donatist bishop of Carthage).

HIPPO, A.D. 393—At which St. Augustine disputed "de fide et symbolo" as a presbyter.

CABARUSSI and of the CAVERNS, A.D. 394—Of the same on the same subject.

BAGAIS, A.D. 394—Of Primian's supporters, against Maximian.

— A.D. 396—One canon only preserved; against translations of bishops and priests.

BYZATIUM, A.D. 397—Confirming all that had been decreed in 393 at Hippo.

CARTHAGE, A.D. 397—Called the 3rd, either reckoning that under Gratus as first, and that under Genethlius as 2nd; or else supposing two to have been held under Aurelius previously in 394 and 397, and making this the 3rd under him; passed 50 canons, among which the "Breviarium canonum Hipponensium" is said to have been inserted (Mansi, iii. 875, and the notes).

CARTHAGE, A.D. 400—Called the 5th under Aurelius; of 72 bishops; passed 15 canons on discipline (Pagi, quoted by Mansi, iii. p. 972). Yet, p. 979, Mansi reckons a first African Council in 399, and a 2nd and 3rd in 401, which he calls 4th, 5th, and 6th Councils under Aurelius, in the pontificate of Anastasius.

MILEVIS, A.D. 402—To decide several points affecting bishops.

CARTHAGE, A.D. 403, 404, 405—Mansi makes 3 African Councils of these; a 1st, 2nd, and 3rd, in the Pontificate of Innocent, or 8th, 9th, and 10th under Aurelius, for bringing back the Donatists to the Church (iii. pp. 1155 and 1159).

— A.D. 407, 408, 409—Called by Mansi

4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th African Councils in the pontificate of Innocent, the 5th and 6th being regarded by him as one, or the 11th, 12th, and 13th Councils under Aurelius—all incorporated into the African code (iii. p. 1163).

**CARTHAGE, A.D. 410**—Against the Donatists—probably the 14th under Aurelius.

— **A.D. 411**—Great conference between the Catholics and the Donatists; Aurelius and St. Augustine both taking part on behalf of the former; 286 bishops said to have been present on the Catholic side, and 279 on the Donatist, yet 313 names are given on the latter side. There were three different stages in the proceedings. (Mansi, iv. pp. 269 and 276.)

— **A.D. 412**—In which Celestius was accused of Pelagianism and appealed to the Pope, probably the 15th under Aurelius.

**CIRTA, A.D. 412**—In the matter of the Donatists—published a synodical letter in the name of Aurelius, St. Augustine and others. Silvanus, primate of Numidia, heads it.

**AFRICAN, A.D. 414**—Of Donatists.

**CARTHAGE, A.D. 416**—or the 2nd against the Pelagians: probably the 16th under Aurelius: composed of 67 bishops: addressed a synodical letter to Innocent of Rome, condemning both Pelagius and Celestius.

**MILEVIS, A.D. 416**—Called the 2nd of Milevis against Pelagius and Celestius—composed of 60 bishops—published 27 canons on discipline—addressed a synodical letter to Innocent of Rome, to which was appended another in a more familiar tone from Aurelius, St. Augustine and three more.

**TEDRA, A.D. 417**—Passed canons on discipline.

**CARTHAGE, A.D. 417, 418**—Against the Pelagians—regarded as one, probably the 17th under Aurelius.

**HIPPO, SUFFETULA, MACRIANA, A.D. 418**—Passed canons on discipline preserved by Ferrandus (Mansi, iv. 439).

**THENES, A.D. 418**—Published nine canons on discipline.

**CARTHAGE, A.D. 419**—Attended by 229, or, according to other accounts, 217 bishops; and by Faustinus, Bishop of Potenza, and two presbyters as legates from Rome. Its proceedings have been anticipated in what was said on the African code. It would seem as if it really commenced in 418, and extended through 419. Pagi supposes 33 canons to have been passed in the former year, and but 6 in the latter (Mansi, iv. 419); and Mansi seems even to make two synods of it, calling one a 5th or 6th, and the other a 7th Council of Carthage (against the Pelagians, he probably means), and yet evidently reckoning both together as the 18th under Aurelius. From 419 it seems to have been adjourned to 421, and then lasted into 422 at least, as has been shown above; this adjourned council was therefore in reality the 20th under Aurelian, though sometimes headed the 18th, as being one with the council of which it was but the adjournment. Then the 19th under Aurelius is the title given in Mansi (iv. 443) to one held in the

interim, A.D. 420, to determine certain questions of precedence amongst bishops, possibly the missing 6th against Pelagianism.

**NUMIDIA, A.D. 423**—In which Antonius, a bishop of that province, was condemned.

**CARTHAGE, A.D. 426**—At which Leporius, a French presbyter, cleared himself from Pelagianism.

**HIPPO, A.D. 426**—At which Heraclius was elected successor to St. Augustine at his nomination.

— **A.D. 427**—Said to have passed canons 29 and 30, in the Latin numbering of the African code (Mansi, iv. 539).

**AFRICAN, A.D. 484**—To render account of their faith to King Hunneric, when it appeared that of 475 sees, 14 were then vacant: 88 had been deprived of their bishops by death, and most of those who survived were in exile (Mansi, vii. pp. 1156–64 and the notes).

**BYZATIUM, A.D. 507**—To appoint new bishops in place of those who had died or been exiled.

**JUNCA, A.D. 523**—under Liberatus: to condemn a bishop of the province of Tripoli who had usurped a church not in his diocese: St. Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe, being one of those present.

**CARTHAGE, A.D. 525**—under Boniface; when two volumes of the canons were found, as already described (Mansi, viii. 635–56).

**AFRICAN, A.D. 533**—Sent a synodical letter to John II. of Rome by Liberatus, deacon of the church of Carthage, so well known for his writings.

**BYZATIUM, A.D. 541**—Sent a deputation to Justinian, and legislated on discipline.

**AFRICAN, A.D. 550**—Excommunicated Vigilius for condemning the three chapters.

**SUFFETULA, A.D. 570**—Passed canons on discipline, some of which are preserved.

**AFRICAN, A.D. 594**—Against the Donatists, probably for the last time.

**BYZATIUM, A.D. 602**—To examine certain charges made against Clement the primate.

**NUMIDIA, A.D. 603**—To examine the case of Donadeus, a deacon, who had appealed from his bishop to Rome.

**BYZATIUM, NUMIDIA, MAURITANIA, CARTHAGE, A.D. 633**—Against Cyrus, Pyrrhus, and Sergius, the Monothelite leaders.

**BYZATIUM, NUMIDIA, MAURITANIA, CARTHAGE, 646**—Against the Monothelites: the councils of Byzantium, Numidia, and Mauritania addressed a joint synodical letter: and the Bishop of Carthage a letter in his own name to Theodore, Bishop of Rome: all preserved in the acts of the Lateran Council under Martin I. A.D. 649. [E. S. F.]

**AGABUS**, the prophet (Acts xxi. 10), commemorated Feb. 13 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet.*); April 8 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**AGAPAE**.—The custom which prevailed in the Apostolic Church of meeting at fixed times for a common meal, of which all alike partook as brothers, has been touched on in the *Dict. of the Bible* [LORD'S SUPPER.] It had a precedent



in the habits of the Essene communities in Judaea (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8), and in the *ἑταῖροι* of Greek guilds or associations; in the *Charisties* of Roman life (Ovid, *Fasti*, ii. 616), in the *πυσίλια* of Crete, in the *φειδίτια* of Sparta. The name apparently was attached to the meals towards the close of the Apostolic age. The absence of any reference to it in 1 Cor. xi. or xiii., where reference would have been so natural, had it been in use, may fairly be taken as negative evidence that it was not then current. The balance of textual authority inclines in favour of ἀγάπαι, rather than ἀφάται, in Jude v. 12, and perhaps also, though less decidedly, in 2 Pet. i. 13, and we may fairly assume (without entering on the discussion of the authorship and date of those epistles) that they represent the terminology of the Church in the period from A.D. 60 to A.D. 80. The true reading of 1 Pet. v. 14 (ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης) cannot be disjoined from the fact that there was a feast known then or very soon afterwards by that name, at which such a salutation was part of the accustomed ceremonials. Soon the name spread widely both in the East and West. Ignatius (*ad Smyrn.* c. 8),<sup>a</sup> for the Asiatic and Syrian Churches, Clement for Alexandria (*Paedag.* ii. p. 142), Tertullian for Western Africa (*Apol.* c. 39), are witnesses for its wide-spread use.

It is obvious that a meeting of this character must have been a very prominent feature in the life of any community adopting it. The Christians of a given town or district came on a fixed day, probably the first day of the week (the "stato die" of Pliny's letter to Trajan, *Epp.* x. 96), in some large room hired for the purpose, or placed at their disposal by some wealthy converts. The materials of the meal varied according to the feeling or wealth of the society. Bread and wine were, of course, indispensable, both as connected with the more solemn commemorative act which came at some period or other in the service, and as the staple articles of food. Meat, poultry, cheese, milk, and honey, were probably used with them (August., c. *Faust.* xx. 20). Early paintings in the catacombs of Rome seem to show that fish also was used (Aringhi, *Romæ Subterræ.* ii. pp. 77, 83, 119, 123, 185, 199, 267). Both the fact of its being so largely the common diet of the poor in Syria (Matt. vii. 9, xiv. 17, xvi. 34), and the associations of Luke xxiv. 42, John xxi. 9 (to say nothing of the mystical significance attached to the word ἰχθὺς as early as Tertullian), would naturally lead Christians to use it at their "feasts of love." The cost of the meal fell practically on the richer members of the Church, whether it was provided out of the common funds, or made up of actual contributions in kind, meat or fruit sent for the purpose, or brought at the time. At the appointed hour they came, waited for each other (1 Cor. xi. 33),

<sup>a</sup> There is a suggestive difference, indicating a change in language and practice, between the shorter and longer texts of the Ignatian Epistles in this passage. In the former the writer claims for the bishop the sole prerogative of baptizing, or ἀγάπην ποιεῖν. In the latter the word προσφέρειν is interpolated between them. The Agapè is distinguished, i. e. from the "Supper of the Lord," with which it had before been identified; and the latter, thus separated, is associated with a more sacrificial terminology, and placed before the social feast.

men and women seated at different tables, perhaps on opposite sides of the room, till the bishop or presbyter of the Church pronounced the blessing (εὐλογία). Then they ate and drank. Originally, at some time before or after<sup>b</sup> the rest of the meal, one loaf was specially blessed and broken, one cup passed round specially as "the cup of blessing." When the meal was over, water was brought and they washed their hands. Then, if not before, according to the season of the year, lamps were placed (as in the upper room at Troas, Acts xx. 8) on their stands, and the more devotional part of the evening began. Those who had special gifts were called on to expound Scripture, or to speak a word of exhortation, or to sing a hymn to God, or to "Christ as to a God" (Plin. l. c.). It was the natural time for intelligence to be communicated from other Churches, for epistles from them or their bishops to be read, for strangers who had come with ἐπιστολαὶ συστατικαὶ to be received. Collections were made for the relief of distressed churches at a distance, or for the poor of the district (1 Cor. xvi. 1; Justin. *M. Apol.* ii.; Tertullian. *Apol.* c. 39). Then came the salutation, the kiss of love (1 Pet. v. 14), the "holy kiss"<sup>c</sup> (Rom. xvi. 16), which told of brotherhood, the final prayer, the quiet and orderly dispersion. In the ideal Agapae, the eating and drinking never passed beyond the bounds of temperance. In practice, as at Corinth, the boundary line may sometimes have been transgressed, but the testimony of Pliny in his letter to Trajan (l. c.), as well as the statements of the Apologists, must be allowed as proving that their general character at first was that of a pure simplicity. The monstrous slanders of "Thyestean banquets" and "shameless impurity" were but the prurient inventions of depraved minds, who inferred that all secret meetings must be like those of the Bacchanalian orgies which had at various periods alarmed the Roman Senate with their infinite debasement (Liv. xxxix. 13, 14). At Alexandria, indeed, as was natural in a wealthy and luxurious city, there seems to have been a tendency to make the Agape too much of a sumptuous feast, like the entertainments of the rich, and to give the name to banquets to which only the rich were invited. Clement protests with a natural indignation against such a misapplication of it by those who sought to "purchase the promise of God with such feasts" (*Paedag.* ii. 1, § 4, p. 61). It seems probable from his protest against the use of flutes at Christian feasts (*Paedag.* ii. 4, p. 71) that instrumental music of a secular and meretricious character had come to be used instead of the "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" (Eph. v. 19, Col. iii. 16) which had been in use without accompaniment, at the original Agapae. Clement, however, permits the employment of the harp or lyre.

At first the practice would naturally serve as:

<sup>b</sup> Chrysostom (*Hom.* 27 and 54, on 1 Cor. xi.), followed by Theodoret and Theophylact *in loc.*, and most liturgical writers, say "before," but obviously under the influence of later practice, and the belief that the Eucharist could not have been received otherwise than fasting in the time of the Apostles.

<sup>c</sup> We may probably think of some order like that which attends the use of a "grace-cup" in college or civic feast each man kissed by his neighbour on one side, and kissing in turn him who sat on the other.

witness and bond of the brotherhood of Christians. Rich and poor, even master and slave, met together on the same footing. What took place but once a year in the Roman saturnalia was repeated in the Christian society once a week. But in proportion as the society became larger, and the sense of brotherhood less living, the old social distinctions would tend to reassert themselves. The Agapae would become either mere social entertainments for the wealthy, as at Alexandria, or a mere dole of food for the poor, as in Western Africa (Augustin. *c. Faustum* ix. 20), and in either case would lose their original significance. Other causes tended also to throw them into the back-ground. When Christians came to have special buildings set apart for worship, and to look on them with something of the same local reverence that the Jews had had for the Temple, they shrank from sitting down in them to a common meal as an act of profanation. The Agapae, therefore, were gradually forbidden to be held in churches, as by the Council of Laodicea (c. 27), and that of 3rd Carthage A.D. 391 (c. 30), and that in Trullo much later<sup>4</sup> (A.D. 692). This, of course, together with the rule of the 3rd Council of Carthage (c. 29), that the Eucharist should be received fasting, and the probable transfer, in consequence of that rule, of the time of its "celebration" from the evening to the morning, left the "feast of love" without the higher companionship with which it had been at first associated, and left it to take more and more the character of a pauper meal. Even the growing tendency to asceticism led men who aimed at a devout life to turn aside fastidiously from sitting down with men and women of all classes, as a religious act. So Tertullian, who in his *Apology* had given so beautiful a description of them, after he became a Montanist, reproaches the Church at large with the luxury of its Agapae, and is not ashamed to repeat the heathen slander as to the prevalence in them even of incestuous licence (*De Jejun. c. xvii.*). One effort was made, as by the Council of Gangra, to restore them to their old position. Those who despised and refused to come to them were solemnly anathematised (c. 11). But the current set in strongly, and the practice gradually died out. Their close connection with the annual commemoration of the deaths of martyrs, and the choice of the graves of martyrs as the place near which to hold them, was, perhaps, an attempt to raise them out of the disrepute into which they had fallen. And for a time the attempt succeeded. Augustine describes his mother Monica as having been in the habit of going with a basket full of provisions to these Agapae, which she just tasted herself, and then distributed (*Confess. vi. 2*). And this shows the prevalence of the practice in Western Africa. In Northern Italy, however, Ambrose had suppressed them on account of the disorders which were inseparable, and their resemblance to the old heathen Parentalia, and Augustine, when he returned to Africa, urged Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage, to follow the example (*Epist. xxii.*). The name, indeed, still lingered as given to the annual dedication feasts

of churches at Rome in the sixth century (Greg. M., *Epp. ii. 76*), and the practice left traces of itself, in the bread, blessed as distinct from consecrated, which, under the title of EULOGIA, was distributed in churches, or taken from them to absent members of the congregation, (2) in the practice, prohibited by the Apostolic canons (c. 3), and by the Council in Trullo (c. 28, 57, 99) of bringing to the altar honey, milk, grapes, poultry, joints of meat, that the priest might bless them there before they were eaten at a common table. The grapes appear, indeed, to have been actually distributed with the *εὐχία*, or consecrated elements, while the joints of meat are mentioned as a special enormity of the Armenian Church. (3) Traces of the Agapae are to be found lastly in the practice which prevailed in Egypt, from the neighbourhood of Alexandria to the Thebaid, in the 5th century, of meeting on the evening of Saturday for a common meal, generally full and varied in its materials, after which those who were present partook of the "mysteries" (Sozom. *H. E. vii. 19*; Socrates, *H. E. v. 22*). The practice, then, noticed as an exception to the practice of all other Churches (comp. Augustin. *Epist. ad Jan. i. 5*) was probably a relic of the primitive Church, both as to time and manner, when the Lord's Supper had been, like other suppers, eaten in the evening, when an evening meeting on "the first day of the week" meant, according to the Jewish mode of speech, the evening of Saturday, when the thought that "fasting" was a necessary condition of partaking of the Supper of the Lord was not only not present to men's minds, but was absolutely excluded by the Apostle's rule, that men who could not wait patiently when the members of the Church met, should satisfy their hunger beforehand in their own houses (1 Cor. xi. 34).

The classification of Agapae, according to the occasion on which they were held, as (1) connected with the anniversaries of martyrdoms [comp. NATALITIA], (2) as *Connubiales* [comp. MARRIAGE], (3) as accompanying funerals [BURIAL], (4) as at the dedication festivals of churches [DEDICATIONS], must be looked on as an after-growth of the primitive practice of weekly meetings. Details will be found under the respective headings.

We have lastly to notice the probable use at the Agapae of cups and plates with sacred emblems and inscriptions, of which so many have been found in the Catacombs [GLASS, CHRISTIAN], and which almost suggest the idea of toasts to the memory of the martyrs whose *Natalities* were celebrated. "Victor VIVAS IN NOMINE LAURETI" (Buonarrotti. Plate xix. fig. 2), "SEMPER REFRIGERIS IN NOMINE DEI" (*Ibid.* xx. 2), "ΠΙΕ ΖΗΣΑΙΣ ΕΝ ΑΓΑΘΟΙΣ, DULCIS ANIMA VIVAS, BIBAS (for VIVAS) IN PACE," are examples of the inscriptions thus found. In the judgment of the archaeologist just referred to, they go back to the third, or even to the second century. The mottoes were probably determined by the kind of Agape for which they were intended (comp. Martigny, art. *Fonds de Coupe*). [E.H.P.]

AGAPE. (1) Virgin of Antioch, commemorated Feb. 15 and March 10 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

(2) Virgin of Thessalonica, commemorated April 3 (*Martyrol. Rom. Vet.*).

<sup>4</sup> The significance of the reversal of the prohibition is into a date, is that it shows that the practice still lingered.

(3) Martyr, April 16 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(4) Daughter of SOPHIA, Sept. 17 (*Id.*).

(5) Virgin, commemorated at Rome Aug. 8 (*M. Hieron.*).

(6) Virgin, commemorated at Heraclea, Nov. 20 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

AGAPETI, and AGAPETAE, respectively, men who dwelt in the same house with deaconesses, and virgins who dwelt in the same house with monks, under a profession of merely spiritual love; the latter of the two akin to *συνείσακτοι*, and also called *ἀδελφοί*: denounced by St. Greg. Naz. (*Carm. III.*), by St. Jerome (*Ad Eustoch.* and *Ad Oceanum*,—"Agapetarum pestis"), by St. Chrysostom (*Pallad. in V. S. Chrys. p. 45*), by Epiphanius (*Haer. lxxiii., lxxix.*), and by Theodoret (*In Epist. ad Philem. v. 2*); and forbidden by Justinian (*Novell. vi. c. 6*), and others (see Photius in *Nomocan. tit. viii. c. xiv. p. 99*). (Du Cange, Meursius in *Glossar.*, Suicer.) The Irish Rules and Penitentials severely condemn a like practice: see *e. g.* Reg. Columban. ii. 13. And the "second order of saints," in Ireland itself (according to the well-known document published by Ussher), "abnegabant mulierum administrationem, separantes eas a monasteriis," owing apparently to the abuse arising from the practice when permitted by "the first order." See Todd, *Life of St. Patrick*, pp. 90-92. (See *συνείσακτοι*.) [A. W. H.]

AGAPETUS or AGAPITUS. 1. Commemorated March 24 (*Mart. Hieron., Bedae*).

(2) Of Asia, April 12 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

(3) The deacon, martyr at Rome, commemorated with Felicissimus, Aug. 6 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae*). Proper office in Gregorian *Sacramentary*, p. 118, and Antiphon in *Lib. Antiph.*, p. 705.

(4) Martyr at Praeneste, commemorated Aug. 18 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae*). Proper office in Gregorian *Sacramentary*, p. 123, and Antiphon in *Lib. Antiph.* p. 707. [C.]

AGAPIUS. (1) The bishop, martyr in Numidia, commemorated April 29 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) And companions, martyrs at Gaza, March 15 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

AGATHA or AGATHE. (1) The virgin, martyr at Catana, passion commemorated Feb. 5 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae, Cal. Byzant.*). Another commemoration, July 12 (*M. Hieron.*). One of the saints of the Gregorian Canon. Proper office for her *Natalis* in Gregorian *Sacramentary*, p. 25, and Antiphon in *Lib. Antiph.* p. 665.

(2) Commemorated April 2 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

AGATHANGELUS, martyr, commemorated Jan. 23 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

AGATHENSE CONCILIUM. [AGDE.]

AGATHO. (1) Martyr at Alexandria, commemorated Dec. 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) Deacon, April 4 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(3) Commemorated July 5 (*Id. et Hieron.*). [C.]

AGATHONICA of Pergamus, commemorated April 13 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

AGATHONICUS, martyr, commemorated Aug. 23 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

AGATHUS, commemorated May 8 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

AGAUNE, COUNCIL OF (AGAUNENSE

CONCILIUM), April 30, A.D. 515, 516, or 523; a sixty bishops and sixty nobles, under Sigismund King of the Burgundians; established the "Law Perennis" in the monastery of Agaune (or St. Maurice in the Valais), then also endowed with lands and privileges. Maximus, Bishop of Geneva heads the signatures; but Avitus, Archbishop of Vienne, is supposed to have been also present (Mansi, viii. 531-538). [A. W. H.]

AGDE, COUNCIL OF (AGATHENSE CONCILIUM), in Narbonne, A.D. 506, Sept. 10 or 11 of 35 bishops from the South of France; in the 22nd year of Alaric, (Arian) King of the Goths enacted 73 canons in matters of discipline among other things, forbidding "bigami" to be ordained; commanding married priests and deacons to abstain from their wives; fixing 25 as the age of a deacon, 30 as that of a priest or bishop, &c. It was assembled "ex permisso domini nostri gloriosissimi magnificentissimi regis," sc. Alaric; without any mention of the pope (Symmachus), save as mentioning his year in the title (Mansi, viii. 319-346). [A. W. H.]

AGE, CANONICAL. The age required by the canons for ordination. In the case of bishop it appears to have been the rule of the Church from early times that they should be thirty years old at the time of their ordination. The rule, however, was frequently dispensed with either in cases of necessity or in order to promote persons of extraordinary worth and singular qualifications. It may be questioned whether this rule was observed from the days of the Apostles, as it is nowhere enjoined in St. Paul's Pastoral Epistles or elsewhere in the New Testament. And in the so-called Apostolical Constitutions, which may be taken as expressing the system of the Eastern Church as it was established about the end of the third century, fifty is the age required of a bishop at his ordination, except he be a man of singular merit which may compensate for the want of years.

The age of thirty is required by implication by the Council of Neocaesarea, A.D. 314, which forbids to admit any one, however well qualified to the priesthood, under thirty years of age because the Lord Jesus Christ at that age began His ministry. The Council of Agde (Concilium Agathense) forbids the ordination of bishops or priests under thirty years of age.

By this rule, as enacted by the above-named councils, the ordinary practice of the Church has been regulated. The deviations, however, in special cases have been numerous, and these a warrant may be found in the case of Timothy, whose early ordination as Bishop of Ephesus is inferred from the Apostle's admonition,—“Let no man despise thy youth” (Tim. iv. 12). We learn from Eusebius, that Gregory Thaumaturgus and his brother Athanasius were both ordained bishops very young. It is probable that Athanasius was ordained to the see of Alexandria before he was thirty. Remigius, Bishop of Rheims, as authors agree, was ordained at the age of twenty-two, A.D. 471.

In later times, boys of eleven or twelve years of age have been ordained to the episcopate by papal dispensation; but this abuse was unknown to the ancient Church.

Presbyters, like bishops, might not be ordi-



before the age of thirty. Justinian, indeed, avoted that none should be a presbyter before thirty-five; but the Sixth General Council of Constantinople reduced it to the old period, appointing thirty for a priest and twenty-five for a deacon. Which ages were also settled in the Saxon Church, as appears by Egbert's Collection of the Canons then in force in this country.

The councils of Agde, 506, of Carthage, 397, of Trullo, 692, of Toledo, 633, all prescribe twenty-five as the minimum of age for a deacon; and, according to Bingham, this rule was very strictly observed, so that we scarce meet with an instance of any one that was ordained before this age in all the history of the Church. For this the Council of Toledo cites the Levitical precedent.

In the Greek Church the age of thirty is still prescribed for a priest, and twenty-five for a deacon. In our own Church, the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. prescribed twenty-one for deacons, twenty-four for priests. The present rubric is a provision of Canon 34.

(Bingham, x. 1, xx. 20; Landon's *Manual of Councils*; *Cumbe's Companion*; *Prayerbook interlined*.) [D. B.]

**AGENDA** (from *agere* in the special sense of performing a sacred act). A word used to designate both the mass and other portions of Divine service.

1. In the plural.—The second Council of Carthage (390) speaks of presbyters who committed a breach of discipline, in that "agent agenda" in private houses, without the authority of the bishop (Canon 9). Innocent I. (*Epistola ad Decimum*, § 3, p. 552, Migne) speaks of celebrating other agenda, in contrast with the consecration of the mysteries.

2. The plural form "agenda" came in time, like "Biblia," to be considered a singular feminine. For instance, St. Benedict in his Rule, c. 13 (p. 391), speaking of the morning and evening office, says, "Agenda matutina et vespertina non transeat."

3. The word "agenda" is not unfrequently used absolutely to denote the office for the dead. This may not improbably be the case in the canon quoted above by the II. Conc. Carthage; and it is certainly used in this sense by Venerable Bede, when, speaking of local commemorations of the dead, he says, "Per omne sabbatum a presbytero loci illius Agendae eorum sollemniter celebrantur" (*Vita St. Augustini*, in Ducange a. v.). Compare Menard's note in his edition of *Gregory's Sacramentary*, p. 462. (Ducange's *Glossary*, a. v. "Agenda.") [C.]

**AGNES**, or **AGNE** (ἀγνή). (1) The virgin, martyr at Rome. Her *Natalis*, which is an ancient and highly-honoured festival, is celebrated Jan. 21 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Bedae); Octave, Jan. 28 (ib.). Proper office for the *Natalis* in the Gregorian *Sacramentary*, p. 23, and Antiphon in *Lit. Antiq.* p. 664. By Theodorus Lector (*Eclogia* ii.) the deposition of her relics is joined with the deposition of those of Stephen and Lawrence (see *Greg. Sacram.* p. 304, ed. Menard). She is one of the saints of the Gregorian Canon, where her name appears in the form Agne.

Tillemont (*Mém. Eccl.* iv. 345) conjectures that the second festival on Jan. 28 commemorates the apparition of St. Agnes to her parents eight days after her death.

Her remains are said to have been buried in a *proedion* belonging to her family on the Via Nomentana. The crypt dug to receive them became the nucleus of the famous cemetery of St. Agnes. Two churches at Rome are dedicated to St. Agnes, one of which is said to be that built by Constantine at the request of his daughter Constantia, and is certainly one of the most ancient basilicas in Rome. In early times, it was customary for the Pope to be present at the festival of St. Agnes in this church, in which Gregory the Great delivered several of his homilies (e.g. in *Matt. c. xiii.*, *Hom. 2*); and in this church still, on Jan. 21, the lambs are blessed, from the wool of which the *PALLA* destined for archbishops are to be made.



St. Agnes.

In the illustration, taken from an ancient glass vessel, the doves on each side bear the two crowns of Chastity and of Martyrdom. This representation illustrates the verse of Prudentius (*Peristeph.* xiv. 7),

"Duplex corona est praestita martyri."

Representations of St. Agnes are found very frequently on glass vessels in the catacombs; only St. Peter and St. Paul are found more often so represented. When alone, she is generally placed between two trees; sometimes she is at the side of the Virgin Mary; sometimes between the Lord and St. Laurence; between St. Vincent and St. Hippolytus; between St. Peter and St. Paul.

(2) There is another festival of St. Agnes on Oct. 18 (*Mart. Hieron.*). Tillemont (l. c.) conjectures that this was instituted in commemoration of the dedication of some church in her honour. (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. chret.* p. 22 ff.; the Abbé Martigny has also written a monograph, *Notice historique, liturgique, et archéologique sur le Culte de Ste. Agnès*. Paris et Lyon, 1847.) [C.]

**AGNITUS**, commemorated Aug. 16 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**AGNUS DEI**. The versicle "Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, Misereere nobis," is generally spoken of as the "Agnus Dei."

1. A reference to the "Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," was introduced (as was natural) into some of the liturgies at an early period. Thus in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, during the breaking of the bread, the priest says, *Μελέψαντες τοῦ θανάτου* d

ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ (Neale's *Tetralogia*, 176); and in that of St. James, after breaking and signing with the cross, the priest says, 'Ἰδὲ ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὁ αἰρὼν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, σφαγιασθὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας (Ib. 179). And in the ancient "Morning Hymn" [GLORIA IN EXCELSIS] adopted both in Eastern and Western Liturgies, the deprecation is found: 'Ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, 'Ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὁ αἰρὼν τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ κόσμου, Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς.

2. At the Trullan Council (692) it was decreed, among other matters, that the Lord should no longer be pictured in churches under the form of a lamb, but in human form (Canon 82). The then Pope, however, Sergius I., rejected the decrees of this Council (though its conclusions had been subscribed by the Papal legates), and Anastasius the Librarian (in Baron., an. 701, vol. xii. 179) tells us that this Pope first ordered that, at the time of the breaking of the Lord's body, the "Agnus Dei" should be chanted by clerks and people. Some think that Sergius ordered it to be said thrice, where it had previously been said only once; others, as Krazer (*De Liturgiis*, p. 545), that he ordered it to be said by the whole body of the clergy and people, as being a prayer for all; not, as previously, by the choir only. However this may be, the evidence of the Ordines Romani I., II., and III. (Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, ii. pp. 29, 50, 59), and of Amalarius of Metz, shows that in the beginning of the 9th century the choir alone, and not the priest at the altar, chanted the "Agnus Dei;" and this was the case also when Innocent III. wrote his treatise on the "Mystery of the Altar." The Ordines Romani do not define the number of repetitions of the versicle; but Martene (*De Ritibus Ecclesiae*, lib. i., c. 4, art. 9) proves from ancient documents that the threefold repetition was expressly enjoined in some churches—as in that of Tours—before the year 1000; and in the 12th century this custom prevailed in most churches. Subsequently, probably from about the 14th century, the "Agnus Dei" came to be said in a low voice by the priest with his deacon and subdeacon. In later times, says Innocent III. (*De sacro Altaris Mysterio*, i. 4, p. 910, Migne), as trouble and adversity fell upon the Church, the response at the third repetition was changed into "Dona nobis pacem;" in the church of St. John Lateran only was the older form retained. When the substitution of "Dona nobis pacem" was made is uncertain; it is found in no MS. older than the year 1000. The reason which Innocent gives for the introduction of the prayer for peace may perhaps be the real one; but it is not an unreasonable conjecture that it had reference to the "pax," or kiss of peace, which was to follow.

3. Gerbert (*De Musica Sacra*, i. p. 458) mentions among ancient customs the chanting of the "Agnus Dei" by the choir during the time that the people communicated, before the antiphon called "Communio" (Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, i. 148).

4. The "Agnus Dei" was sometimes interpolated with "tropes;" for instance, the following form is quoted by Cardinal Bona from an ancient missal, the date of which he does not mention: "Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, crimina tollis, aspera mollis, Agnus honoris, Miserere nobis.

Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, vulnera sanas, ardua planas, Agnus amoris. Miserere nobis." Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, sordida mundas, cuncta foecundas, Agnus odoris, Dona nobis pacem" (*De Rebus Liturgicis*, lib. ii. c. 16 p. 473). And Rupert of Deutz has the addition "Qui sedes ad dextram Patris, Miserere nobis" (Daniel, *Codex Lit.* i. 142).

5. In the Ambrosian rite the "Agnus Dei" occurs only in masses for the dead; where, after "Dona nobis pacem," the words are added, "Requiem sempiternam, et locum indulgentiae cum sanctis tuis in gloria" (Krazer, *De Liturgiis* p. 637).

6. A legend preserved by Robert of Mount St Michael (in Bona, *De Reb. Lit.* lib. ii. c. 16) tells how, in the year 1183, the Holy Virgin appeared to a woodman at work in a forest, and gave him a medal bearing her own image and that of her Son, with the legend "Agnus Dei, qui tollis peccata mundi, Dona nobis pacem." This she had him bear to the bishop, and tell him that all who wished the peace of the Church should make such medals as these, and wear them in token of peace. [C.]

**AGNUS DEI.** A medallion of wax, bearing the figure of a lamb. It was an ancient custom to distribute to the worshippers, on the first Sunday after Easter, particles of wax taken from the Paschal taper, which had been solemnly blessed on the Easter Eve of the previous year. These particles were burned in houses, fields, and vineyards, to secure them against evil influences or thunder-strokes.

In Rome itself, however, instead of a Paschal taper, the archdeacon was accustomed to pronounce a benediction over a mixture of oil and wax, from which small medallions bearing the figure of a lamb were made, to be distributed to the people on the first Sunday after Easter, especially to the newly baptised. (*Ordo Romanus* pp. 25, 31; Amalarius *de Eccl. Off.* i. 17, 1033; Pseudo-Alcuin, *de Div. Off.* c. 19, p. 489)

In modern times this benediction of the *Agnus Dei* is reserved to the Pope himself, and takes place in the first year of each pontificate, and every seventh year following.

The Paschal taper was anciently thought to symbolise the pillar of fire which guided the Israelites, and the *Agnus Dei* the Passover Lamb (Amalarius, u. s. c. 18; compare the Gregorian Sacramentary, p. 71; "Deus, cujus antiqua miracula in praesenti quoque saeculo coruscant sentimus").

A waxen *Agnus Dei* is said to have been among the presents made by Gregory the Great to Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards (Fr *Memorie di Monza*, i. 34); but nothing of the kind is mentioned by the saint himself in his letter (*Epist.* xiv. 12, p. 1270) in which he gives a list of his presents. One was found in 1725 in the church of San Clemente on the Coelian Hill at Rome, in a tomb supposed to be that of Flavius Clemens a martyr. This *Agnus* is supposed, by De Vitry (in Calogiera's *Raccolta* xxxiii. 280), to have been placed in the tomb with the translation of the relics which he thinks took place in the 7th century.

An *Agnus* was frequently enclosed in a case or reliquary; and some existing examples of such cases are thought to be of the 5th or 9th century.

toy. A very remarkable one, said to have belonged to Charlemagne, is among the treasures of Aix-la-Chapelle; but the style appears to be of a much later age than that of Charlemagne (Ochir and Martin, *Mélanges d'Archéologie*, vol. i. pl. xix. fig. D.). [C.]

AGRICIUS, Bishop of Trèves and confessor, deposition Jan. 13 (*Mart. Bedae*). [C.]

AGRIOLA. (1) In Africa, martyr, commemorated Nov. 3 (*M. Hieron.*).

(2) Martyr at Bologna, commemorated Nov. 27 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(3) Saint, *Natalis* Dec. 3 (*M. Bedae*).

(4) In Auvergne, Dec. 9 (*M. Hieron.*).

(5) At Ravenna, Dec. 16 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

AGRIPPINA, martyr at Rome, commemorated June 23 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

AGRIPPINENSE CONCILIIUM. [CONCILES, COUNCIL OF.]

AGRIPPINUS, of Alexandria, commemorated July 15 (*Mart. Hieron.*); Jakatit 5 = Jan. 30 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

AINOL. [LAUDA.]

ABLE. [CHURCH.]

AIX-LA-CHAPELLE, COUNCIL OF (*AGGREGATIONIS CONCILII*).—i. A.D. 789; a mixed synod held under Charlemagne in his palace, which enacted 82 capitulars respecting the Church, 16 of monachos, 21 on matters of a mixed kind (*Baluz.*, *Capit.* i. 208).—ii. A.D. 797; also under Charlemagne, and consisting of bishops, abbots, and counts; at which 11 capitulars were made respecting matters ecclesiastical and civil, and 33 "de partibus Saxoniarum." The canons (48) of Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, "ad parochias esse sacerdotum," are appended to this council (*Baluz.*, *Capit.* i. 250; *Manus.*, xiii. 994-1022).—iii. A.D. 799; also under Charlemagne, and in his palace, of bishops, abbots, and monks, where Felix of Urgel was induced by Alcuin to renounce the heresy of Adoptionism (*Manus.*, xiii. 1023-1040, from Alcuin, *ad Eupand.* i., and the *Vita Alcuini*).—iv. A.D. 802, October; also under Charlemagne, of bishops, priests, and deacons, who then took the oath of allegiance to him (*Manus.*, xiii. 1102).—v. A.D. 809, November; also under Charlemagne, upon the question of the *Filioque*; which sent messengers to Pope Leo III., and was instructed by him to omit the words from the Creed, although the doctrine itself was *de fide* (*Manus.*, xiv. 17-28). The later Councils of Aix are beyond the period assigned to this work. [A. W. H.]

ALB (*alba*, *tunica alba*, *tunica talaris*, *podera*, *hanc*, *supperna*, *subcincta*, *camisia*; see also STICHARION).

§ 1. *The word and its derivation.*—The Latin word *alba*, the fuller expression for which is *tunica alba*, first appears, as the technical designation of a white tunic, in a passage of Vegetius, who speaks of an *alba suberica*, or tunic made of silk interwoven with some other material, used as a present, circ. 245, A.D., from Gallienus to Claudius (*Hist. August. Script.*, Trebellianus in Claudius, p. 208). The same expression, *alba suberica*, occurs more than once in a letter of the Emperor Valerian. The word survives in the Fr. "*aise*," as in our own "*alb*." The cor-

responding Italian word "*camice*" is derived from "*camisia*" (see below, § 3).

§ 2. *Ecclesiastical use of the word, and of the vestment.*—There are two uses of the term in ancient writers, between which it is not always easy to distinguish. When used in the singular it has generally the technical meaning above noticed, that of a white tunic. But in the plural the phrase is *abbas*, and the like, may either mean "*in alba*," or, more vaguely and comprehensively, "*in white garments*." Context only can determine which is meant.

The first recorded instance of the technical use of the term, as a designation of a vestment of Christian ministry, occurs in a canon of the African church (*Concil. Carthag.* iv. can. 41), dating from the close of the 4th century. That canon prescribes that deacons shall not wear the alb except when engaged in Divine service. "*Ut diaconus tempore oblationis tantum, vel lectionis, alba utatur.*" This probably implies that bishops and presbyters, but not deacons, were allowed to wear in ordinary life a long white tunic, resembling that worn in divine service. Other early canons, on the subject of ecclesiastical habits, show, as does that last quoted, that there was a general tendency on the part of the deacons, and other yet inferior orders, to assume the insignia which properly belonged to the higher grades of the ministry. "Human nature" had found its expression in such and the like ways in the early church as in later times.

This conjecture as to an alb being worn by bishops and presbyters even in ordinary life (from the time of the "Peace of the Church" under Constantine), at least on occasions when "full dress" was required, is confirmed by the remarkable mosaics in the church of St. George at Thessalonica. These date in all probability from the 4th century. Among the personages represented, all of them in the more stately dress of ordinary life, there are two only who are ecclesiastics, Philip Bishop of Heraclea, and the Presbyter Romanus; and the dress of each is so arranged as to show the white chiton (or tunic), though an outer tunic of darker colour is also worn. In this respect their dress differs from that of the other figures, which are those of laymen. These mosaics are figured in the *Byzantine Architecture* of Texier and Pullan (London, 1864). That an alb was so worn, more or less generally, by presbyters, at least in some parts of the West in later centuries, appears clearly from such a direction as that of Leo IV. in his *Cære Pastorale*: "*Nullus in alba qua in suo usu utitur præsumat missas cantare.*" This direction is repeated almost verbatim in the *Capitula* of Hincmar of Rheims (†882), and in the *Disciplina Ecclesiastica* of Regino, abbot of Prüm, in the following century.

§ 3. *Primitive forms of the Alb.*—In the early ages of the church the alb of Christian ministry was of full and flowing shape, and distinguished in this respect from the closely-fitted tunic of Levitical priesthood. St. Jerome (*Epist. ad Fabianum*) follows Josephus (*Antiq. Jud.* iii. 7) in dwelling particularly on this distinctive characteristic of the Levitical tunic; and in order to convey to his readers an idea of its general appearance, he is obliged to refer them to the linen shirts, called *camisia*, worn by soldiers when on service. More than four centuries later, Amal-

rise of Metz quotes this passage of St. Jerome, in his treatise *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (lib. ii. cap. 18); and expressly notices the fact that the Christian alb differed from the *poderis*, or full-length tunic of Levitical ministry, in that, while this last was strictum, closely fitted to the body, that of the church was *largum*, full and flowing. With this statement the earliest monuments of ministering vestments quite accord. The albs (if they be not rather dalmatics) worn by Archbishop Maximian and his attendant clergy in the Ravenna mosaics (see *Vestiarium Christianum*, Pl. xviii.; and under *VESTMENTS*), and in a less degree, that assigned to the deacon in the fresco representing Ordination in the cemetery of St. Hermes at Rome (Arlingh, *Roma vet.*, tom. ii. p. 329); and again those worn under a *planeta* by Pope Cornelius of Rome and St. Cyprian of Carthage in frescoes of (probably) the 6th century (*De Rom.*, *Roma Sott.*, vol. i. pp. 298-304) all agree in this respect. In these last, particularly, the albs (possibly DALMATICS, q. v.) worn under the *planeta*, have sleeves as large as those of a modern surplice.

But while this was, no doubt, the prevailing form, we have pictorial evidence to show, that, in the ninth century certainly, and in all probability at a considerably earlier time, a different form of alb was in use side by side with the first. Considerations of practical convenience determined this, as had been the case, we may well believe, in the case of the Levitical priests. If these latter, in the discharge of their sacrificial duties, would have been not only incumbered but endangered by wearing full and flowing linen garments, so were there occasions, particularly the administration of baptism, when large and full sleeves, like those of the ordinary alb or dalmatic, would have been inconvenient in the highest degree to those engaged in offices of Christian ministry. We find accordingly, in an illumination dating from the 9th century (see woodcut in the article *BAPTISM*), that the priest in baptizing wore a closely fitted alb, girded. This is, we have reason to believe, the earliest example in Christian art of an alb so shaped; but in later centuries, as the "sacred vestments" continually increased in number, the alb, which was worn underneath the rest, was gradually more and more contracted in form; and at the present time the alb, technically so called, is a closely-fitting vestment, girded, nearly resembling that of the priest in the plate just referred to.

§ 4. *Decoration of the alb.*—Like other vestments which, in primitive times, were of white linen only, the alb was often enriched in later times in respect of ornament, material, and colour. Details as to this are given by Bock (*Liturgische Gewänder*, li. 33) and by Dr. Bock (*Church of our Fathers*, vol. i. p. 424 sqq.). The most common ornaments of the kind were known as *parures* (a shorter form of *paraturae*), which were oblong patches, richly coloured and ornamented, attached to the tunic. Hence a distinction between *alba parata*, an alb with "apparals" (technically so called), and *alba pura*, this last being the "white alb *plain*" spoken of in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. These *alba parata* date, according to Professor Weiss, from the close of the 10th century (*Kunstgesch.*, u. a. w., p. 687). But this is true only of

ecclesiastical use. Ornaments like in kind to these apparals had long been in use for the rich albs worn by persons of high secular rank. They were called *Paragaudes*, from a Syriac word of similar import. See Casanbon's note on the passage of Trebellius referred to in § 1. [W.B.M.]

**ALBANUS** (1) (ST. ALBAN) or **ALBANO** (*Mart. Hieron.*) and his companions, martyrs in Britain, commemorated June 23 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, *Hieron.*, et *Beda*).

(2) Saint, commemorated December 1 (*M. Bedae*). [C.]

**ALBINUS**. (1) Bishop and confessor, commemorated March 1 (*Mart. Hieron.*, *Beda*).

(2) Martyr, June 21 (*M. Bedae*). [C.]

**ALCESTER**, COUNCIL OF (**ALHEMUS COUNCILUM**), A.D. 709; an imaginary council, resting solely on the legendary life of Egwin, Bishop of Worcester, and founder of Evesham Abbey, b. Brihtwald of Worcester (or Glastonbury); one to have been held to confirm the grants made to Evesham (Wilk. i. 72, 73; Mansi, xii. 183, 189). Wilfrid of York, said to have been at the council, died June 23, 709. [A. W. R.]

**ALDEGUNDIS**, virgin, deposition Jan. 9 (*Mart. Bedae*). [C.]

**ALDERMANN**. [ALDORMAN.]

**ALEXANDER**, (1) martyr under Decius commemorated Jan. 30 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) Commemorated Feb. 9 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(3) Son of Claudius, martyr at Ostia, Feb. 18 (*ib.*).

(4) Bishop of Alexandria, Feb. 26 (*ib.*); Apr. 10 (*M. Hieron.*).

(5) Of Thessalonica, Feb. 27 (*M. Hieron.*).

(6) Of Africa, March 5 (*M. Hieron.*).

(7) Of Nicomedia, March 6 (*M. Hieron.*).

(8) With Onias, March 10 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(9) Bishop of Jerusalem, martyr, March 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, *Beda*).

(10) Martyr at Caesarea in Palestine, Mar. 28 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); Mar. 27 (*M. Bedae*).

(11) Saint, April 24 (*Mart. Bedae*); April 1 (*Hieron.*).

(12) The Pope, martyr at Rome under Trajan May 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, *Beda*). Named in the Gregorian Canon, Antiphon in *Lit. Antiph.* p. 69.

(13) Martyr at Bergamo, Aug. 26 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(14) Bishop and confessor, Aug. 28 (*ib.*).

(15) "Is Sabina," Sept. 9 (*ib.* et *Hieron.*).

(16) Commemorated Sept. 10 (*M. Hieron.*).

(17) In Capua, Oct. 15 (*M. Hieron.*).

(18) Patriarch, Nov. 7 (*Cal. Armen.*); Mianh 22 = April 17, and Nahasse 18 = Aug. 11 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(19) Bishop and martyr, Nov. 26 (*M. E. V.*).

(20) Martyr at Alexandria, translated Dec. 12 (*ib.*). [C.]

**ALEXANDRIA, CATECHETICA SCHOOL OF**. The school thus described occupies an exceptional position in the history of the Christian Church. Everywhere, of course, there was instruction (*κατήχησις*) of some kind for converts [*CATECHUMENS*]; everywhere, before long there must have been some provision made for the education of Christian children. That at Alexandria was the only one which acquired a special reputation, and had a succession of illustrious

teachers, and affected, directly and indirectly, the theology of the Church at large. The lives of those teachers, and the special characteristics of their theological speculations will be treated of elsewhere. Here it is proposed to consider (1) the outward history of the school; (2) its actual mode of working, and general influence on the religious life of the Alexandrian Church.

(1.) The origin of the Alexandrian school\* is buried in obscurity. Eusebius (*H. E.*, v. 10) speaks of it as of long standing (ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους), but the earliest teacher whom he names is Pantaenus, circ. A.D. 180. If we were to accept the authority of Philip of Sida (Fragm. in Dodwell's *Dissert. in Iren.* Oxf. pp. 488-497), the honour of being its founder might be conceded to Athenagoras, the writer of the *Apologia*; and this would carry us a few years further. But the authority of Philip is but slight. His list is manifestly inaccurate, the name of Clement coming after Origen, and even after Dionysius, and the silence of Eusebius and Jerome must be held to outweigh his assertion. Conjecture may look to St. Mark (Hieron., *Cat.* 36), with more probability, perhaps, to Apollon, as having been the first conspicuous teacher at Alexandria. Pantaenus, however, is the first historical name. He taught both orally and by his writings, and, though his work was interrupted by a mission to India, he seems to have returned to Alexandria, and to have continued teaching there till his death. First working with him, and then succeeding him, we have the name of Clement, and find him occupying the post of teacher till the persecution of Severus, A.D. 202, when he with others fled for safety. The vacant place was filled by Origen (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 3), then only eighteen years of age, but already well known as a teacher of grammar and rhetoric, and as having studied profoundly in the interpretation of the Scriptures. It is probable, but not certain, that he himself had attended Clement's classes. As it was, seekers after truth came to him in such numbers that he renounced his work as an instructor in other subjects, and devoted himself to that of the school which was thus reopened. Clement may possibly have returned to Alexandria, and worked with him till his death, circ. A.D. 220. Origen himself left soon afterwards, and founded, in some sense, a rival school at Caesarea. Of the teachers that followed we know little more than the names. Philip of Sida (*l.c.*) gives them as Heraclas, Dionysius, Pierius, Theognostus, Serapion, Peter, Macarius, Didymus, Rhodon. Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 32) names Pierius as a man of philosophical attainments at Alexandria, and mentions Achilles more distinctly as having been entrusted with the *ἐκκλησιαστικὴν* there under the episcopate of Theonas. He further speaks of the school as existing in his own time (circ. A.D. 330). Theodoret (*l. l.*) names Arius as having at one time been the chief teacher there, and Sozomen (*H. E.* iii. 15) and Eufimius (*H. E.* ii. 7) name Didymus, a teacher who became blind, as having held that post for a long period of years (circ. A.D. 340-395). During the later years of his life he was assisted by Rhodon as a coadjutor, who, on his death, re-

moved to Sida, where he numbered among his pupils the Philip from whom we get the list of the succession. This seems to have broken up the school, and we are unable to trace it further.

(2.) The pattern upon which the work at Alexandria was based may be found in St. Paul's labours at Ephesus. After he ceased to address the Jews through his discourses in the synagogue he turned to the "school" (σχολή) of Tyrannus (*Acta*, xix. 9). That "school" was probably a lecture-hall (so the word is used by Plutarch, *Vit. Arati*, c. 29), which had been used by some teacher of philosophy or rhetoric, and in which the apostle now appeared as the instructor of all who came to inquire what the "new doctrine" meant. Something of the same kind must have been soon found necessary at a place like Alexandria. With teachers of philosophy of all schools lecturing round them, the Christian Society could not but feel the need of lecturers of its own. Elsewhere, among slaves and artisans it might be enough to hand down the simple tradition of the faith, to develop that teaching as we find it in the *Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem. The age of apologists, appealing, as they did, to an educated and reading class, must have made the demand for such teachers more urgent, and the appearance of Pantaenus as the first certainly known teacher, indicates that he was summoned by the Church to supply it. In a room in his own house, or one hired for the purpose, the teacher received the inquirers who came to him. It was not a school for boys, but for adults. Men and women alike had free access to him. The school was open from morning to evening. As of old, in the schools of the Rabbis, as in those of the better sophists and philosophers of Greece, there was no charge for admission. If any payment was made it came, in the strictest sense of the word, as an *honorarium* from grateful pupils (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 4). After a time he naturally divided his hearers into classes. Those who were on the threshold were, it is natural to think, called on, as in the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* of Clement, to turn from the obscenities and frivolities of Paganism to the living and true God. Then came, as in his *Paedagogus*, the "milk" of Catechesis, teaching them to follow the Divine Instructor by doing all things, whether they ate or drank, in obedience to His will. Then the more advanced were led on to the "strong meat" of ἡ ἐκπολιτικὴ θεωρία (*Clem. Alex., Strom.* v. p. 686, Pott.). At times he would speak, as in a continuous lecture, and then would pause, that men might ask the questions which were in their hearts (Origen, in *Matt. Tr.* xiv. 16). The treatises which remain to us of Clement's, by his own account of them, embody his reminiscences of such instruction partly as given by others, partly doubtless as given by himself. We may fairly look on Origen's treatises and expositions as having had a like parentage. (Comp. Guerike, *De Scholâ Alex.*; Hasselbach, *De Schola Alex.*; Redepenning's *Origenes*, i. 57, ii. 10; and Art. *Alexandrinisches Catechetischen Schule*, in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*; Neander's *Church History* [Engl. Translation], ii. 260, et seq.) [E. H. P.]

\* It may be worth while to note the names by which it is described:—(1) τὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, or τὸ τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων ἐκκλησιαστικόν, *Euseb., H. E.* v. 10, vi. 2, 28: (2) τὸ ἱερὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν τῶν ἱερῶν μετέφραστον, *Sozom.* iii. 15: (3) *ἐκκλησιαστικὴ σχολή*, *Hieron., Cat.* c. 38.

**ALEXANDRIA, COUNCILS OF.** There were no councils of Alexandria proportionate to its situation as the marine gate of the East, or to the fame of its catechetical and eclectic schools,



or to its ecclesiastical position, as having been the second see of the world. And the first of them was held A.D. 230, under Demetrius, in a hasty moment, to pass judgment upon one of the most distinguished Alexandrians that ever lived, Origen: his chief fault being that he had been ordained priest in Palestine, out of the diocese. His works were condemned in this, and he himself excommunicated and deposed in a subsequent council; but both sentences were disregarded by the bishops of Palestine, under whose patronage he continued to teach and to preach as before.

A.D. 235—There was a synod under Heraclas, who is said to have appointed 20 bishops; one of whom, Ammonius, having betrayed the faith, was reclaimed at this synod.

A.D. 263—This was a synod, under Dionysius, against the errors of Sabellius; in another, Nepotianus, a bishop of Egypt, and Cerinthus fell under censure for their views on the Millennium.

A.D. 306—under Peter; against Meletius, a bishop of Lycopolis, who had sacrificed to idols, and was therefore deposed.

A.D. 321—Against Arius, who was deposed in two synods this year under Alexander.

A.D. 324—Against Arius once more; but this time under Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, who had been despatched to Alexandria to make enquiries, by Constantine.

A.D. 328—When St. Athanasius was consecrated bishop. (On the date, see Mansi, ii. 1086.)

A.D. 340—In favour of St. Athanasius. Deputies were sent from the council to Rome and Tyre in that sense. Its synodical letter is given by St. Athanasius in his 2nd Apology.

A.D. 352—Called "Egyptian;" in favour of St. Athanasius again.

A.D. 362—under St. Athanasius, on his return from exile, concerning those who had Arianised. It published a synodical letter. On its wise and temperate decisions, see Newman's *Arians*, v. 1.

A.D. 363—under St. Athanasius on the death of Julian; published a synodical letter to the new emperor Jovian.

A.D. 371—Of 90 bishops, under St. Athanasius: to protest against Auxentius continuing in the see of Milan. This is one of those called "Egyptian."

A.D. 371—under St. Athanasius the same year; to receive a profession of faith from Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, which turned out orthodox.

A.D. 399—Against the followers of Origen, who were condemned. Part of its synodical letter is preserved in that of the emperor Justinian to Mennas on the same subject long afterwards.

A.D. 430—under St. Cyril against Nestorius; where St. Cyril indited his celebrated epistle with the twelve anathemas.

A.D. 457—under Timothy, surnamed Aelurus, or the Cat, at which the Council of Chalcedon was condemned. This was repeated, A.D. 477.

A.D. 482—At which John Tabenniosites was consecrated bishop; he was ejected at once by the emperor Zeno, when Peter Moggus re-

turned, and in a subsequent synod the same year condemned the 4th council having first caused a schism amongst his own followers by subscribing to the Henoticon (Evang. iii. 12-16).

A.D. 485—under Quintian, to pronounce Peter the Fuller deposed from Antioch.

A.D. 578—The last of those called Egyptian; it was composed of Jacobites, to consider the case of the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, Paul.

A.D. 589—under Eulogius; against the Samaritans.

A.D. 633—under Cyrus, the Monothelite patriarch: the acts and synodical letter of which are preserved in the 13th action of the 6th general council. This is the last on record.

The interests of the Church History of Alexandria are so great, that a few words may be added respecting its patriarchate.

The patriarchate of Alexandria grew out of the see founded there by St. Mark, "according to the constant and unvarying tradition both of the East and West" (Neale's *Patriarch of Alex.* l. i.); to which jurisdiction was assigned, as of ancient custom appertaining, by the 6th Nicene canon, over "Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis." This was in effect, what was already known as the Egyptian diocese, being one of five placed under the jurisdiction of the praelect of the East, and comprehending itself six provinces. Of these, Augustanica was subdivided into Augustanica prima and secunda: the first stretching upon the coast from Rhinocorura on the borders of Palestine to Diospolis on the east of the Mendesian mouth of the Nile, with the second immediately under it inland; Egypt proper was likewise subdivided into prima and secunda, of which secunda stretched westwards of the same mouth of the Nile along the coast, with prima lying immediately under it inland. Then Arcadia at Haptanomis, forming the 3rd province, lay under Augustanica secunda and Aegyptus prima on both sides of the Nile; and south of this Thebais or the 4th province, whose subdivisions, prima comprehended all the rest of the country lying north, and secunda all the country lying south of Thebes, included in Egypt. Returning towards the coast, westwards of Aegyptus secunda the 5th province, Libya inferior or secunda, was also called Marmarica; and to the west of it was the 6th province, Libya Pentapolis, also called Cyrenaica. The ecclesiastical arrangements in each of these provinces have yet to be given. For this purpose the "Notitia" published by Beveridge (Synod. ii. 143-4) might have been transcribed at length; but as the sites of so many of the sees are unknown, their metropolises, which are often uncouth and of doubtful spelling, would be devoid of interest. It may suffice to enumerate them, with their metropolises in each case. Thus Augustanica prima contained 14 episcopal sees, of which Pelusium was the metropolis; Augustanica secunda 6, at the head of which was Leonto; Aegyptus prima 2, at the head of which was Alexandria; Aegyptus secunda 12, at the head of which was Coptos. The province of Arcadia contained 6, under the metropolitan of Oxyrinchus; but 7 are given subsequently, corresponding to the 7 mouths of the Nile, of which Alexandria is placed first.

There were 8 sees in Thebais prima, under the metropolitan of Antino; and twice that number in Thebais secunda, under the metropolitan of Ptolemais. Libya secunda, or Marmarica, contained 8, under the metropolitan of Dranicon; and Libya Pentapolis 6, at the head of which was Sozusa. Tripoli was a later acquisition, including 3 sees only. They may have been placed under Alexandria subsequently to the time of the 4th Council, when all to the west of them lay in confusion under the Vandals; and possibly may have been intended to compensate for those two sees of Berytus and Rabba bordering on Palestine, of which Alexandria was then robbed to swell the patriarchate of Jerusalem on the south-west (Cave, *Ch. Govt.* iv. 11). The list of sees in Le Quien (*Oriens Christianus*, vol. ii. p. 330-640), illustrated by a map of the patriarchate from D'Anville, agrees with the above in most respects, only that it is shorter.

Alexandria had been synonymous with orthodoxy while St. Athanasius lived; shortly after his death, however, the next place after Rome, which it had ever enjoyed from Apostolic times, was given by the 2nd General Council to Constantinople. For this it seemed to have received ample compensation in the humiliation of the Constantinopolitan patriarch Nestorius, at the 3rd Council under St. Cyril; when the want of tact and perverseness of his successor Dioscorus enabled the more orthodox patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople to help themselves at its expense, and obtain sanction for their proceedings at the 4th Council. For a time, it is true, Rome peremptorily refused assenting to them; and charged their authors with having infringed the Nicene canons. But Alexandria falling into the hands of those by whom the doctrinal decisions of the 4th Council were called in question and even condemned, Rome naturally ceased taking any further steps in its favour; and under Jacobite patriarchs principally, and sometimes exclusively, Alexandria gradually came to exercise no palpable influence whatever, even as 3rd see of the world, on the rest of the Church. Le Quien reckons 48 patriarchs in all, down to Eustathius, who was consecrated A.D. 801, but several of them were heretical; and there were numerous anti-patriarchs, both heretical and schismatical, from time to time disputing their claims. The '*Art de vérifier les Dates*' makes this Eustathius the 66th patriarch. Dr. Neale makes him the 40th, and contemporary with Mark II., the 49th Jacobite patriarch.

There were several peculiarities connected with the see of Alexandria, which have been variously explained. One rests upon the authority of Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria in the 10th century, and of St. Jerome. The words of Eutychius are as follows: "St. Mark along with Ananias ordained 12 presbyters to remain with the patriarch; so that when the chair should become vacant, they might elect one out of the 12 on whose head the other 11 should lay their hands, give him benediction, and constitute him patriarch; and should after this choose some other man to supply the place of the promoted presbyter, in such sort that the presbytery should always consist of 12. This custom continued at Alexandria till the time of the patriarch Alexander, one of the 318 (Fathers of

Nicaea) who forbade the presbyters in future to ordain their patriarch; but decreed that on a vacancy of the see, the neighbouring bishops should convene for the purpose of filling it with a proper patriarch, whether elected from those 12 presbyters or from any others." Eutychius adds, "that during the time of the first 10 patriarchs, there were no bishops in Egypt; Demetrius the 11th having been the first to consecrate them." (Taken from Neale, p. 9.) This perhaps may serve to explain the extreme offence taken by Demetrius at the ordination of Origen to the priesthood out of the diocese, if a priest in Alexandria was so much more to the bishop than a priest elsewhere. It may also serve to explain the haste with which Alexander instituted proceedings against Arius. The passage of St. Jerome seems conclusive as to the interpretation to be given to that of Eutychius. This Father in an epistle to Evagrius, while dwelling on the dignity of the priesthood, thus expresses himself: "At Alexandria, from the time of St. Mark the Evangelist to that of the bishops Heraclas and Dionysius (in the middle of the 3rd century), it was the custom of the presbyters to nominate one, elected from among themselves, to the higher dignity of the bishopric; just as the army makes an emperor, or the deacons nominate as archdeacon any man whom they know to be of active habits in their own body." (*Ibid.*). St. Jerome would be talking nonsense, if the 12 of whom he is speaking had been bishops themselves; that is, of the same rank as their nominee was to be. Hence the theory of an episcopal college, to which Dr. Neale seems to incline, falls to the ground at once. On the other hand, it seems unquestionable that St. Jerome must have meant election, not ordination, from the marked emphasis with which he lays down elsewhere that presbyters cannot ordain. Otherwise, from the age in which Eutychius lived, and still more the language in which he wrote, it would hardly be possible to prove that he meant election only, when he certainly seems to be describing consecration. But again, if there were "no bishops in Egypt during the time of the first ten patriarchs," how could episcopal consecration be had, when once the patriarch had ceased to live? To this no satisfactory answer has ever been returned. Eutychius, though he lived in the 10th century, may be supposed to have known more about the ancient customs of his see, in a land like Egypt, than those who have decried him. And certainly, though we know there were bishops in Egypt under Demetrius, for two synods of bishops (Phot. *Bibl.* s. 118 and Huet. *Origen.* i. 12), we are told, met under him to condemn Origen; it would be difficult to produce any conclusive testimony to the fact that there were any episcopal sees there, besides that of Alexandria, before then. The vague statement of the Emperor Adrian, "*Illi qui Serapim colunt Christiani sunt; et devoti sunt Serapi, qui se Christi episcopus dicunt,*" speaking of Egypt, clearly warrants no such inference, standing alone; nor does it appear to have ever been suggested that each of the first ten patriarchs consecrated his successor during his own life-time. Yet there was a strange haste in electing a new patriarch of Alexandria, that seems to require some explanation. The new patriarch, we learn from Libe-



ratus, always interred his predecessor; and before doing so, placed his dead hand on his own head. Can it have been in this way, during that early period, extraordinary as it may seem, that episcopal consecration was supposed to be obtained, as it were, in one continuous chain from St. Mark himself? The position of the patriarch *after* consecration was so exceptional, that it would be no wonder at all if his consecration differed materially from all others. In civil matters his authority was very great; in ecclesiastical matters it was quite despotic. All bishops in Egypt were ordained by him as their sole metropolitan. If any other bishop ever performed metropolitan functions, it was as his delegate. The Egyptian bishops themselves, in the 4th action of the Council of Chalcedon, professed loudly that they were impotent to act but at his bidding; and hence they excused themselves from even subscribing to the letter of St. Leo while they were without a patriarch, after Dioscorus had been deposed; and that so obstinately, that their subscription was allowed to stand over, till the new patriarch had been consecrated. The patriarch could moreover ordain presbyters and deacons throughout Egypt in any number, where he would; and it is thought probable that the presbyters, his assessors, had power given them by him to confirm. All the episcopal sees in Egypt seem to have originated with him alone. As early as the 3rd century we find him called "papa," archbishop in the next, and patriarch in the 5th century, but not till after St. Cyril. In later times, "judge of the whole world" was a title given him, on account of his having formerly fixed Easter. On the liturgies in use in the Egyptian diocese, Dr. Neale says (*General Introd.* i. 323-4), "The Alexandrine family contains 4 liturgies: St. Mark, which is the normal form, St. Basil, St. Cyril, and St. Gregory. . . . St. Mark's was the rite of the orthodox Church of Alexandria. . . . The other three are used by the Monophysites. St. Basil (*i. e.* the Copto-Jacobite) is the normal and usual form; St. Gregory is employed in Lent; St. Cyril on festivals. . . . Why the first of these liturgies bears the name of Basil" is uncertain. "It is not possible now to discover its origin, though it would appear to have been originally Catholic; to have been translated from the Greek into Coptic, and thence after many ages into Arabic. The liturgy of St. Cyril is to all intents and purposes the same as that of St. Mark . . . and in both that, and in the office of St. Gregory, the first part is taken from the normal liturgy of St. Basil." Both the proanaphoral and anaphoral parts of the Copto-Jacobite liturgy of St. Basil, together with the anaphoral part of that of St. Mark are given in parallel columns further on in the same work. And the Copto-Jacobite patriarchal church at Alexandria, said to be the burial-place of the head of St. Mark, and of 72 of the patriarchs, is described there likewise, p. 277. Between the two works of Dr. Neale already cited, and the *Oriens Christianus* of Le Quien, everything further that has yet been discovered on the subject of this patriarchate may be obtained. [E. S. F.]

ALEXIUS, ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ Θεοῦ, commemorated March 17 (*Cal. Byzant.*); July 17 (*Mart. Rom.*). [C.]

**ALIENATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY.**—In treating of a subject like that of the alienation of Church property, the canons and other authorities cited as evidence of the law concerning it might either be arranged according to the various descriptions of property to which they refer, or else the entire legislation of each church and nation might be exhibited in chronological order apart from the rest. The latter plan has been here adopted, both as being more suitable to a general article, and also because in matters of church order and discipline the canons of councils were not in force beyond the limits of the churches in which they were authoritatively promulgated.

The alienation—by which is to be understood the transference by gift, sale, exchange, or perpetual emphyteusis<sup>a</sup>—of Church property [see **PROPERTY OF THE CHURCH**] was from early times restrained by special enactments.

It is a much debated question amongst Canonists whether or not alienation, except in extraordinary cases, was absolutely prohibited in the first ages of the Church, by reason of the sacred character impressed upon property given for ecclesiastical purposes, and by that act dedicated to God (see Balsamon in can. 12, Conc. VII. ap. Beveridge *Pand. Can.* i. 303). As, however, the property of the Church must in those times have consisted only of the offerings and oblations of the faithful, which were placed in the hands of the bishops,<sup>b</sup> it would appear most probable that they were free to make such use of it as they might think would be productive of the greatest benefit to their several dioceses.

The general law of the Church has been well epitomised in the Commentary of Balsamon (ap. Beveridge *Pand. Can.* ii. 177). "Unusquisque nostrorum Episcoporum rationem administrationis rerum suae Ecclesiae Deo reddet. Vasa enim pretiosa Ecclesiarum, seu sacra, et reliqua Deo consecrata, et possessiones immobiles, non sunt alienabilia, et Ecclesiae servantur. Ecclesiasticorum autem reddituum administratio secure credi audacterque committi debere illis, qui statis temporibus sunt Episcopi." Its history, as it is found in the councils of different churches, has now to be traced.

*In the East.*—The earliest canon which refers to the subject is the 15th canon of the Council of Ancyra (A.D. 314), which provides that the Church (on the expression τὸ κυριακόν see Beveridge, *Adnott.* in loc.) may resume possession of whatever property the presbyters of a diocese may have sold during the vacancy of the see; but this canon does not limit any power which the bishop himself may previously have possessed, and is simply an application of the well-known rule "sede vacante nihil innovetur."

The Council of Antioch (A.D. 341) has two canons, the 24th and 25th, bearing upon this

<sup>a</sup> On the nature of this tenure see Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, sub voce, 'Emphyteusis.' It may be described in brief as the right to use another person's land as one's own, on condition of cultivating it, and paying a fixed rent at fixed times.

<sup>b</sup> The oath now taken by bishops consecrated according to the Roman ordinal, contains a clause relating to the alienation of Church property. In what words and at what time a clause of this nature was first introduced into the ordinal is a question which has given rise to much controversy.

question, which are either imitated from the 39th and 40th Apostolic Canons, or have been imitated by the authors of that collection [APOSTOLIC CANONS]. The 24th directs that Church property, which ought to be administered subject to the judgment and authority of the bishop, should be distinguished in such a way that the presbyters and deacons may know of what it consists, so that at the bishop's death it may not be embezzled, or lost, or mixed up with his private property. That part of this canon in which reference is made to the duties imposed on presbyters and deacons is not contained in the Apostolic canon. This omission would seem to point to the conclusion that this council is later in date than the 39th Apostolic canon; and Beveridge (*Cod. Can.* i. 43) draws the same inference as to the date of the 40th Apostolic canon from its not making mention of *οἱ τῶν ἀγρῶν καρποί*, words which are to be found in the 25th Canon of Antioch. By the 25th canon it is provided that the Provincial Synod should have jurisdiction in cases where the bishop is accused of converting Church property to his own use, which was also forbidden by the 37th Apostolic canon, or managing it without the consent (*μὴ μετὰ γνώμης*) of the presbyters and deacons, and also in cases where the bishop or the presbyters who are associated with him are accused of any misappropriation for their own benefit. Here again it will be noted that the effect of this canon is to make provision for the better and more careful management of Church property, and that it does not abridge any right of alienation which the bishop may have before possessed. It must, however, be observed that the power of the bishop to manage (*χειρίζειν*) Church property (an expression which would doubtless include the act of alienation) is qualified by the proviso that it must be exercised with the consent of his presbyters and deacons.

The 7th and 8th canons of the Council of Gangra (the date of this council is uncertain, some writers placing it as early as A.D. 324, and others as late as A.D. 371: see Van Espen, *Dissertatio in Synodum Gangrensem*, Op. iii. 120, ed. Lovan. 1753, and Beveridge, *Adnott.* in id. *Conc.*, who inclines to the opinion that it was held a short time before the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341), prohibit under pain of anathema all persons from alienating (*διδόναι ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας*) produce belonging to the Church, except they first obtain the consent of the bishop or his *oeconomus*, or officer entrusted with the care of Church property.

The enactments contained in the second Council of Nicaea (or as it is generally styled the 7th Œcumenical Council) A.D. 787, will be more conveniently considered below.

The African Church seems to have found it necessary to place special restrictions upon the power of alienating Church property possessed by bishops under the general law. By the 31st canon of the code known as the *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*, promulgated (according to Bruns, *Canones*, i. 140) at the 4th Council of Carthage (A.D. 398), the bishop is enjoined to use the possessions of the Church as trustee, and not as if they were his own property; and by the next canon all gifts, sales, or exchanges of Church property made by bishops without the consent in writing ("*absque conniventia et subscriptione*")

of their clergy are pronounced invalid. In the 31st canon there are further provisions against the unauthorized alienation of Church property by the inferior clergy. If convicted in the synod of this offence they are to make restitution out of their own property.

Again by the 26th (ap. *Bev.* 29th) canon of the *Codex Ecclesiae Africanæ* promulgated A.D. 419, which repeats the 4th canon of the 5th Council of Carthage (A.D. 401), it is ordained that no one sell the real property belonging to the Church; but if some very urgent reason for doing so should arise, it is to be communicated to the Primate of the Province, who is to determine in council with the proper number of bishops (i.e. twelve) whether a sale is to be made or not; but if the necessity for action is so great that the bishop cannot wait to consult the synod, then he is to summon as witnesses the neighbouring bishops at least, and to be careful afterwards to report the matter to the synod. The penalty of disobedience to this canon was deposition. By the 33rd canon (ap. *Bev.* 36th) presbyters are forbidden to sell any Church property without the consent of their bishops; and in like manner the bishops are forbidden to sell any Church lands (*praedia*) without the privity of their Synod or presbyters. (See on these canons Van Espen, *Op.* iii. 299, &c.; and the *Scholion* of Balsamon ap. *Bev. Pand. Can.* i. 551.)

Passing from Asia Minor and Africa to Italy, the earliest provisions with reference to alienation to be found in the councils are in the council held at Rome by Pope Symmachus in A.D. 502. The circumstances under which the canons of this council were passed (and which relate solely to the question of alienation) are thus described by Dean Milman: "On the vacancy of the see [by the death of Pope Simplicius, A.D. 483] occurred a singular scene. The clergy were assembled in St. Peter's. In the midst of them stood up Basilius, the Patrician and Prefect of Rome, acting as Vicegerent of Odoacer the barbarian King. He appeared by the command of his master, and by the admonition of the deceased Simplicius, to take care that the peace of the city was not disturbed by any sedition or tumult during the election. . . . He proceeded, as the protector of the Church from loss and injury by churchmen, to proclaim the following edict: 'That no one under the penalty of anathema should alienate any farm, buildings, or ornaments of the churches; that such alienation by any bishop present or future was null and void.' So important did this precedent appear, so dangerous in the hands of these schismatics who would even in those days limit the sacerdotal power, that nearly twenty years after, a fortunate occasion was seized by the Pope Symmachus to annul this decree. In a Synod of bishops at Rome the edict was rehearsed, interrupted by protests of the bishops at this presumptuous interference of the laity with affairs of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The authenticity of the decree was not called in question; it was declared invalid as being contrary to the usages of the Fathers enacted on lay authority, and as not being ratified by the signature of any Bishop at Rome. The same council, however, acknowledged its wisdom by re-enacting its ordinances against the alienation of Church property" (*History of Latin Christianity*, vol. i., p. 221, 2nd ed.). On this

Council Boehmer notes that it has not more authority than belongs to it as a Council of the Italian Church, and that therefore its decrees (which go far beyond any yet promulgated elsewhere) were not binding upon other Churches. Previously, however, to this date Pope Leo the Great (A.D. 447) had written to the bishops of Sicily and forbidden the alienation of Church property by the bishops except for the benefit of the Church, and with the consent of the whole clergy (*Ep.* 17). Pope Gelasius also (A.D. 492–496), writing to Justinus and Faustus (who were acting in the place of their bishop), directed the restitution of all property belonging to the Church of Volterra which had been alienated up to that time; and in another letter he forbade the appropriation of Church lands for the payment of any particular stipend (*Fragg.* 23 and 24, ap. Thiel).

In the history of the *Gallican Church* the earliest reference to alienation is to be found in a letter from Pope Hilarus (A.D. 462) to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne, Lyons, Narbonne, and the Maritime Alps, in which he prohibits the alienation of such Church lands as are neither waste nor unproductive (“*nec deserta nec damnosa*”) except with the consent of a council (*Ep.* 8 sec. ult.).

The Council of Agde (A.D. 506) contains several canons on alienation. The 22nd canon, while declaring that it is superfluous to define anything afresh concerning a matter so well known, and a practice forbidden by so many ancient canons, prohibits the clergy from selling or giving away any Church property under pain of being excommunicated and having to indemnify the Church out of their private resources for any loss, the transaction being at the same time declared void. The 26th canon inflicts the like punishment on those who suppress or conceal or give to the unlawful possessor any document by which the title of the Church to any property is secured. The 48th canon reserves to the Church any property left on the death of a bishop, which he had received from ecclesiastical sources. The 49th canon repeats almost in the same words the above cited 31st canon of the *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*; the 53rd canon prohibits, and pronounces void, any alienation by parish priests; while by the 56th canon abbots are forbidden to sell Church property without the bishop's consent, or to manumit slaves, “as it would be unjust for monks to be engaged in their daily labours in the field while their slaves were enjoying the ease of liberty.”

The 1st Council of Orleans (A.D. 511) places all the immoveable property of the Church in the power of the bishop “that the decrees of the ancient canons may be observed” (canons 14 and 15).

Pope Symmachus, A.D. 513 (who died A.D. 514), in answering certain questions put to him by Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, forbids Church property to be alienated under any pretence, but he permits a life rent to be enjoyed by clerks worthy of reward (*Ep.* 15).

By the 5th canon of the 1st Council of Clermont (A.D. 535) all persons are excommunicated who obtain any Church property from kings.

In the same year Pope Agapetus writing to Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, says, that he is unwillingly obliged to refuse the bishop permission

to alienate some Church lands, “*revocant nos veneranda Patrum manifestissima constituta, quibus specialiter prohibemur praedia juris ecclesiae quolibet titulo ad aliena jura transferre*” (*Conc. Gall.* i. 240).

The 12th canon of the 3rd Council of Orleans (A.D. 538) allows the recovery of Church property within 30 years, and ordains that if the possessor should refuse to obey the judgment of the Council ordering him to surrender, he is excommunicated.

The 23rd canon renews the prohibition against the alienation of Church property by abbots or other clergy without the written consent of the bishop; and by the 9th canon of the 4th Council held at the same city (A.D. 541) it is provided that Church property which has been alienated or encumbered by the bishop contrary to the canons shall, if he has left nothing to the Church, be returned to it; but slaves whom he may have manumitted shall retain their freedom, though they must remain in the service of the Church. The 11th, 18th, 30th, and 34th canons contain further provisions on the subject.

The 1st canon of the 3rd Council of Paris (A.D. 557) is directed against the alienation of Church property, but this canon, as well as those next mentioned, would appear to refer to seizure by force rather than to possession by any quasi-legal process. Alienation is forbidden by the 2nd canon of the 2nd Council of Lyons (A.D. 567).

In the 2nd Council of Tours (A.D. 567) there are two canons—the 24th and 25th—relating to the recovery of Church property from the hands of unlawful possessors.

In Spain the Council held A.D. 589 at Narbonne, which in its ecclesiastical relations must be considered in Spain (*Wiltsh. Geog. of the Church*, i. 100), prohibits the alienation of Church property by the inferior clergy, without the consent of the bishop, under pain of suspension for two years and perpetual inability to serve in the church in which the offence was committed (can. 8).

By the 3rd Council of Toledo (held in the same year), can. 3, bishops are forbidden to alienate Church property, but gifts which, in the judgment of the monks of the diocese, are not detrimental to the interests of the Church cannot be disturbed; by the next canon bishops may assign Church property for the support of a monastery established with the consent of his Synod.

By the 37th canon of the 4th Council of Toledo (A.D. 633) the bishop is permitted (subject to the confirmation of a Provincial Council) to redeem any promise of reward made for services to the Church.

The 9th Council of Toledo (A.D. 655) contains provisions very similar to the above cited canons of the 3rd Council held at the same place.

In England, Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury (A.D. 668–690) forbids abbots to make exchanges without the consent of the bishop and their brethren (*Poenitentiale—De Abbatibus*).

The *Excerptiones* ascribed erroneously to Archbishop Egbert of York (who held that metropolitanical see from A.D. 732 to 766) declare that gifts, sales, or exchanges of Church property by bishops without the consent and written permission of the clergy shall be void (cap. 144). The *Poenitentiale*, also attributed wrongly to the

same prelate, permits exchanges between monasteries with the consent of both communities (addit. 25).

The last Council which passed canons on the subject of alienation during the period covered by this article, is the 2nd Council of Nicaea (the "Seventh Oecumenical Council") held A.D. 787. The 12th canon making mention of the 39th Apostolic Canon forbids the alienation or transfer of Church lands by bishops and abbots in favour of princes or other secular potentates; and it also, like many of the canons hereinbefore cited, prohibits bishops from appropriating any ecclesiastical property to their own use or to that of their relatives. Even when the retention of any Church lands is unprofitable they may not be sold to magistrates or princes, but to the clergy or to farmers; and these again may not sell them to magistrates, and so contravene the spirit of the canon. Such deceitful transactions are invalid, and the bishop or abbot who is guilty of taking part in them is to be deposed.—See the elaborate *Scholia* of Balsamon on this canon, ap. *Bev. Pand. Can.* i. 303.

Having now gone through the principal canons passed by the ecclesiastical assemblies of the first eight centuries, there remain to be considered the laws by which the Christian emperors limited the power of the Church as regards the alienation of its property.

Constantine the Great had in a decree of the year A.D. 323 (secs. 16, 18) assured to the Church the safe enjoyment of its property, and had commanded the restitution as well by the State as by private individuals of all such property as they might have got possession of; but it does not appear that there was any imperial legislation concerning the alienation of Church property until after the promulgation of the *Codex Theodosianus* in A.D. 438.

The *Codex Repetitæ Prælectionis* promulgated by Justinian in December A.D. 534 contains in the 2nd title of the 1st Book various provisions, made by his predecessors and re-enacted by him, on the subject of alienation.

In the 14th section there is a constitution of the Emperor Leo (A.D. 470) which prohibits the Archbishop of Constantinople, or any of his stewards (oekonomi) from alienating in any way the land or other immoveable property or the coloni or slaves or state allowances (civiles annonæ) belonging to his Church, not even if all the clergy agreed with the Archbishop and his steward as to the propriety of the transaction. The reason given for this stringent law is that as the Church which is the mother of Religion and Faith, is changeless, her property ought to be preserved also without change. Any transactions completed in defiance of this constitution were void, and all profits resulting therefrom were given to the Church. The stewards who were parties to the act were to be dismissed, and their property made liable for any damage which might arise from this infringement of the law. The notaries employed were to be sent into perpetual exile, and the judge who ratified the proceeding was punished by the loss of his office and the confiscation of his property. There was, however, an exception made to this rule in the case of a usufruct, the creation of which was permitted for a term of years or for the life of the usufructuary. (The editions of the

*Corpus Juris Civilis* generally contain after this section a series of extracts from the Novells on the same subject.)

The 17th section contains a constitution of the Emperor Anastasius to which no precise date is affixed by the commentators, but which must have been promulgated between the years A.D. 491 and 517 (Haenel, *Indices ad Corpus Legum ab Imp. Rom. ante Just. Iatarum*, p. 82, Lipsiæ 1857). This constitution, like the last cited, applies solely to the Church of Constantinople, and relates to monasteries, orphanages and other eleemosynary institutions whose property might in cases of necessity be sold, exchanged, mortgaged, or leased in perpetual emphyteusis; provided that the transaction be effected in the manner therein prescribed and in the presence of the civil authorities and the representatives of the particular body whose property is about to be dealt with. It is, however, decreed that if there be moveable property (the sacred vessels excepted) sufficient to meet the sum required, the immoveable property shall not be touched.

In the 21st section is given a constitution of Justinian himself (A.D. 529) in which he forbids any sale or other alienation of sacred vessels or vestments except only with the object of redeeming captives (and, according to some editions, relieving famine); "quoniam non absurdum est animas hominum quibuscunque vasis vel vestimentis præferri."

The rule which permitted the sale or melting down of Church plate for the redemption of captives is one of great antiquity. Its propriety is nowhere more eloquently defended than in the following passage from the 2nd Book of St. Ambrose *De Officiis Ministrorum* (cir. A.D. 391) "Quid enim diceret? Timui ne templo Dei ornatus deesset? Responderet: Aurum Sacramenta non quaerunt; neque auro placent, quae auro non emuntur. Ornatus sacramentorum redemptio captivorum est. Vere illa sunt vasa pretiosa, quae redimunt animas a morte. Ille verus thesaurus est Domini qui operatur quod sanguis Ejus operatus est. . . . Opus est ut quis fide sincera et perspicaci providentia munus hoc impleat. Sane si in sua aliquis derivat emolumenta, crimen est; sin vero pauperibus erogat, captivum redimit, misericordia est." He concludes by directing that vessels which are not consecrated should be taken in preference to those which have been consecrated; and that both must be broken up and melted within the precinct of the Church (cap. 28). The supreme claims of charity over all other considerations are insisted upon in the same strain by St. Jerome (*Ep. ad Nepotianum*, A.D. 394) and St. Chrysostom (Hom. 52 in St. Matthaeum), while at the same time the proper respect due to the sacred vessels is always emphatically enjoined, as, for example, by St. Optatus, *De Schismate Donatistarum* vi. 2. An example of the precautions taken against the abuse of this privilege is to be found in one of the letters of Gregory the Great (vii. 13) in which writing (A.D. 597) to Fortunatus, Bishop of Fano, he gives permission for the sale of Church plate in order to redeem captives, but directs, with the view of avoiding all suspicion, that the sale and the payment over of the money received therefrom should be made in the presence of the "defensor."

Passing to the *Novells* of Justinian—the 7th



Novell (A.D. 535) relates to the question of alienation of Church property, and professes to amend and consolidate the then existing laws, and to extend their operation to the whole of the empire. In the first chapter the alienation, either by sale, gift, exchange, or lease on perpetual emphyteusis, of immoveables or quasi-immoveables belonging to churches or eleemosynary institutions, was forbidden under the penalties prescribed by the above-cited constitution of Leo.

Under the 2nd chapter alienation is permitted in favour of the emperor when the proper forms are observed and ample compensation made, and when the transaction is for the public benefit. The reason given for this exception is not without significance. In the Latin version it is as follows: "Nec multum differant ab alterutro sacerdotium et imperium, et res sacrae a communibus et publicis; quando omnis sanctissimis ecclesiis abundantia et status ex imperialibus munificentis perpetuo praebeatur."

The third and four succeeding chapters contain regulations for the lease of Church estates by emphyteusis. Their provisions are too elaborate to be set out at length, but may be briefly stated thus: "The usual conditions of these emphyteuses are for three lives—that of the original emphyteuta and of two of his or her heirs, being children or grandchildren, or the husband or wife of the emphyteuta if there be a special clause to that effect (though about this power there is some doubt) in succession. Thus the duration of the lease is indeterminate and contingent. The contract was invalidated by default in payment of the quit rent (canon) for two instead of for three years as was the case with lay emphyteuses" (Colquhoun, *Roman Civil Law*, § 1709).

The 8th chapter renews the prohibition against the sale, pledge, or melting down of Church plate, except with the object of redeeming captives.

The 12th chapter sanctions the abandonment of all contracts made on behalf of the Church for the acquisition by gift or purchase of unprofitable land.

The 40th Novell (promulgated the following year, A.D. 536) gives to the "Church of the Holy Resurrection" at Jerusalem the privilege of alienating buildings belonging to it, notwithstanding the general prohibition contained in the 7th Novell.

The 46th Novell (A.D. 536 or 537) relaxed the law against the alienation of immovable Church property when there was not sufficient moveable property to pay debts owing to the State or to private creditors. But this step could not be taken except after investigation by the clergy, the bishop, and the metropolitan, and under a decree of the "judex provinciae."

The 2nd chapter of the 54th Novell (A.D. 537) permits exchanges between ecclesiastical and eleemosynary corporations, but the Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople is excepted from the operation of this law as it is also from that of the 46th Novell.

The 55th Novell (A.D. 537) forbids alienation made ostensibly in favour of the emperor, but really for the benefit of private individuals. It also permits churches and other religious bodies (with the exception of the Church of St. Sophia)

to lease their lands to one another in perpetual emphyteusis.

The 65th Novell has reference to the alienation of property belonging to the Church of Mysia, but being only of local importance it need not be further considered.

In the 67th Novell (A.D. 538) the number of persons appointed under the 46th Novell to enquire into the propriety of any alienation is increased by the addition of two bishops chosen by the metropolitan from his Synod.

The 10th chapter of the 119th Novell (A.D. 544) permits the alienation by the emperor of Church property which had been transferred to him.

The last of the numerous edicts promulgated by Justinian on the alienation of Church property is contained in the 120th Novell (A.D. 544) in which he again undertakes the task of consolidating the law on this subject.

The first four chapters concern only the Church of Constantinople. The alienation of immoveables is forbidden, except in favour of the emperor.

The 5th chapter relates to the property of other Churches. The provisions therein contained, and those contained in the previous chapters on emphyteusis are thus briefly summarized by Colquhoun (*Roman Civil Law*, § 1709):—"The 120th Novell was promulgated by Justinian in order to modify the rigour of the prohibition against creating perpetual emphyteuses on ecclesiastical property by restricting it to the estates of the Church of Constantinople, leaving the property of other Churches to be regulated by the common law. It is, however, very doubtful whether or not the emphyteusis on Church property can be perpetual without the express stipulation for a term. Nor does the prohibition appear to be absolute even as regards the Church of Constantinople, which had permission to grant perpetual emphyteuses in cases where it owned ruined edifices without the means of restoring them. The Novell fixes the amount at a third of the revenue which such edifices produced before their then ruined state, payable from the date of the emphyteutical title, or at a half of the revenue which the buildings actually produced after their restoration. What is doubtful with respect to the lay is clear with regard to ecclesiastical emphyteuses, viz., that they must be reduced to writing. As before, the contract was invalidated by default to pay the quit rent for two instead of three years, as was the case with lay emphyteuses. The point open to discussion, in respect to lay emphyteuses, of whether the rent in arrear may be recovered and the expulsion of the tenant also insisted on, is clear in the case of ecclesiastical emphyteuses in the affirmative. Lastly, the Churches enjoyed a right of resumption entirely exceptional to the common law when the estate accrued 'aut in imperialem domum, aut in sacrum nostrum aerarium, aut in civitatem aliquam, aut in curiam, aut in aliquam venerabilem aliquam domum.' This right of resumption applied equally in the case of all transmission of the right, whether inter vivos or mortis causa, without reference to the title of acquisition, and the time for its exercise was two years instead of two months as in lay cases."

The remaining chapters of this Novell relate

to the exchange of ecclesiastical property and the sale of immovables and Church plate for the redemption of captives. The provisions therein contained do not differ in any important particular from the previous laws above cited on the same subject, and they need not be repeated.

The provisions of the Civil Law (which have now been examined) have been usefully arranged by the glossator on the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, Nov. 7 and Nov. 120 (ed. Lugd. 1627). Immovable property belonging to the Church cannot be alienated under any circumstances if it fall within the following classes—1. If it had been given by the emperor (Nov. 120, 7). 2. If the thing to be alienated is the church or monastery itself (*ib.*). 3. When the proposed transferee is the oconomus or other church officer (*ib.*). 4. When the property was given to the Church subject to a condition that it should not be alienated (Nov. 120, 9). 5. If the proposed transferee be a heretic (131, 14). But subject to the above restrictions, immovable property may be alienated under the following circumstances, viz.:—1. For debt (Nov. 46). 2. By way of emphyteusis for a term (*var.*). 3. In exchange with another church (Nov. 54, 2). 4. If the transferee be the emperor (Nov. 7, 2). 5. For the redemption of captives (Nov. 120, 9). On the other hand moveable property can be freely alienated if it be for the advantage of the Church that such a step should be taken. The exception to this rule is in the case of Church plate, which cannot be alienated except for the redemption of captives (Nov. 7, 8 and Nov. 120, 10), and for the payment of debt when it is not necessary for the proper performance of Divine Service (Nov. 120, 10).

The *Barbarian Codes* contain, as might be expected, many laws directed against the forcible seizure of Church property, but such acts can hardly be considered to fall under the head of alienation. There are, however, a few provisions on the subject anterior in date to the death of Charlemagne.

By the 3rd chapter of the 5th Book of the *Leyes Visigothorum* (cir. A.D. 700: see Davoud Oghlou, *Histoire de la Legislation des Anciens Germains*, i. 2) if any bishop or clerk alienate by sale or gift any Church property without the consent of the rest of the clergy, such sale or gift is void, unless it be made according to the ancient canons.

Again in the 20th chapter of the *Lex Alamannorum* (which in its present shape was probably compiled about the beginning of the 8th century—see Davoud Oghlou, *op. cit.* i. 304) the inferior clergy are forbidden to sell Church lands or slaves except by way of exchange.

In the collection entitled *Capitularia Regum Francorum* there is a Capitulary of the date A.D. 814, forbidding all persons whatsoever to ask for or receive any Church property under pain of excommunication (6, 135).

There are also two Capitularies which are probably not later in date than the one last cited. By the first of these presbyters are forbidden to sell Church property without the consent of the bishop (7, 27); to which in the second is added the consent of other priests of good reputation (7, 214).

(The following authorities may be consulted:—Du Rousseaud de la Combe, *Recueil de Juris-*

*prudens Canonique* [Paris 1755], sub voce *Alienation*; Boehmer, *Jus Ecclesiasticum Protestantium* [Halae Magd. 1738, &c.] in *Decretal.* III. 13; Ferraris, *Bibliotheca Canonica* [ed. Migne], sub voce *Alienatio*; Sylvester Mazzolini da Prierio [Lugd. 1533] sub voce *Alienatio*; Redoanus, *De Rebus Ecclesiae non alienandis* [printed in the 2nd part of the 15th volume of the *Tractatus Universi Juris*, Venice, 1584]; and the Commentators on the above-cited passages from the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, and on the following passages from the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, *Decreti Secunda Pars*, Causa xii. Quaestio 2; and *Decretal.* lib. III. 13). [I. B.]

**ALLELUIA** (Greek Ἀλληλούια). The liturgical form of the Hebrew אֱלֹהֵינוּ, "Sing ye praises to Jehovah;" a formula found in Psalm 117, and in the headings of several Psalms, especially Psalms 113–118, which formed the "Hallel," or Alleluia Magnum, sung at all the greater Jewish feasts. Alleluia and Amen, says the Pseudo-Augustine (*Ep.* 178, ii. 1160, Migne), neither Latin nor barbarian has ventured to translate from the sacred tongue into his own; in all lands the mystic sound of the Hebrew is heard.

1. It is thought by some that the early Church transferred to the Christian Paschal feast the custom of singing Psalms with Alleluia at the Paschal sacrifice; and this conjecture derives some probability from the fact, that in the most ancient sacramentaries the Alleluia precedes and follows a verse, as in the Jewish usage it precedes and follows a Psalm. Yet we can hardly doubt that the use of the Alleluia in the Church was confirmed, if not originated, by St. John's vision (*Apoc.* 19, 6) of the heavenly choir, who sang Alleluia to the Lord God Omnipotent. By the 4th century it seems to have been well known as the Christian shout of joy or victory; for Sozomen (*H. E.* vii. 15, p. 298) tells of a voice heard (an. 389) in the temple of Serapis at Alexandria chanting Alleluia, which was taken for a sign of its coming destruction by the Christians. The victory which the Christian Britons, under the guidance of Germanus of Auxerre, with their loud shout of Alleluia, gained over the pagan Picts and Scots (an. 429) is another instance of the use of Alleluia for encouragement and triumph (Beda, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, i. c. 20, p. 49); and Sidonius Apollinaris (lib. ii. *Ep.* 10, p. 53) speaks as if he had heard the long lines of haulers by the river side, as they towed the boats, chanting Alleluia as a "celeusma," to make them pull together. These instances are of course not altogether free from suspicion; but they serve to show that in early times the Alleluia was regarded as a natural expression of Christian exultation or encouragement.

2. A special use of the Alleluia is found in the liturgies both of East and West. In most Eastern liturgies, it follows immediately upon the CHERUBIC HYMN, which precedes the greater ENTRANCE; as, for instance, in those of St. James, St. Mark, and St. Chrysostom (Neale's *Tetralogia*, pp. 54, 55). In the Mozarabic, which has many Oriental characteristics, it is sung after the Gospel, while the priest is making the oblation: "Interim quod chorus dicit Alleluia, offerat sacerdos hostiam cum calice" (Neale's *Tetralogia*, p. 60). In the West, it follows the GRADUAL,



and so immediately precedes the reading of the Gospel. In early times it seems to have been simply intoned by the cantor who had sung the Gradual, standing on the steps of the Ambo, and repeated by the choir; but before the 8th century the custom arose of prolonging the last syllable of the Alleluia, and singing it to musical notes (*Ordo Romanus* II., in Mabillon's *Museum Italicum*, vol. ii. p. 44). This was called *jubilatio*. The jubilant sound of the Alleluia, however, was felt to be fitting only for seasons of joy; hence its use was in many churches limited to the interval between Easter and Whitsunday. Sozomen, indeed (*H. E.* vii. 19, p. 307) seems to say that in the Roman Church it was used only on Easter-day; but we cannot help suspecting that he must have misunderstood his informant, who may have used the word "Pascha" to denote the whole of the seven weeks following Easter-day; for St. Augustine distinctly says (*Ep. ad Janarium*; *Ep.* 119 [al. 55] p. 220 Migne) that the custom of singing Alleluia during those fifty days was universal, though in several churches it was used on other days also. In the Rule of St. Benedict (c. 15, p. 297) the use of Alleluia in the responsories of the mass seems to be limited to the season from Easter to Whitsunday; but soon after Benedict's time it was probably more common in the West to intermit its use only from Septuagesima to Easter. For at the end of the 6th century, Gregory the Great writes to John of Syracuse (*Epist.* ix. 12, p. 940) that some murmured because he (Gregory) was overmuch given to following the customs of the Greek Church, and in particular because he had ordered the Alleluia to be said at mass beyond the Pentecostal season (*extra tempora Pentecostes*); so far, he continues, is this from being the case, that whereas the Church of Rome in the time of Pope Damasus had adopted, through Jerome's influence, from the Church of Jerusalem the limitation of the Alleluia to the season before Pentecost, he had actually innovated on this Greek custom in ordering the Alleluia to be said at other seasons also. This seems the most probable sense of this much-controverted passage, as to the reading and interpretation of which there is much difference of opinion. (See Baronius, *Ann.* 384, n. 27, vol. v., p. 578; and Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, ii. xcvi.). The 4th Council of Toledo (canon 11) orders that (in accordance with the universal custom of Christendom) the Alleluia should not be said in the Spanish and Gaulish churches during Lent—an injunction which seems to imply that its use was permitted during the rest of the year. The same canon (in some MSS.) also forbids the Alleluia on the Kalends of January, "quae propter errorem gentilium aguntur," but on which Christians ought to fast.

The intermission of Alleluia during a particular season is expressed by the phrase "Alleluia clausum" (Du Cange, s. v.).

3. We have already seen that St. Benedict prescribed the use of the Alleluia in the responsories of the Mass from Pasch to Pentecost. He prescribed it also in the ordinary offices (*Regula*, c. 12, p. 286). From Pentecost to Ash-Wednesday, however, it was to be said in the nocturnal office only with the six last Psalms: "A Pentecoste autem ad caput quadragesimae omnibus noctibus cum sex posterioribus Psalmis tan-

tum ad nocturnas dicatur" (*Regula*, c. 15, p. 297).

In the Roman arrangement of the ordinary offices, the Alleluia follows the "Invocation" in all the hours; but from Septuagesima to the Thursday in Holy Week the verse, "Laus tibi Domine; Rex aeternae gloriae," is substituted.

4. We learn from Jerome (*Ep.* 27 [108], § 19, p. 712, ad Eustochium; cf. 23 [38], § 4, p. 175) that the sound of the Alleluia summoned monks to say their offices: "Post Alleluia cantatum, quo signo vocabantur ad collectam, nulli residere licitum erat."

5. It was chanted at funerals; as, for instance, at that of Fabiola (Jerome, *Ep. ad Oceanum*, 30 [77], p. 466); at that of Pope Agapetus in Constantinople (Baronius, *ann.* 536, § 64, vol. ix., p. 544).

This usage is found in the Mozarabic rite, and perhaps once existed in the ancient Gallican (Baronius, *ann.* 590, § 39, vol. x. p. 485).

(Bona, *De Divina Psalmodia*, c. xvi. § 7; *De Rebus Liturgicis*, lib. ii., c. 6, § 5; Krazzer, *De Liturgiis*, p. 419.) [C.]

**ALL SAINTS, FESTIVAL OF** (*Omnium Sanctorum Natalis, Festivitas, Solemnitas*).—In the Eastern Church a particular Sunday, the first after Pentecost, was appropriated in ancient times to the commemoration of all martyrs. Chrysostom, in the *Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους πάντας τοὺς ἐν δόξῃ τῷ κόσμῳ μαρτυρήσαντας*, says that on the Octave of Pentecost they find themselves in the midst of the band of martyrs; *παρέλαβεν ἡμᾶς μαρτύρων χόρος* (Opp. ii. 711); and there is a similar allusion in *Orat. contra Judaeos*, vi. (Opp. ii. p. 650). This Festival of All Martyrs became in later times a Festival of All Saints, and the Sunday next after Pentecost appears in the Calendar of the Greek Menologion as *Κυριακὴ τῶν Ἁγίων πάντων*. The intention in so placing this commemoration probably was to crown the ecclesiastical year with a solemnity dedicated to the whole glorious band of saints and martyrs.

In the West, the institution of this festival is intimately connected with the dedication to Christian purposes of the Pantheon or Rotunda at Rome. This temple, built in honour of the victory of Augustus at Actium, was dedicated by M. Agrippa to Jupiter Vindex, and was called the Pantheon, probably from the number of statues of the gods which it contained, though other reasons are assigned for the name.

Up to the time of St. Gregory the Great, idol-temples were generally thrown down, or, if they were suffered to remain, were thought unworthy to be used in the service of God. Gregory himself at first maintained this principle, but in the latter part of his life, thought it would conduce more to the conversion of the heathen if they were allowed to worship in the accustomed spot with new rites (see his well-known letter to Mellitus, in Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 30; Opp. vi. p. 79); and from this time, the principle of converting heathen fanes to Christian uses seems to have become familiar. In the beginning of the 7th century, the Pantheon remained almost the solitary monument of the old heathen worship in Rome. In the year 607 Boniface III. obtained from the Emperor Phocas the important recognition of the supremacy of Rome over all

other churches; and in the same year his successor, Boniface IV., having cleansed and restored the Pantheon, obtained the emperor's permission to dedicate it to the service of God, in the name "S. Mariae semper Virginis et omnium Martyrum:" (*Liber Pontif. in Muratori, Rer. Ital. Scriptores*, iii. 1, 135). This dedication is commemorated, and is believed to have taken place, on May 13. On this day we find in the old Roman Martyrology edited by Rosweyd, "S. Mariae ad Martyres dedicationis dies agitur a Bonifacio Papa statutus." Baronius tells us, that he found it recorded in an ancient MS. belonging to the Church itself, that it was first dedicated "In honorem S. Mariae, Dei Genetricis, et omnium Ss. Martyrum et Confessorum;" and that at the time of dedication the bones of martyrs from the various cemeteries of the city were borne in a procession of twenty-eight carriages to the church. (*Martyrol. Rom.* p. 204.) The technical use of the word "confessor" seems, however, to indicate a somewhat later date than that of the dedication; and Paulus Diaconus (*Hist. Longobard.* iv. 37, p. 570) tells us simply that Phocas granted Boniface permission, "Ecclesiam beatae semper Virginis Mariae et omnium Martyrum fieri, ut ubi quondam omnium non deorum sed daemonum cultus erat, ibi deinceps omnium fieret memoria sanctorum," and the church bears to this day the name of "S. Maria dei Martiri." This festival of the 13th May was not wholly confined to the city of Rome, yet it seems to have been little more than a dedication-festival of the Rotunda, corresponding to the dedication-festivals of other churches, but of higher celebrity, as the commemoration of the final victory of Christianity over Paganism.

The history of the establishment of the festival of All Saints on Nov. 1 is somewhat obscure. The *Martyrologium Rom. Vet.*, already quoted, gives under "Kal. Novembr." a "Festivitas Sanctorum, quae celebris et generalis agitur Romae." The very terms here used show that this "Festivitas Sanctorum" was a specially Roman festival, and it was probably simply the dedication-feast of an oratory dedicated by Gregory III. "In honorem Omnium Sanctorum." But in the 8th century, the observance of the festival was by no means confined to Rome. Beda's *Metrical Martyrology* has

"Multipli rutllat gemma ceu in fronte November,  
Sanctorum fulget Sanctorum laude decoria."

In the ancient Hieronymian calendar in V'achery (*Spicileg.* tom. ii.), it appears under Kal. Novemb., but only in the third place; "Natalis St. Caesarii; St. Andomari Episcopi; sive Omnium Sanctorum." The list of festivals in the *Penitential* of Boniface gives "In solemnitate Omnium Sanctorum;" but the feast is not found in the list given by Chrodogang (an. 762), or in Charlemagne's Capitulary (*Opp. Caroli Magni*, i. 326) on the subject of festivals. It appears then to have been observed by some churches in Germany, France, and England in the middle of the 8th century, but not universally. It was perhaps this diversity of practice which induced Gregory IV., in the year 835, to suggest to the Emperor Lewis the Pious, a general ordinance on the subject. Sigebert, in his *Chronicon* (in Pistorius, *Script. Germ.* tom. i.), tells us, under that year, "Tunc monente Gre-

gorio Papa, et omnibus episcopis assentientibus, Ludovicus Imperator statuit, ut in Gallia et Germania Festivitas Omnium Sanctorum in Kal. Novemb. celebraretur, quam Romani ex instituto Bonifacii Papae celebrant." (Compare *Adonis Martyrol.* ed. Rosweyd, p. 180.) It would seem from this, that the festivals of May 13 and Nov. 1 had already coalesced on the latter day, and that the one festival then observed was referred to Boniface IV., who, in fact, instituted that of May 13. The time was perhaps chosen as being, in a large part of Lewis's dominions, the time of leisure after harvest, when men's hearts are disposed to thankfulness to the Giver of all good. From this time, All Saints' day became one of the great festivals of the Church, and its observance general throughout Europe.

It probably had a Vigil from the first, as before the time of its general observance a Vigil and Fast preceded the great festivals of the Church. It may, perhaps, have had an octave from its first institution in Rome itself; but this was not the case in other churches, for an octave of All Saints does not seem to be found in any calendar earlier than the 13th century. Proper collects, preface, and benediction for the "Natalis Omnium Sanctorum" are found in some, but not the most ancient, MSS. of the Gregorian Sacramentary (p. 138).

(Baronius in *Martyrologio Romano*, May 13 and Nov. 1; Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vol. v. pt. 1, p. 487 ff.; Alt in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, i. 247.) [C.]

ALL SOULS, FESTIVAL OF (*Omnium fidelium defunctorum memoria* or *commemoratio*). Very ancient traces of the observance of a day for the commemoration of "the souls of all those who have died in the communion of the body and blood of our Lord" (according to Cyprian) appear in the Fathers of the Church.

Tertullian (*De Coronâ Militis*, c. 3) says, "Oblationes pro defunctis annua die facimus." And to the same effect he speaks (*De Exhort. Castitatis*, c. 11, and *De Monogam.* c. 10) of annual offerings (oblationes) for the souls of the departed. These were probably made on the anniversary of the death, and were especially the business of surviving relatives. So Chrysostom (*Hom. 29 in Acta Apost.*), speaks of those who made commemoration of a mother, a wife or a child. Similarly Augustine (*De Curâ pro Mortuis*, ch. 4).

It appears from an allusion in Amalarius of Metz (before 837) that in his time a day was specially dedicated to the commemoration of all souls of the departed, and it seems probable that this was the day following All Saints' Day. Amalarius says expressly (*De Eccl. Officiis*, lib. iii. c. 44) "Anniversaria dies ideo repetitur pro defunctis, quoniam nescimus qualiter eorum causa habeatur in alterâ vitâ." And in c. 65, he says "Post officium Sanctorum inserui officium pro mortuis; multi enim transierunt de praesenti saeculo qui non illico sanctis conjunguntur, pro quibus solito more officium agitur." The festival of All Souls is here regarded as a kind of supplement to that of All Saints, and may very probably have taken place on the morrow of that day. But the earliest definite injunction for the observance of a commemoration of all souls of the departed on Nov 2 appears to

be that of Odilo, Abbot of Clugny, in the 10th century. A pilgrim returning from Jerusalem, says Peter Damiani (*Vita Odilonis*, Opp. ii. 410), reported to Odilo a woful vision which he had had on his journey of the suffering of souls in purgatorial fire; Odilo thereupon instituted in the churches under his control a general commemoration of the souls of the faithful departed on the day following All Saints' Day: "per omnia monasteria sua constituit generale decretum, ut sicut primo die Mensis Novembris juxta universalis Ecclesiae regulam omnium Sanctorum solemnitas agitur; ita sequenti die in psalmis, eleemosynis et praecipue Missarum solemniss, omnium in Christo quiescentium memoria celebraretur." This order was soon adopted, not only by other monastic congregations, but by bishops for their dioceses; for instance, by the contemporary Bishop Notger of Liège (*Chronicon Belgicum*, in Pistorius's *Scriptores German.* iii. 92). The observance appears, in fact, in a short time to have become general, without any ordinance of the Church at large on the subject.

But even after the observance of a commemoration of All Souls on Nov. 2 became common, we find (*Statutes of Cahors*, in Martene, *Thesaurus Anecd.* iv. 766) that in some places the morrow of St. Hilary's Day (Jan. 14), and in others the morrows of the Octaves of Easter and Pentecost were appropriated to the special commemoration of the souls of the departed (Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vol. v. pt. 1, p. 492 ff.). [C.]

**ALMACHIUS**, martyr at Rome, commemorated Jan. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae). [C.]

**ALMS** (Ελεημοσύνη, non-classical in this sense, either word or thing; although for the thing, see Seneca, *De Benefic.* vi. 3, and Martial, *Epigr.* v. 42; and for the word also, Diog. Laert. v. 17: first found in the special meaning of alms in LXX., Dan. iv. 24 [27 Heb.], where the original reads "righteousness;" so also Tobit xii. 9, xiv. 11 [and elsewhere], Ecclus. iii. 30, iv. 2, vii. 10, xxix. 15, 16, xxxv. 2). Alms recognized as a duty throughout the O. T., but brought into prominence in the later Jewish period (cf. Buxtorf, *Floril. Hebr.* p. 88; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. in Matt.* vi. 2, *Luc.* ii. 8), when they were formally and regularly given in the synagogues (*Vitring. De Syn. Vet.*) to be distributed by appointed officers, as also by putting them into certain trumpet-shaped alms-boxes in the temple, called γασοφυλάκια (Le Moyne, *Not. in Var. Sac.* ii. 75; Deyling, *Observ. Sac.* iii. 175; distinct from the γασοφυλάκιον or treasury of St. Luke xxi. 1). They were regarded also as a work specially acceptable to God (Prov. xix. 17, xxii. 9, &c.; Tobit, and Ecclus., passim; St. Luke xi. 41, Acts x. 2). In like manner they became in the Christian Church—

I. A fundamental law of Christian morality (St. Matt. x. 42, xix. 21, xxv. 35; St. Luke xii. 33; Acts ii. 44, iv. 34–37, xi. 29, 30; Rom. xii. 13, xv. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 12, ix. 7; Gal. ii. 1, vi. 10; Ephes. iv. 28; 1 Tim. vi. 18; Hebr. xiii. 16; 1 Pet. iv. 8, 9; 1 John iii. 17), so thoroughly recognized as to make it both superfluous and impossible to enumerate patristic allusions to it. Special tracts on almsgiving, by St. Cyprian, *De Opere et Eleemos.*; St. Greg.

Nyss., *De Pauperibus Amandis Orat. II.* St. Greg. Naz., *De Pauperum Amore Orat.*; St. Basil M., *Serm. de Eleemos.* inter *Sermon.* XXIV.; St. Ephraem Syrus, *De Amore Pauperum*; St. Leo M., *Sermones VI. De Collectis et Eleemos.*; St. Maximus, *Ad Joann. Cubic. Epist. II.* (*De Eleemos.*); and among the sermons attributed to St. Chrysostom, one *De Jejun. et Eleemos.*, and three *De Eleemos.*, &c. (and see a collection of patristic citations in Drexelius, *De Eleemosyna*). Even Julian the Apostate, c. A.D. 351, bears testimony that the almsgiving of "the Galileans" overflowed beyond their own poor to the heathen (*Epist. ad Arsac.*, *Epist.* xlix.; and compare Lucian, as quoted below); and thinks it expedient to boast of his own kindness (*Ad Themist.*). Compare also such notable examples as those, e.g., of Pope Soter as described by his contemporary Dionysius Bishop of Corinth, c. A.D. 160 (ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23); of Paulinus of Nola; of Deo Gratias Bishop of Carthage towards Genseric's captives (see Milman, *L. C.* i. 205, and Gibbon); of Johannes "Eleemosynarius," Patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 606–616: and the occurrence of such expressions as, "Hoc praestat eleemosyna quod et Baptisma" (St. Hieron. in *Ps. cxxxiii.*), "Christiani sacrificium est eleemosyna in pauperem" (St. Aug. *Serm.* xlii., from Heb. xiii. 16); or again, that almsgiving is the "characteristic mark of a Christian,"—*χαρακτηριστικὸν Χριστιανού*, and that it is *μέγλη ἀγάπη, φάρμακον ἀμαρτημάτων, κλίμαξ εἰς τὸ οὐρανὸν ἐστηρυμένη* (St. Chrys. in *Heb. Hom.* xxxii., and in *Tit. Hom.* vi.); or again, that "res ecclesiae" are "patrimonia pauperum."

II. An integral part of Christian worship (Acts ii. 42, vi. 1; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 1 Tim. v. 3, 16): alms for the poor, to be distributed by the clergy (Acts xi. 30), being a regular portion of the offering made in church, among those for the support of the clergy, and oblations in kind for the Church services (Justin M., *Apol. I.* p. 98, Thirlby; St. Greg. Naz., *Orat.* xx., Opp. i. 351; *Constit. Apostol.* iv. 6, 8; St. Chrys., *Hom.* l. in *Matth.* Opp. vii. 518, Ben.; *Conc. Gangra* circ. A.D. 324, c. 8; for the East:—St. Iren. *Adv. Haer.* iv. 18; St. Cypr., *De Op. et Eleem.* 203, Fell; Tertull., *Apol.* 39; Arnob., *Ad Gent.* iv., in fin.; St. Ambros., *Ep.* xvii. *A Valent.* Opp. ii. 827, Ben.; *Conc. Eliber.*, A.D. 304, cc. 28, 29; *Conc. Carthag.* iv., A.D. 394 cc. 93, 94; Optatus, *De Schism. Donat.* vi. p. 9; Albaspin.; *Conc. Matiscon.* ii., A.D. 585, c. 4 *Hom.* cclxv. in *Append. ad S. Aug.* Opp. v. *Resp. Greg. M. ad Qu. Aug.* ap. Baed. *H.* i. 27; for the West: Psalms being sung, at least at Carthage, during the collection and distribution, St. Aug. *Retract.* ii. 11); and this as a privilege, the names of considerable donors being recited (*Constit. Apostol.* iii. 4; St. Cypr., *Epist. al.* xvii., lx. *al.* lxii.; St. Hieron., in *Jerem.* lib. ii., in *Ezech.* xviii.; St. Chrys., *Hom.* xvi. in *Act.*; *Gest. Caecil. et Felic.* ad fin. *Optati* p. 9; and the offerings of evil-livers, energumens, and of those who communicate persons, suicides, and of those in enmity with their brethren, being rejected (Iren., *Adv. Haer.* iv. 34; Tertull., *De Praxor.* 30; *Constit. Apost.* iv. 5–7; St. Athan., *Ep. Solitar.*, p. 364, ed. 1698; *Epist. ad Bonifac.* *App. ad Opp. S. Aug.* ii.; *Conc. Ilerd.* A.D. 524, 13; and *Antissiod.* i., A.D. 578, c. 17; the Irish synods assigned to St. Patrick, c. 12, Wilk. i.

and c. 2, ib 4; and St. Ambrose, Optatus, and the Councils of *Lerida* and *Carthage*, above quoted; or later still, *Capit. Herard. Archiep. Turon.* 116, in Baluz. *Capit.* i. 1294, and repeatedly in the *Capitularies*). There was also an alms-box (*γαλοφιλάνιον*, *corbōna*, see St. Cypr., *De Op. et Elamos.*, and St. Hieron., *Epist.* 27, c. 14), placed in the church for casual alms, to be taken out monthly (Tertull. *Apol.* 39). And Paulinus (*Epist.* 32) speaks of a table (*mensa*) for receiving the offerings. Collections for the poor in church both on Sundays and on week days are mentioned by St. Leo the Great (*Serm. de Collectis*). The poor also habitually sat at the church door, at least in the East, to receive alms (St. Chrys., *Hom.* xxvi. *De Verb. Apost.*, *Hom.* i. in 3 Tim., *Hom.* iii. *De Poenit.*).

III. An institution having a formal list of recipients, mainly widows and orphans (St. Ignat., *ad Polycarp.* iv.; *Constit. Apost.* iv. 4, &c.); or, upon occasion, martyrs in prison or in the mines, or other prisoners, or shipwrecked persons (Dion. Coriath. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23; Tertull., *De Jejun.* 13; Lucian, *De Morte Peregrin.* § 11, Op. viii. 279, Bipont.; Liban., A.D. 387, *Orat.* xvi. in *Tismen.*, *Orat. de Vincis*, ii. 258, 445, ed. Reiske); and special officers, as for other directly ecclesiastical functions, so also for managing the Church alms, viz. deacons (*Constit. Apost.* ii. 31, 32, iii. 19; Dionys. Alex. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 11; St. Cypr., *Epist.* xli., and xlix. al. lii., Fell.; St. Hieron., *Ad Nepot. Epist.* xxxiv.); and among women, deaconesses, commonly widows of advanced age (*Constit. Apost.* iii. 15; St. Hieron., *Ad Nepot. Epist.* xxxiv.; and Lucian and Libanius as above). See also Tertullian (*Ad Uxor.* ii. 4 and 8) for the charitable works of married Christian matrons.

IV. These arrangements were supplemented when necessary by special collections appointed by the bishop (Tertull., *De Jejun.* 13), after the pattern of St. Paul, for extraordinary emergencies, whether at home or among brethren or others elsewhere; e.g. St. Cyprian's collection of "sestertia centum millia nummorum" for the redemption of Numidian captives from the barbarians (St. Cypr., *Epist.* lx.); mostly accompanied by fast days (Tertull. *ib.*—and so, long after, Theodulph, A.D. 787 [*Capit.* 38], enjoins almsgiving continually, but specially on fast days), but sometimes at the ordinary Church service (St. Leo M., *De Collectis*): a practice which grew sometimes into the abuse which was remedied by the Council of Tours (ii. A.D. 567, c. 5), enacting that each city should provide for its own poor, and by Gregory the Great, desiring the Bishop of Milan to protect a poor man at Genoa from being compelled to contribute to such a collection (St. Greg., *Epist.* ix. 126). See also St. Hieron., *Adc. Vigilantium*.

The *ἐκδοταὶ* also may be mentioned in this connection (1 Cor. xi. 20, Jude 12; Tertull., *Apol.* 39; *Constit. Apost.* ii. 28; prohibited *Conc. Laod.*, A.D. 364, c. 5, and see *Conc. Quiniext.* A.D. 762, c. 74; and under AGAPAE). Also the *ἐκδοταὶ* or *ἐκδοχῆς* (St. Chrys., *Hom.* xlv. in *Art. Apostol.*; St. Aug., *Tract.* xcvi. in *Joh.* § 4); the *πρωτοτροφία*, managed by the "κληρικοὶ or ἀφρογόμενοι τῶν πρωχέλων" (*Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, c. 8; and Pallad., *Hist. Laus.* v.); the *γρηγορέα*, the *ροσκομεία* (Pallad., *V. Chrys.* p. 19), the *ὀρφανοτροφία*: of which the

names explain themselves (and see abundant references in Suicer, *sub vocc.*, and Justinian also enacts laws respecting such institutions and the clergy who manage them), and which came into being with the Christian Church. E.g., the *Βασιλειὰς* of St. Basil at Caesarea stands as a notable example of a Christian hospital, at once for sick and strangers (St. Basil. M., *Epist.* 94; St. Greg. Naz., *Orat.* xxvii. and xxx.; Sozom. vi. 34), with its smaller offshoots in the neighbouring country (St. Basil. M., *Epist.* 142, 143); and so also the hospital of St. Chrysostom, with his advice on the subject to the faithful of Constantinople (St. Chrys., *Hom.* xlv. in *Act. Apost.* Opp. ix. 343); and the *Xenodochium* founded "in portu Romano" by Pammachius and Fabiola (St. Hieron., *Ad Ocean. Ep.* lxxxiv.). Add also the alms given at marriage and at funerals (St. Chrys., *Hom.* xxxii. in *S. Matth.*; St. Hieron., *Ad Pammach. de Obitu Uxor. Ep.* liv.; Pseudo-Origen., *Comment. in Job.* lib. iii. p. 437; St. Aug., *Cont. Faust.* xx. 20; and see Bingham). Our own Council of Cealchyth, in A.D. 816 (c. 10), directs the tenth of a bishop's substance to be given in alms upon his death. The Manichaeans appear to have refused alms to needy persons not Manichaeans on some recondite principle of their connection with the principle of evil, for which they are condemned by St. Aug. (*De Mor. Manich.* ii. 15, 16) and Theodoret (*Haer. Fab.* i. 26).

There was apparently no specified rule for division of ecclesiastical revenues, originally of course entirely voluntary offerings, anterior to the 5th century; the bishop being throughout their chief administrator, but by the hands of the deacons (see e.g. St. Cypr., about Felicissimus, *Epist.* xli.; and *Conc. Gangr.*, c. 8, and Epiphanius, *Haer.* xl., condemning the Eustathians for withdrawing their alms from the bishop or the officer appointed by him). In the Western Church in the 5th century (setting aside the questionable decree of the Synod of Rome under Sylvester in 324) we find a fourfold division of them: 1, for the bishop; 2, for the clergy; 3, for the poor; 4, for the fabric and sustentation of the churches. Or again, for 1. Churches; 2. Clergy; 3. Poor; 4. Strangers. This originated with the Popes Simplicius (*Epist.* 3, A.D. 467) and Gelasius (in *Gratian Caus.* 12 qu. 2, c. *Sancimus*, A.D. 492); is mentioned repeatedly by St. Gregory the Great at the end of the 6th century (e.g. *Ep.* iv. 11, v. 44, vii. 8, xiii. 44; *Resp. ad August.*, &c.;—and see also *Conc. Aurel.* I. c. 5), was varied in Charlemagne's and Lud. Pius' *Capitularies* (i. 80, Baluz. 718), as regarded voluntary offerings, into two-thirds to the poor and one-third to the clergy in rich places, and half to each in poor ones; but was repeated in the old form by the *Capit.* of Charlemagne himself respecting tithes (Baluz. i. 356) and by the *Counc. of Worms*, A.D. 868, c. 7; *Tribur.*, A.D. 895, c. 13; and *Nantes*, A.D. 895 (?), c. 10 (if at least this last is not to be referred to the Council of Nantes in 658).

The special office of *Eleemosynarius* or *Almoner* occurs in later times, afterwards the name of the superintendent of the alms-house or hospital, but at first a distributor of alms: both in monasteries (described at length by Du Cange, from a MS. of St. Victor of Paris), although the office in the older Egyptian monasteries belonged to the



*oeconomus*, under the special name of *διακονία* (Cassian, *Collat.* xviii. 7, xxi. 9); and afterwards, in England at least, as an officer attached to each bishop (*Conc. Oxon.*, A.D. 1222; Lyndw., *Provinc.* i. 13, p. 67); and lastly to the king, as *e.g.* in England, and notably to the Kings of France (see a list in Du Cange).

In the history of doctrine, the subject of almsgiving is connected—I. With the notions of community of goods, voluntary poverty, and the difficulty of salvation to the rich; the current voice of fathers, as *e.g.* Tertull., *Apol.* 39, Justin M., *Apol.* i., Arnob. *Adv. Gent.* iv. in fin., magnifying the temper indicated by τὰ τῶν φίλων πάντα κοινά, while others, as St. Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* iii. 6, p. 536, Potter), rejected its literal and narrow perversion (see also his tract at length, *Quis Dives Salvetur*); which perversion indeed the Church condemned in the cases of the *Apostolici* or *Apotactitae* (St. Aug., *De Haer.* xl. Opp. viii. 9; St. Epiphan., *Haer.* lxi.), and of the *Massalians* (St. Epiphan. *Haer.* lxx.), and again in that of the *Pelagians*, who maintained that rich men must give up their wealth in order to be saved (so at least Pseudo-Sixtus III., *De Divitiis*; and see St. Aug., *Epist.* cvi. ad Paulin., and *Conc. Diospolit.* § 6, A.D. 415). Compare Mosheim's *Diss. de Vera Nat. Commun. Bonorum in Eccl. Hieros.* II. With the relation of good works to justification; alms and fasting standing prominently in the question, i. as comparatively outward and positive acts, ii. as being specially urged from early times as parts of repentance and charity (*e.g.* Hermas, *Pastor* x. 4; Salvian, *Adv. Avarit.* ii. p. 205; Lactant., *Div. Instit.* vi. 13, tom. i. p. 470; *Constit. S. Clem.* vii. 12; St. Ambros., *De Elia et Jejun.* xx.; St. Chrys., *Hom.* vii. de *Poenit.* § 6, Opp. ii. 336 C). "Date et dabitur vobis," found its answer in the repeated occurrence of the words (*e.g.* St. Caesar. Arel., *Hom.* xv.; St. Eligius, in *Vita* ii. 15, ap. D'Ach., *Spicil.* ii. 96), "Da, Domine, quia dedimus;" but the whole doctrine derived its colour in each case from the successive phases of the doctrine of merit. III. With (in time) the idea of compounding for other sins by alms, a feeling strengthened by the imposition of alms by way of satisfaction and of commutation of penance. The introduction of the practice is attributed to Theodore of Canterbury, c. A.D. 700, but upon the ground only of the Penitentials hitherto falsely attributed to him; while the abuse of it is severely condemned by the Council of Cloveshoe, A.D. 747 (c. 26), and by Theodulph (*Capit.* 32, A.D. 787). Its grossest instance is probably to be found in the ledger-like calculation of the payments, by which "powerful men" could redeem their penances, in Eadgar's canons, in fin. (Thorpe, ii. 286-289), about A.D. 963. See also Morinus, *De Poenit.* lib. x. c. 17, who treats the question at length. IV. With alms for the dead. See *Conc. Carth.* iv., A.D. 398, c. 79; St. Chrys., as before quoted, and Bingham. See also for later times, Car. M., *Capit.* v. 364, ap. Baluz. i. 902.

Plough-alms in England (*eleem. carucarum, Sahl-aclmyssan*), viz., a penny for every plough used in tillage, to be paid annually fifteen days after Easter (*Laws of Eadgar and Guthrun*, A.D. 906, c. 6; *Eadgar's Laws* i. 2, and can. 54, A.D. 959 and 975; *Ethelred's*, ix. 12, A.D. 1014; *Canons*, c. 8, c. A.D. 1030: *Rectit. Sing Pers.*, § de

*Villanis*), were rather a church due than alms properly so called. As was also St. Peter's penny, *Eleemos. S. Petri*. And *Libera Eleemosyna*, or Frank-Almoign, is the tenure of most Church lands from Saxon times (viz., tenure on condition, not of specified religious services, but of Divine Service generally), although now incapable of being created *de novo* (*Stat. Quia Emptores*, 18 Edw. I.). See Stephen's *Blackstone*, i., Bk. II. Pt. i. c. 2, in fin. [A. W. H.]

ALNENSE CONCILIUM. [ALCESTER, COUNCIL OF.]

ALTAR.—The table or raised surface on which the Eucharist is consecrated.

#### I. Names of the Altar.

1. *τράπεζα*, a table; as *τράπεζα Κυρίου*, 1 Cor. x. 21. This is the term most commonly used by the Greek Fathers and in Greek Liturgies; sometimes simply, ἡ *τράπεζα*, as the Table by pre-eminence (Chrysost. in *Ephes.* Hom. 3), but more frequently with epithets expressive of awe and reverence; *μυστική*, *πνευματική*, *φοβερή*, *φρικτή*, *φρικώδης*, *βασιλική*, *ἀθάνατος*, *ιερά*, *ἁγία*, *θεία*, and the like (see Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v.). St. Basil in one passage (*Ep.* 73, Opp. ii. 870) appears to contrast the Tables (*τράπεζας*) of the orthodox with the Altars (*θυσιαστήρια*) of Basilides. Sozomen (*Eccl. Hist.* ix. 2, p. 368) says of a slab which covered a tomb that it was fashioned as if for a Holy Table (*ὥστερ εἰς ἱερὰ ἐξησκεῖτο τράπεζαν*), a passage which seems to show that he was familiar with stone tables.

2. *Θυσιαστήριον*, the place of Sacrifice; the word used in the Septuagint for Noah's altar (*Gen.* viii. 20), and both for the Altar of Burnt sacrifice and the Altar of Incense under the Levitical law, but not for heathen altars.

The word *θυσιαστήριον* in Heb. xiii. 10, is referred by some commentators to the Lord's Table, though it seems to relate rather to the heavenly than to the earthly sanctuary (Thomas Aquinas). The *θυσιαστήριον* of Ignatius, to (*ad Philad.* 4; compare *Magn.* 7; *Trall.* 7) can scarcely designate the Table used in the Eucharist (see Lightfoot on *Philippians*, p. 26 n. 2). But by this word Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* x. 4, § 44) describes the altar of the great church in Tyre, and again (*Panegy.* sub fin.) speaks of altars (*θυσιαστήρια*) erected throughout the world. Athanasius, or Pseudo-Athanasius (*Disp. cont. Arium*, Opp. i. 90), explains the word *τράπεζα* by *θυσιαστήριον*. This name rarely occurs in the liturgies. *Θυσιαστήριον* not unfrequently designates the enclosure with which the altar stood, or BEMA (see Mede, *On the Name Altar or Θυσιαστήριον*, Works, p. 382 ff).

3. The Copts call the altar *ἱλαστήριον*, a word applied in the Greek Scriptures to the Mercy-Seat, or covering of the Ark [compare ARCA]; but in the Coptic liturgy of St. Basil they use the ancient Egyptian word *Pimam schoouschi*, which in Coptic versions of Scripture answers to the Heb. פִּימָם שְׁכוּשְׁכִּי and the Greek *θυσιαστήριον* (Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.* i. 181).

4. The word *βωμὸς* (see Nitzsch on 1 *Odyssey*, vol. ii. p. 15) is used in Scripture and in Christian writers generally for a heathen altar. Thus in 1 Maccab. i. 54, we read that the persecution under Antiochus an "abomination of desolation" was built on the Temple-altar.

Θυσιαστήριον), while idol-altars (Βωμοί) were set up in the cities of Judah; and, again (i. 59), sacrifices were offered "ἐν τῷ Βωμῷ ὅς ἦν ἐν τῷ Θυσιαστηρίῳ." The word Βωμός is, however, applied to the Levitical altar in Ecclesiasticus i. 12, the work of a *gentilizing* writer. It is generally repudiated by early Christian writers, except in a figurative sense: thus Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vii. p. 717) and Origen (*c. Celsus* viii. p. 389) declare that the soul is the true Christian altar (Βωμός), the latter expressly admitting the charge of Celsus, that the Christians had no material altars. Yet in later times Βωμός was sometimes used for the Christian altar; Synesius, for instance (*Kardorasis*, c. 19, p. 303), speaks of flying for refuge to the unbloody altar (Βωμόν).

5. The expression "Mensa Domini," or "Mensa Dominica," is not uncommon in the Latin Fathers, specially St. Augustine (e.g. *Sermo* 21, c. 5, on Pa. lxiii. 11). And an altar raised in honour of a martyr frequently bore his name; as "Mensa Cypriani" (Augustine, *Sermo* 310). The word "mensa" is frequently used for the slab which formed the top of the altar (v. infra).

6. Ara, the Vulgate rendering of Βωμός (1 Maccab. i. 54 [57], etc.), is frequently applied by Tertullian to the Christian altar, though not without some qualification; for instance, "ara Dei" (*de Oratione*, c. 14). Yet ara, like Βωμός, is repudiated by the early Christian apologists on account of its heathen associations; thus Minucius Felix (*Octavius*, c. 32) admits that "Delubra et aras non habemus;" compare Arnobius (*adu. Gentes* vi. 1) and Lactantius (*Divin. Institut.* ii. 2). In rubrica, Ara designates a portable altar or consecrated slab. (Macri *Hieroglyphicon*, s.v. "Altare.") Ara is also used for the substructure on which the mensa, or altar proper, was placed; "Altaris aram funditus pessumdare" (Prudentius, *Peristeph.* xiv. 49). Compare Ardo Smaragdus, quoted below.

7. But by far the most common name in the Latin Fathers and in Liturgical diction is altare, a "high altar," from altus (Isidore, *Origines*, xv. 4, p. 1197; compare alveare, collare). This is the Vulgate equivalent of θυσιαστήριον. Tertullian (*de Exhort. Castitatis* c. 10) speaks of the Lord's Table as "altare" simply; so also Cyprian (*Epist.* 45, § 3, ed. Goldhorn), who, by the phrase "altari posito," indicates that the church-altar in his time was moveable; and who, in another place (*Epist.* 59, § 25), contrasts the Lord's Altar ("Domini Altare") with the "ara" of idols. So again (*Epist.* 65, § 1) he contrasts "aras diaboli" with "Altare Dei." So Augustine (*Sermo* 159, § 1) speaks of "Altare Dei." Yet Cyprian speaks (*Ep.* 59, § 15) of "diaboli altaria," so uncertain was the usage. In the Latin liturgies scarcely any other name of the altar occurs but altare. The plural altaria is also occasionally used by ecclesiastical writers, as invariably by classical authors, to designate an altar; thus Caesarius of Arles (*Hom.* 7) says that the elements (creaturae) to be consecrated "sacris altaribus imponuntur." (Mone's *Griech. u. Lat. Messen*, p. 6.)

The singular "altarium" is also used in late writers: as in the Canon of the Council of Auxerre quoted below, mass is not to be said more than once a day, "super uno altario." Altarium is also used in a wider sense, like

θυσιαστήριον, for the BEMA or Sanctuary; so also altaria.

8. In most European languages, not only of the Romanesque family, but also of the Teutonic and Slavonic, the word used for the Lord's Table is derived, with but slight change, from altare. In Russian, however, another word, *prestol*, properly a throne, is in general use. [C.]

II. *Parts composing altars.*—Although in strictness the table or tomb-like structure constitutes the altar, the steps on which it is placed, and the ciborium or canopy which covered it, may be considered parts of the altar in a larger sense, or, at least, were so closely connected with it, as to make it more convenient to treat of them under the same head.

The altar itself was composed of two portions, the supports, whether legs or columns, in the table form, or slabs in the tomb-like, and the "mensa" or slab which formed the top.

The expression "cornu altaris," horn of the altar, often used in rituals (as in the *Sacrament. Gelasianum* 1, c. lxxxviii.), appears to mean merely the corner or angle of the altar, no known example showing any protuberance at the angles or elsewhere above the general level of the mensa, although in some instances (as in that in the church of S. Giovanni Evangelista at Ravenna hereafter mentioned) the central part of the surface of the mensa is slightly hollowed. By the Cornu Evangelii is meant the angle to the left of the priest celebrating, by Cornu Epistolae that to the right. These phrases must, however, it would seem, date from a period subsequent to that when the Gospel was read from the ambo.

III. *Material and form of altars.*—It is admitted by all that the earliest altars were tables of wood; in the high altar of the church of S. Giovanni Laterano at Rome is enclosed an altar of the tomb-like form, the mensa and sides formed of wooden planks, on which St. Peter is asserted to have celebrated the Lord's Supper, and at Sta. Pudenziana, in the same city, fragments of another are preserved to which the same tradition attaches. [ARCA.]

This shows an ancient belief that altars were of wood. And there is abundant proof that in Africa at least the Holy Table was commonly of wood up to the end of the fourth century. Athanasius, speaking of an outrage of the Arians in an orthodox church (*Ad Monachos*, *Opp.* i. 847), says that they burnt the Table (ξύλινη γὰρ ἦν) with other fittings of the church. Optatus of Mileve, describing the violence of the Donatists, mentions their planing afresh, or breaking up and using for firewood, the Holy Tables in the churches of their rivals (*De Schismate Donatistarum* vi. 1, p. 90 ff.); and St. Augustine (*Epist.* 185, c. 27) declares that they beat the orthodox Bishop Maximinianus with the wood of the altar under which he had taken refuge. In England, at a much later date, if we may trust William of Malmesbury (*Vita S. Wulstani*, in *De Gestis Pontif. Angl.* iii. 14), Wulstan, bishop of Worcester (1062–1095), demolished throughout his diocese the wooden altars which were still in existence in England as in ancient days, "altaria lignea jam inde a priscis diebus in Angliâ." Martene (*De Antiq. Eccl. Ritibus* i. 3) and Mabillon (*Acta SS. Benedict.* Saec. vi., pars 2, p. 860) have shown that wooden altars were anciently used in Gaul.



Yet there is distinct evidence of the existence of stone altars in the fourth century. Gregory of Nyssa (*De Christi Baptismo*, Opp. III. 369) speaks of the stone of which the altar was made being hallowed by consecration. To the same effect St. Chrysostom (on 1 Cor. Hom. 20). And stone became in time the usual canonical material of an altar. The assertion that Pope Sylvester (314-335) first decreed that altars should be of stone rests upon no ancient authority (Bona, *De Reb. Lit.* I., c. 20, § 1). The earliest decree of a council bearing on the subject is one of the provincial council of Eponea (Pamiers in France) in 517, the 26th Canon of which (Brun's *Concomptes* II. 170) forbids any other than stone altars to be consecrated by the application of Chrism.

As this council was only provincial, its decrees were no doubt only partially received. The 14th chap. of the Capitularies of Charles the Great, A.D. 769 (Migne's *Patrologia*, xcvi. 124), orders that priests should not celebrate unless "in mensis lapideis ab Episcopis consecratis." This seems to mark a period when the use of wooden altars, although disapproved of, was by no means unknown. In the Eastern churches the material of the altar has been deemed a matter of less importance, and at all times down to the present day altars have been made of wood, stone, or metal.

Asseriani (*Bibl. Orient.* III. 238) cites a Canon of a Synod of the Syro-Jacobites, held circa A.D. 908, which orders the use of fixed altars of stone, and the disuse of wood; he adds that in the churches of the Maronites and of the Jacobites the altars were sometimes of wood, sometimes of stone (compare Nale, *Eastern Ch. Instr.* 181). In some instances at the present day pillars of stone are used to support a mass of wood.

This change of material was in some degree occasioned or accompanied by the adoption of a different type of form, that of the tomb. Such adoption has been usually accounted for by the supposition that the tombs in the Roman catacombs known as "arcozelle" were used during the period of persecution as altars. These arcozelle were formed by cutting in the wall of the chamber or oratory, at a height of about three feet from the floor, an opening covered by an arch. In the wall below this opening an excavation was made sufficiently large to receive one or sometimes two bodies, and this was covered by a slab of marble.

Such tombs would evidently furnish sufficiently convenient altars, but there appears to be some deficiency of proof that they were actually so used during the period of persecution, to which, indeed, the far greater number are by some centuries posterior. Some writers assert that up to the time of St. Sylvester the only altars in use were wooden chests [compare *ARCA*] carried about from place to place wherever the Roman bishop had his habitation. Whether this opinion be or be not well-founded, it is certain that traces of altars occupying the normal position, viz., the centre of the apse, have been found in the oratories of the catacombs. Bizio and Boldetti state that they had met with such, the one in the cemetery of Priscilla, the other in that of SS. Marcellinus and Peter, and Martigny (*Dict. des Antiq. Chr.* p. 58), adds that he had been shown by the Cav. de Rossi in

the cemetery of Calixtus the traces left by the four pillars which had supported an altar. The date of the altars in question does not, however, appear to have been clearly ascertained.

It was, however, not only in Rome that the memorials of martyrs and altars were closely associated; the 83rd Canon of the *Concilium Conc. Eccl. Afric.* A.D. 419 (in Brun's *Concomptes*, I. 176) orders that the altars which had been raised everywhere by the roads and in the fields as "Memoriae Martyrum," should be overturned when there was no proof that a martyr lay beneath them; and blames the practice of erecting altars in consecration of dreams and "insane revelations."

In the *Liber Pontificalis* it is stated that Pope Felix I. (A.D. 269-274) "constituit super supplicia martyrum missas celebrari," but perhaps the most clear proof of the prevalence of the practice of placing altars over the remains of martyrs and saints at an early period, are furnished by passages in Prudentius, particularly that so often quoted (*Peristeph.*, Hymn XI. v. 169-174):—

"Tallibus Hippolyti corpus mandatur operibus  
Propter ubi apponitur et ara dicitur Deo,  
Illa sacramentalis domus unumquodque  
Centes fidei sui martyris apponitur,  
Survivens ad aeternum spem iudicii cum corpore  
Punctum item sanctis thronis deditur."


The practice of placing the altar over the remains of martyrs or saints may probably have arisen from a disposition to look upon the sufferings of those confessors of the faith as analogous with that sacrifice which is commemorated in the Eucharist; and the passage in the Revelation (chap. vi. v. 9), "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God," no doubt encouraged or instigated the observance. The increasing disposition to venerate martyrs and their relics fostered this practice, by which, as Prudentius says (*Peristeph.*, Hymn. III. v. 211)—

"Sic venerant omnes ibi  
Constituit altar et insepulchrum."

And it took firm root in the Western Church; so much so that a rule has long been established that every altar must contain a relic or relics, among which should be one of the saint in whose honour it was consecrated. [CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES; RELICS.]

This practice, no doubt, conduced to the change of material from wood to stone, and also to a change of form from that of a table to that of a chest or tomb, or to the combination of the two. The table-form seems to have been still common in Africa in the early part of the 5th century: for Synesius (*Kardianos*, c. 19, p. 303), says that, in the terrors of the Vandal invasion, he would cast himself beneath the altar, and clasp the columns that supported it. The annexed woodcut furnishes an example of the combination of the table-form with the tomb-form. It was discovered in the ruins of the so-called basilica of S. Alessandro on the Via Nomentana, about seven miles from Rome, and may with all probability be ascribed to the fifth century. The mensa is a slab of porphyry, the rest is of marble. The small columns were not placed as represented in the woodcut at the time when the sketch from which it is taken was made; they were, however, found close by

the altar, and there can be little doubt but that they were originally so placed. Beneath the altar is a shallow excavation lined with marble,



Altar of St. Alexander on the Via Nomentana

in which the bones of St. Alexander are believed to have been deposited. The square opening in the cancellated slab was probably used for the purpose of introducing cloths [BRANDER], which were laid on the tomb of a saint, and afterwards preserved as relics. A part of the inscription on the front has been lost: what remains reads "et Alexandro Dilectus veto posuit dedicatus Aepiscopo Urs..." The name wanting at the beginning is supposed to be that of Eusebius, also buried in the same cemetery. Ursus is believed to have been bishop of Nomentum.

The altar in the apse-chapel at Ravenna, known as "S. Nazaro e Celso," is an example of the simple tomb-like form. The chapel was built about A.D. 450, and this altar may be of about the same date. According to the Rev. B. Webb (*Sketches of Continental Ecclesiology*, p. 439) it is composed of three slabs of alabaster supporting a mensa; on the ends are carved crosses; on the front is a cross between two sheep; and on each side of it the device of a crown suspended from a wreath. It is shown in the engraving of the chapel in Gally Knight's *Ecc. Arch. of Italy*.

In the somewhat earlier mosaics in the baptistery of the cathedral of Ravenna, altars are represented as tables supported by columns with capitals; the tables are represented red and the columns gold, indicating perhaps the use of porphyry and gilt bronze as the materials. Now, although the tomb-like form eventually became in the Western Church the ruling one, was the table-form disused, for examples of it of a date even as late as the thirteenth century are still extant.



Altar, from Auriol in France.

A variety of the table-form, in which the mensa is supported by only one leg, is shown in

the accompanying woodcut. This altar was found in the neighbourhood of Auriol, in the department of the Bouches-du-Rhône, in France, and may be attributed to the fifth or sixth century.

Martigny (*Dict. des Antiq. Chréti.*, p. 56) mentions other examples in which the mensa is supported by five columns, one being in the centre. One of these found at Avignon is supposed to have been erected by S. Agricola (doc. A.D. 500). Another, in the Musée at Marseilles, he attributes to the 5th century, and a third he says exists in the crypt of the church of St. Marthe, at Tarascon.

In the baptistery of the cathedral of Ravenna is an altar composed of a mensa with two columns in front, and a quadrangular block of marble, in which is a recess or cavity now closed by a modern brass door; the front of this block has some decoration of an architectural character, a small cross, doves, ears of wheat, and bunches of grapes. This central block would appear to be an altar (or part of one) of the 6th century. A very similar block is at Porence, in Istria, and is engraved in Heider and Eisselberger's *Mittelalterliche Kunstdenkmale des Oesterreichischen Kaiserstaates* (I. 109); the writer of that work is, however, disposed to consider it not an altar but a tabernacle.

Mr. Webb (*Sketches of Cont. Ecclesiology*, pp. 430, 440) mentions two altars at Ravenna, one in the crypt of S. Giovanni Evangelista, the other in the nave of S. Apollinare in Classe, of the same form as that of the baptistery of the Cathedral described above, and seems to consider this arrangement as original; but says of the altar of the baptistery that it was the tabernacle of the old Cathedral. He remarks that the mensa of the altar in S. Giovanni is not level, but slightly hollowed so as to leave a rim all round.

Many notices of altars may be found in the *Liber Pontificalis* (otherwise known as *Anastasius Bibliothecarius de Vita Pontificum*), as that Pope Hilarius (A.D. 461-467) made at S. Lorenzo f. l. m. "altare argenteum pensans libras quadraginta," that Leo III. (A.D. 795-816) made at S. Giovanni Laterano "altare majus mirae magnitudinis decoratum ex argenteo purissimo pensans libras sexaginta et novem."


In these and in the numerous like instances it is either expressly stated that the altar was decorated with gold or silver, or the quantity of the metal employed is evidently quite insufficient to furnish the sole material; but we are not told whether the altar was constructed of stone or of wood.

In a mosaic at S. Vitale, at Ravenna, dating from the 6th century (engraved in Webb's *Cont. Eccles.* p. 437), an altar doubtless is represented as standing on feet at the angles, and therefore of the table form. It has, according to Mr. Webb, an ornamental covering of white linen with a hanging beneath.

The annexed woodcut taken from the same work (p. 440) shows an altar similarly represented in a mosaic in S. Apollinare in Classe at Ravenna. This church was commenced between 544 and 538, and dedicated between 548 and 552, but much of the mosaic was not executed until between 671 and 677 (Hübner, *Altchristlichen Kirchen*).


Paul the Silentiary, in his poetical description

of St. Sophia at Constantinople, as rebuilt by Justinian (between A.D. 532 and A.D. 563),



Altar, built to the order of St. Apollinare in Classe at Ravenna.

describes the altar as of gold, decorated with precious stones and supported on golden columns. This has of course long since been destroyed, but there still exists an altar of almost equal splendour, though of the other type, viz., that of the tomb, and more recent by three hundred years. This is the high altar of St. Ambrogio, at Milan, made in A.D. 835, measuring 7 ft. 3 in. in length and 4 ft. 1 in. in height, the mensa being 4 ft. 4 in. wide. The front is of gold, the back and sides of silver. It is covered with subjects in relief in panels divided by bands of ornament, and many small ornaments in cloisonné enamel are interspersed. The subjects on the back are chiefly incidents in the life of St. Ambrose; those of the front are Christ seated within an oval compartment within a cross, in the branches of which are the symbols of the Evangelists, figures of the Apostles being placed above and below. On the right and left are subjects from the Gospels or the Acts of the Apostles. On the ends of the altar are crosses in compartments, surrounding which are angels in various attitudes of adoration. It is represented in the woodcut.



Altar of St. Ambrogio, at Milan.

Two examples of the tomb-like form, of stone and of earlier date, may be seen in the lateral apse of the basilican church which forms part of S. Stefano at Bologna. These perhaps date from the 7th or 8th century. On one are a cross and two peacocks, and an inscription in honour of S. Vitalis; on the other, figures of a lion and a stag or ox. It is not clear whether these were constructed to serve as altars, or as tombs converted to that use; but the first seems the more probable suggestion.

The account given by Ardo Smaragdus, in his life of St. Benedict of Aniane (*Act. Sanct. Feb. vol. ii. die 12, p. 614*), of one of the altars constructed by the latter in the church of that place (in A.D. 782?), is, though somewhat obscure, too remarkable to be passed over; the altar was hollow within, having at the back a little door; in

the cavity boxes (cassae) containing relics were preserved on non-festive days. This "altar," which was the high altar, was so constructed (in altari . . . tres arae causavit subponi) as to symbolize the Trinity.

It is difficult to find the date at which it became customary to incise crosses, usually five in number, on the mensa of an altar; they do not appear to exist on the mensa of the wooden altar in S. Giovanni Laterano at Rome, which is no doubt of an early date, on that of the altar of S. Alessandro, near Rome, or on those of the early altars at Ravenna, or Auriol, or even on the altar of S. Ambrogio. Crosses are however found on the portable altar which was buried with St. Cuthbert (A.D. 687). The very fragmentary state of this object makes it impossible to determine with certainty how many crosses were on it. Two are to be seen on the caken board to which the plating of silver was attached, and two on the plating itself, but it is quite possible that originally there were five on each. In the order for the dedication of a church in the *Sacramentary of Gregory the Great* (p. 148), the bishop consecrating is desired to make crosses with holy water on the four corners of the altar; but nothing is said of incised crosses.

The practice of making below the mensa a cavity to contain relics, and covering this by a separate stone set into the mensa, does not appear to be of an early date. [CONSECRATION.]

IV. *Structural accessories of the altar.*—Usually, though not invariably, the altar was raised on steps, one, two, or three in number. From these steps the bishop sometimes preached; hence Sidenius Apoll., addressing Faustus, Bishop of Riez, says (*Carm. XVI. v. 124*),—

"Sed in conspectu gratias venerabilis ante  
Consecrationis plures adula circumstant."

Beneath the steps it became customary, from the fourth century at least, at Rome and wherever the usages of Rome were followed, to construct a small vault called *confessio*; this was originally a mere grave or repository for a body, as at S. Alessandro near Rome, but gradually expanded into a vault, a window or grating below the altar allowing the sarcophagus in which the body of the saint was placed to be visible. [CONFESSION.]

In the Eastern Church a piscina is usually found under the altar (Neale, *Eastern Church Introd.* 189), called *χρῆ*, *χρῆμα* or more commonly *θάλασσα* or *βαλανεσιον*. What the antiquity of this practice may be does not seem to be ascertained, but it may have existed in the Western Church, as appears from the Frankish missal published by Mabillon (*Liturg. Gall. III. § 12, p. 314*), where, in consecrating an altar holy water is to be poured "*ad haemum*." See the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, p. 149.

The altar was often enclosed within railings of wood or metal, or low walls of marble slabs these enclosures were often mentioned by early writers under the names "*ambitus altaris*," "*circuitus altaris*;" the railings were called "*cancelli*," and the slabs "*transennae*." See further account of these will be found under the words.

Upon these enclosures columns and arches of silver were often fixed, and veils or curtains of rich stuffs suspended from the arches; they are frequently mentioned in the *Lit. Pontif.*, as at

the instance where Pope Leo III. gave 96 veils, some highly ornamented, to be so placed round the "ambitus altaris" and the "presbyterium" of St. Peter's at Rome.

V. *Ciborium*, otherwise *umbraculum*, Gr. *αἰθήριον*. Ital. baldachino.—Down to the end of the period with which we are now concerned, and even later, the altar was usually covered by a canopy supported by columns, the ciborium. The word is no doubt derived from the Greek *αἰθήριον*, the primary meaning of which is the cap-like seed-vessel of the Egyptian water-lily.

It does not appear when the ciborium came first to be in use, though this was probably at as early a date as that in which architectural splendour was employed in the construction of churches. Augusti quotes Eusebius (*Vit. Const. M. lib. iii. c. 38*) as using the word *αἰθήριον* when describing the church of the Sepulchre at Jerusalem, and connecting it with the word *ὑπερσῆπτον*; but in this there seems to be a mistake, as neither word occurs in cap. 38, while in cap. 37 the latter occurs in connection with *αεφάνειον*: by which last it would seem that the spot was meant.

Paulinus of Nola has been thought to allude to the ciborium in the verses (*Lib. ii. Epig. 2*):

"Divinum veneranda tegunt altaria foedus,  
Compositisque sacra cum cruce martyribus."



Ciborium, from mosaic in the church of St. George at Thessalonica.

Veils are mentioned by St. Chrysostom (*Hom. iii. in Epist.*) as withdrawn at the consecration of the Eucharist, and it is probable that these were attached to the ciborium in the fashion represented by the accompanying woodcut, where a ciborium is shown with the veils covering the altar. This representation, taken

CHRIST. ART.

from Memm. Texier and Pullan's work on Byzantine Architecture, is found in the mosaic of St. George at Thessalonica, works certainly not later than A.D. 500, and perhaps much earlier; the authors are indeed disposed to refer them to the era of Constantine the Great.

Ciboria are not mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis* in the long catalogue of altars erected in and gifts made to churches erected in Rome and Naples by Constantine, unless the "fastigium" of silver weighing 2025 lbs. in the basilica of St. John Lateran was, as some have thought, a ciborium. Much doubt, it must be remembered, has been thrown on the trustworthiness of this part of the *Liber Pontificalis*, nor does any mention of one occur until the time of Pope Symmachus (498—514), who, it is stated, made at St. Silvestro a ciborium of silver weighing 120 lbs. Mention is made in the same work of many other ciboria; they are generally described as of silver or decorated with silver. The quantity of metal varies very much: one at St. Paolo f. l. m. is said to have been decorated with 2015 lbs. of silver, that of St. Peter's, of silver-gilt, weighed 2704 lbs. 3 oz., and that at St. Giovanni Laterano only 1227 lbs. All these were erected by Pope Leo III. (795—816). The last is described as "cybodium cum columnis suis quatuor ex argento purissimo diversis depictum historiis cum cancellis et columellis suis mirae magnitudinis et pulchritudinis decoratum." The "cancelli" were, no doubt, railings running from column to column and enclosing the altar. The ciborium in St. Sophia's, as erected by Justinian, is described by Paul the Silentiary as having four columns of silver which supported an octagonal pyramidal dome or blunt spire crowned by a globe bearing a cross. From the arches hung rich veils woven with figures of Christ, St. Paul, St. Peter, &c.

Ciboria were constructed not only of metal, or of wood covered with metal, but of marble; the alabaster columns of the ciborium of the high altar of St. Mark's at Venice are said to have occupied the same position in the chapel of the Greek Emperor at Constantinople. They are entirely covered with subjects from Biblical history, sculptured in relief, and appear to be of as early a date as the fifth century; but perhaps the earliest ciborium now existing is one in the church of S. Apollinare in Classe at Ravenna, which is shown by the inscription engraved upon it to have been erected between A.D. 806 and A.D. 810.

Various ornaments, as vases, crowns, and baskets (cophini) of silver, were placed as decorations upon or suspended from the ciboria; and, as has been already said, veils or curtains were attached to them; these last were withdrawn after the consecration but before the elevation of the Eucharist. These curtains are mentioned repeatedly in the *Liber Pontif.* as gifts made by various popes of the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, e. g., "Vela alba holoserica rosata quae pendent in arcu de cyborio numero quatuor," given to S. Maria Maggiore by Pope Leo III. (A.D. 795—816).

It does not appear when the use of these veils was discontinued in the Western Church; in the Eastern a screen (*akardaras*) with doors now serves the like purpose. Some of the ciboria at Rome, according to Martigny (*Art. Colonnes*)

f

*Eucharistique*), having a ring fixed in the centre of the vault, from which he conceives a receptacle for the host to have been suspended. [PERISTERIUM]. No ciborium now existing at Rome seems to be of earlier date than the twelfth century, but the practice of suspending such receptacles is no doubt much earlier.

Martigny is of opinion that besides the ciborium, the columns of which rested on the ground, there was sometimes a lesser one, the columns of which rested on the altar, and that these last were more properly called "peristeria," as enclosing a vessel in the form of a dove, in which the host was contained. [CIBORIUM, TURRIS, PERISTERIUM.]



Ciborium of St. Apollinare in Classe, at Ravenna.

VI. *Appendages of the Altar.*—In ancient times nothing was placed upon the altar but the ALTAR-CLOTHS and the sacred vessels with the ELEMENTS. A feeling of reverence, says Martene (*de Antiq. Eccl. Rit.* i. 112), permitted not the presence of anything on the altar, except the things used in the Holy Oblation. Hence there were no candlesticks on the altar, nor (unless on the columns, arches, and curtains of the ciborium) any images or pictures. Even in the ninth century we find Leo IV. (an. 855) limiting the objects which might lawfully be placed on the altar to the shrine containing relics, or perchance the codex of the Gospels, and the pyx or tabernacle in which the Lord's body was reserved for the viaticum of the sick. (*De Cura Pastoralis*, § 8, in Migne's *Patrologia*, cxv. 677.)

The Book of the Gospels seems anciently to have been frequently placed on the altar, even when the Liturgy was not being celebrated (Neale, *Eastern Ch. Introd.* 188). An example may be seen in the frescoes of the Baptistery at Ravenna (Webb's *Continental Ecclesiology*, 427).

With regard to the relics of saints, the ancient rule was, as St. Ambrose tells us (*Ad Marcellinum*, Epist. 85) "Ille [Christus] super altare . . . lecti [martyres] sub altari;" and this was the practice not only of the age of St. Ambrose, but

of much later times, even up to the middle of the ninth century, as Mabillon (*Acta SS. l. mediet. Saec. iii.* Praefatio § 105), assures us; the anonymous author of the Life of Servatius of Tongres says expressly that the relics of that saint, when translated by command of Charlemagne the Great, were laid before the altar, as he did not yet presume to lay anything except the sacrifice on the altar, which is the Table of the Lord of Hosts. And even later, Odo of Clug tells us (*Collationes* ii. 28) that when Baz (an. 895) laid the relics of St. Walburgis on the altar, they ceased to work miracles, resenting the being placed "ubi majestas divini Myrtae solummodo debet celebrari." The passage Leo IV., quoted above, seems in fact the first permission to place a shrine containing relics on the altar, and that permission was evidently in accordance with the general religious feeling of that age.

In the early centuries of the Christian Church the consecrated bread was generally reserved in a vessel made in the form of a dove and suspended from the ciborium [PERISTERIUM], perhaps in some cases placed on a tower on the altar itself (*Liber Pontif.*, Innocent I. c. 57, a Hilary, c. 70). Gregory of Tours (*De Vita Martyrum* i. 86) speaks distinctly of the dove taking the turre from the sacristy and placing it on the altar, but this seems to have contained the unconsecrated elements [TURRIS], and to have been placed on the altar only during celebration; nor does the reservation of the consecrated bread in the turre, calyx or pyxis on the altar appear to be distinctly mentioned by any earlier authority than the decree of Leo IV. quoted above (*Binterim's Denkwürdigkeiten*, ii. 2. 167 ff.).

No instance of a Cross placed permanently on the mensa of an altar is found in the first six centuries, as we should expect from the decree of Leo IV. The vision of Probianus (*Socrus Hist. Eccl.* ii. 3. p. 49) shows that crosses were seen in the sanctuary (*θυνακστήριον*) in the fourth century; the cross was found on the summit of the ciborium, as in the great church of St. Sophia at Constantinople (Paul the Silentary *Descrip. S. Sophiae*, 737 [al. ii. 320]), and, in our churches both at Rome and in Gaul, suspended from the ciborium over the altar (Gregory of Tours, *De Gloria Mart.* ii. 20), but not on the mensa of the altar itself. A cross was, however, placed on the altar during celebration. (*Sacram. Gelas.* i. 41.)

The third Canon of the Second Council of Tours (an. 567, Bruno's *Canones* ii. 226), "corpus Domini in altari non in imaginario ornato sub crucis titulo componatur," which has been thought to mean, that the Body of the Lord should not be reserved among the images in a receptacle on the reredos, but under a cross on the altar itself, might possibly refer to a suspended cross; but it is probably rightly explained by Dr. Neale (*Eastern Ch. Introd.* 188) to mean that the particles consecrated should not be arranged according to each man's fancy, but in the form of a cross, according to the rubric.

Tapers were not placed on the altar until the period which we are considering, though it is a very ancient practice to place lights on the altar, especially on festivals. [LIGHTS.]

FLOWERS appear to have been used for



festal decoration of altars at least as early as the sixth century; for Venantius Fortunatus (*Carmina* viii. 9) says, addressing St. Rhadegund,

“*Textis variis altaria festa corona.*”

They appear as decorations of churches as early as the fourth century.

VII. *Number of altars in a Church.*—There was in primitive times but one altar in a church, and the arrangements of the most ancient Basilicas testify to the fact. (See Pagi on Baronius, ann. 313, No. 15.) Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* x. 4, § 45), in the description of the great church at Tyre, mentions only one altar. St. Augustine (*on 1 John*, Tract. 3) speaks of the existence of two altars in one city (*civitate*) as a visible sign of the Donatist schism. But his words should perhaps not be taken in their literal sense; for in the time of St. Basil, there was more than one altar in Neo-Cæsarea; for he, speaking (*Hom.* 19, in *Gordium*) of a persecution of Christians in that city, says that “altars (*θυσιαστήρια*) were overthrown.”

The Greek and other oriental churches have even now but one altar in each church (Renaudet, *Lit. Orient.* i. 182); nor do they consecrate the Eucharist more than once on the same day in the same place. They have, however, and have had for several centuries, minor altars in *παρεκκλήσιας* or side-chapels, which are really distinct buildings. Such side-chapels are generally found where there has been considerable contact with the Latin Church (Neale, *Eastern Church*, introd. 183).

Some writers, as Martigny (*Dict. des Antiq. Chret.*, art. *Autel*), rely upon the “*arcosolia*” or altar-tombs in the catacombs as proving the early use of many altars: two, three, and more such tombs are often found in one crypt, and in one case, a crypt in the cemetery of St. Agnes near Rome, there are as many as eleven *arcosolia* (Marchi, *Mon. delle Arti prim. Crist.*, tav. xiv., xxvi., xxvii.), eight of which, according to Padre Marchi, might have been used as altars (p. 191); but there seems to be generally a deficiency of proof that such tombs were actually so used, nor is their date at all a matter of certainty in the great majority of cases.

It would appear probable that the practice of considering the tomb of a martyr as a holy place fitted for the celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice, and such celebration as an honour and consolation to the martyr who lay below, led first to the use of several altars in a crypt in the catacombs where more than one martyr might rest, and then, when the bodies of several martyrs had been transferred to one church above ground, to the construction of an altar over each, from a wish to leave none unhonoured by the celebration of the Eucharist above his remains. Such ideas were prevalent as early as the beginning of the fifth century, as may be seen in the writings of Prudentius (*Peristeph.* Hymn. XI. v. 169–174; Hymn. III. v. 211), Pope Damasus, and St. Maximus, Bishop of Turin (*Sermo* LXIII. *De natali sanctorum*; v. Marchi, p. 142 et seq.). At that period, and indeed long after, the disturbance of the relics of saints was held a daring and scarcely allowable act, and was prohibited by Theodosius and much disapproved of by Pope Gregory the Great; nor was it until some centuries later that the increasing eagerness for the

possession of such memorials was gratified by the dismemberment of the holy bodies.

It has been contended that more than one altar existed in the Cathedral of Milan in the latter part of the fourth century. That St. Ambrose more than once uses the plural “*altaria*” in connection with the church proves nothing, for “*altaria*” frequently means an altar; but in describing the restoration of the church to the orthodox (an. 385), after the attempt of the Arians to occupy it, he has been understood to say that the soldiers rushing in kissed the altar: hence it is argued that, as they could not reach the altar of the Bema or sanctuary, which was closed to the people, there must have been at least one altar in the nave. But the words “*milites irruentes in Altaria oculis significare pacis signum*” (*ad Marcellinum*, Ep. 33) seem rather to imply that the soldiers rushing into the Bema signalized by their kisses the making of peace. *Altaria* is used in the same sense, as equivalent to “*sanctuary*,” in the Theodosian Codex. [ALTARIUM.] However this may be, at the end of the sixth century we find distinct traces of a plurality of altars in Western churches. Gregory of Tours (*De Gloria Martyrum* i. 33) speaks of saying masses on three altars in a church at Braisne near Soissons; and Gregory the Great (*Epist.* v. 50) says that he heard that his correspondent Palladius, bishop of Saintonge, had placed in a church thirteen altars, of which four remained unconsecrated for defect of relics. Now certainly Palladius would not have begged of the Pope, as he did, relics for his altars, if the plurality of altars had not been generally allowed. Moreover, the Council of Auxerre of the year 578 (Can. 10; Brun’s *Canones* ii. 238) forbade two masses to be said on the same day on one altar, a prohibition which probably contributed to the multiplication of altars, which was still further accelerated by the disuse of the ancient custom of the priests communicating with the bishop or principal minister of the church, and the introduction of private masses, more than one of which was frequently said by the same priest on the same day (Walafrid Strabo, *De Reb. Eccl.* c. 21). Bede (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 20) mentions that Acca, bishop of Hexham (deposed an. 732), collected for his church many relics of apostles and martyrs, and placed altars for their veneration, “*distinctis porticibus ad hoc ipsum intra muros ejusdem ecclesiae*,” placing a separate canopy over each altar within the walls of the church. There were several altars in the church built by St. Benedict at Aniane (*Acta Sanctorum*, Feb. ii. 614).

In the seventh and eighth centuries the number of altars had so increased that Charlemagne, in a Capitulary of the years 805–6 at Thionville, attempted to restrain their excessive multiplication. See *Capitula infra Ecclesiam*, c. 6 (Migne’s *Patrol.* 97, 283).

This was not very effectual, and in the ninth century the multiplication of altars attained a high point, as may be seen by the plan of the church of St. Gall in Switzerland [CHURCH], prepared in the beginning of that century. In this are no less than seventeen altars. The will of Fortunatus Patriarch of Grado (dec. c. A.D. 825) also affords proof of the increase in the number of altars then in active progress: in

one oratory he placed three altars, and five others in another (*Marin. Com. dei Veneziani*, t. i. p. 270).

VIII. *Places of Altars in Churches*.—From the earliest period of which we have any knowledge, the altar was usually placed, not against the wall as in modern times, but on the chord of the apse, when, as was almost invariably the case, the church ended in an apse; when the end of the church was square, the altar occupied a corresponding position. St. Augustine therefore says (*Serino* 46, c. 1.) “*Mensa Christi est illa in medio posita.*” The officiating priest stood with his back to the apse and thus faced the congregation. In St. Peter’s at Rome, and a very few other churches, the priest still officiates thus placed; but though in very many churches, particularly in Italy, the altar retains its ancient position, it is very rarely that the celebrant does so.

That such was the normal position of the altar is shown by many ancient examples, and by the constant usage of the Eastern churches. The ancient rituals invariably contemplate a detached altar as when, in the *Sacramentary* of Gregory, in the order for the dedication of a church (p. 148), the bishop is directed to go round the altar (*vadit in circuitu altaris*), or in the *Sacramentary* of Gelasius where the subdeacon (L. 1, cxlvi.) is directed, after having placed the Cross on the altar, to go behind it (*vadis retro altare*).

Exceptions at an early date to the rule that the altar should be detached, are of the greatest rarity, if we except the tombs in the catacombs, which have been supposed to have been used as altars. It is possible, also, that in small chapels with rectangular terminations, as the chapel of St. John the Evangelist, annexed to the baptistery of the Lateran, the altar may for convenience have been placed against the wall. When, however, it became usual to place many altars in a church it was found convenient to place one or more against a wall; this was done in the Cathedral of Canterbury [CHURCH], where the altar enclosing the body of St. Wilfrid was placed against the wall of the eastern apse; another altar, however, in this case occupied the normal position in the eastern apse, and the original high altar was placed in the same manner in the western apse.

In the plan of the church of St. Gall, prepared in the beginning of the ninth century, the places of seventeen altars are shown, but of these only two are placed against walls.

In a few instances the altar was placed not on the centre of the chord of the arc of the apse but more towards the middle of the church; such was the case in S. Paolo f. l. m. at Rome, if the altar occupies the original position. In this instance it stands in the transept. In some other early churches at Rome, the altar occupies a position more or less advanced. The *Lih. Pontif.* tells us that in the time of Pope Gregory IV. (A.D. 827–844) the altar at S. Maria in Trastevere stood in a low place, almost in the middle of the nave (in humili loco paene in media testudine), the Pope therefore removed it to the apse, and the altar at S. Maria Maggiore seems to have been in the time of Pope Hadrian I. (A.D. 772–795), as appears from the account in the same book of the alterations, effected by that Pope in that church. It is thought by some that in the large circular

or octagonal churches of the fourth and fifth centuries, as S. Lorenzo Maggiore at Milan, and S. Stefano Rotondo at Rome, the altar was placed in the centre.

In the churches of Justinian’s period constructed with domes, there is usually, as at St. Sophia’s Constantinople and S. Vitale, Ravenna, a sort of chancel intervening between the central dome and the apse; when such is the case, the altar was placed therein.

IX. *Use of Pagan Altars for Christian purposes*.—Pagan altars, having a very small superficies, are evidently ill suited for the celebration of the Eucharist; nor would it appear probable that a Christian would be willing to use them for that purpose; nevertheless, traditions allege that in some cases pagan altars were so used (v. Martigny art. *Autel*), and in the church of Arilje in Servia, a heathen altar sculptured with a figure of Atys forms the lower part of the altar. (*Mittheil. der K. K. Central Comm. zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baulenkmale*, Vienna, 1865, p. 6.) Such altars, or fragments of them, were, however, employed as materials (particularly in the bases) in the construction of Christian altars. Instances are stated by Martigny to have been observed in the churches of St. Michele in Vaticano and of St. Nicholas de’ Cesarini at Rome.

X. PORTABLE ALTARS (*altaria portatilia, gestatoria, viatica*) are probably of considerable antiquity; indeed, it is evident that from the time when the opinion prevailed that the Eucharist could not be fitly celebrated unless on a consecrated mensa or table, a portable altar became a necessity. Constantine the Great (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 8) carried with him on his campaigns a church-tent, the fittings of which no doubt included a portable altar, as the participation of the mysteries is especially mentioned. Bede (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 10) tells us that the two Hewalds, the English missionaries to the continental Saxons (an. 692), took with them sacred vessels and a consecrated slab to serve as an altar (*tabulam altaris vice dedicatam*); and bishop Wulfram, the apostle of Friesland (before 740), was accustomed to carry with him on his journeys a portable altar, in the midst and at the four corners of which were placed relics of saints (Jonas in Surius’s *Hist. Sanctorum* ii. 294). The portable altar of St. Willebrord is described by Brower (*Annal. Trevirens.* an. 718, § 112, p. 364); it bore the inscription: “*Hoc altare Willebrordus in honore Domini Salvatoris consecravit, supra quod in itinere missarum oblationes Deo offerre consuevit, in quo et continetur de ligno crucis Christi et de sudario capitis ejus.*” This, however, is probably not a contemporary inscription, and the genuineness of the relic may perhaps be doubted. St. Boniface also carried an altar with him in his journeys. And the monks of St. Denys, when accompanying Charles the Great in his campaign against the Saxons, carried with them a wooden board, which, covered with a linen cloth, served as an altar (Anonymus de *Mirac. S. Dionysii* i. 20, in Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ben.* saec. iii. pt. 2, p. 350).

These portable altars seem to have been in almost all cases of wood. Not until the latter part of the eighth century do we find instances of such altars being made of any other material. The capitulary of 796 (quoted above) seems to

enjoin the use of stone tablets for portable as well as fixed altars. Hincmar, bishop of Reims (*Capitulum* m. c. 3; in Hardoin's *Concilia* v. 408), forbids any priest to celebrate mass except on a regular altar, or on a "tabula ab episcopo consecrata," which table might be "de marmore vel nigra petra aut licio honestissimo." If the reading be correct, the last term certainly seems to indicate a consecrated cloth [ANTIMENSUM] of very rich material; though some (Binterim's *Dehrendigkeiten* iv. 1, 106) connect "licum" with "sublieus," and suppose that it means a thick piece of wood. An "altare portatile" is said to have been given by Charles the Bald to the monastery of St. Denis at Paris, square in shape, made of porphyry set in gold, and containing relics of St. James the Less, St. Stephen, and St. Vincent (ib. 107).

A portable altar of wood is preserved in the church of St. Maria in Campitelli at Rome, which is said to have belonged to St. Gregory Nazianzen, but it does not appear to have a legitimate claim to so high an antiquity. Probably no earlier existing example is to be found than that which was found with the bones of St. Cuthbert (dec. A.D. 687) in the cathedral of Durham, and doubtless belonged to him: it is now preserved in the chapter library. The annexed woodcut will render any detailed de-



Portable Altar of St. Cuthbert.

scription needless: it measures 6 inches by 5½, and is composed of wood covered with very thin silver: on the wood is inscribed IN HONOR . . . PETRI . . . and two crosses. The sense of the letters on the silver has not been satisfactorily made out (v. St. Cuthbert, by James Raine, p. 240). A similar portable altar is recorded by Simon of Durham (*Monumenta Hist. Brit.* p. 659 v) to have been found on the breast of St. Acca, Bishop of Hexham (ob. A.D. 740), when his body was exhumed more than 300 years afterwards. It was of two pieces of wood joined by silver nails, and on it was cut the inscription, "Alme Trinitati agie Sophia Sanctae Mariae." Whether relics were placed in it, the writer adds, is not known.

The "tablet" still in use in the Abyssinian

churches is a square slab of wood, stone or metal, on which the elements are consecrated, in fact, a portable altar. [ARCA.]

In the Greek Church the substitute for a portable altar was the ANTIMENSUM.

For the consecration of altars, see CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES.

XI. *Literature.*—Besides the works quoted in this article, the following may be mentioned:—J. B. Thiers, *Dissertation sur les Principaux Autels, la Célèbre du Chœur et les Jubeés des Églises*: Paris, 1688. J. Fabricius, *De Aris Veterum Christianorum*: Helmstadt, 1698. G. Voigt, *Thynasteriologia, seu De Altaribus Veterum Christianorum*: Ed. J. A. Fabricius; Hamburg, 1709. S. T. Schönland, *Hist. Nachricht von Altären*: Leipzig, 1716. J. G. Geret, *De Veterum Christianorum Altaribus*: Anspach, 1755. J. T. Treiber, *De Situ Altarium versus Orientem*: Jena, 1668. Kausler, *Dissertatio De Altaribus Portatilibus*: Jena, 1695. Heidehoff, *Der Christl. Altar*: Nürnberg, 1838. [A. N.]

ALTAR CLOTHS (*lintamina, pallia* or *pallas altaris*). In Greek writers, ἄμφω, ἀμφόδωρα, ἑνδύματα, ἐνδύματα, ἐνδύματα, and in authors "infimae aetatis," τὸ κερδωπὸν, and τὸ κερδωπὸν. Cloths of different kinds, and of various materials (in the earliest ages, probably of linen only), must have been used in connection with the celebration of Holy Communion from the very earliest times. They were needed partly for the covering of the holy table, and of the oblations, and of the consecrated elements [CORPORALE]; partly also for the cleansing of the sacred vessels, and the like [MAPPA]. The first of these uses, of which we have now more particularly to speak, is referred to by St. Optatus, Bishop of Milevis in Africa (circ. 370 A.D.) as matter of general notoriety. "Who is there," he asks, "among the faithful, who knows not that during the celebration of the mysteries the wood of the altar is covered with a linen cloth ('ipsa ligna linteamine cooperiri,' *De Schism. Donat.* lib. vi. c. i. p. 92.) With this we may compare the allusion made by Victor Vitensis (*De Persec. Afric.* lib. i. cap. 12). Writing in the year 487, he says that Genseric, the Vandal, some sixty years before, sent Proculus into Zeugitana, and the latter required the vessels used in holy ministry, and the books, to be given up; and when these were refused they were violently seized by the Vandals, who "rapaci manu cuncta depopulabantur, atque de palliis altaris pro nefas! camisas (shirts) sibi et femoralia faciebant." In the 6th century St. Gregory of Tours speaks of an altar, with the oblations upon it, being covered with a silken cloth during the celebration of mass. "Cum jam altarium cum oblationibus pallio serico opertum esset" (*Hist. Franc.* vii. 22; compare Mabillon, *Liturgia Gallicana*, p. 41). A little later in the same passage he speaks of one claiming right of sanctuary in the church, and laying hold on the "pallae altaris" for his protection. It is remarkable that at Rome no mention is found of any *pallia altaris* among the many donations to churches recorded by Anastasius, till after the close of the 6th century. Writing of Vitalianus Papa (sed. 658-672), Anastasius says that in his time the Emperor Constant came to Rome and went to St. Peter's in state, "cum

exercitu suo," attended by his guards, the clergy coming out to meet him with wax tapers in their hands; and he offered upon the altar "pallium auro textile," or, according to another reading, "pallam auro textilem," after which mass was celebrated (Anast. *Bibl.* 135, l. 15; Migne, *P. C. C.* tom. 128, p. 775). The same writer, speaking of Zacharias Papa (sed. 741-752), says that he "fecit vestem super altare beati Petri ex auro textam, habentem nativitatem Domini et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, ornavitque eam gemmis pretiosis." The earliest monument in the west, showing an altar (or holy table) set out for the celebration of "mass," is of the 10th or 11th century (*Vestiarium Christianum*, Pl. xliii.), one of the frescoes in the hypogene church of S. Clemente at Rome. The holy table is there covered with a white cloth, which is pendent in front, but apparently not so on the two sides. A richly ornamented border, several inches in breadth, appears on the lower edge of this "lin-teamen" (if such be intended) as it hangs down in front of the altar.

The allusions in Greek writers of early date correspond in character with those above quoted. In the collection of Canons Ecclesiastical (Σύνταγμα Κανόνων) formed by Photius of Constantinople, the earliest in date, bearing upon this point, is one of the so-called "Canons of the Apostles" (Καν. 73) to this effect: "Let no one alienate for his own private use any vessel of gold or of silver, which has been set apart for holy use" (ἁγιασθέν), "or any linen" (ὀθόνην); and the inference we naturally draw that the "linen" here spoken of has reference to altar linen (perhaps also to ministering vestments) is confirmed by the subsequent language of the First and Second Councils of Constantinople. In Canons 1 and 10, after quoting the "Canon of the Apostles" above mentioned, the Council identifies the ὀθόνη of that earlier canon with ἡ σεβασμία τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης ἐνδυτή, "the sacred covering of the holy table." On the other hand a passage of Theodoret, which has been alleged (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chrétiennes*, in voc. 'Autel') as proving the use of rich cloths for the altar early in the 4th century, has probably a very different meaning from that attributed to it. The word θυσιαστήριον in early ecclesiastical Greek is more frequently used in the sense of the whole space immediately about the holy table, the "sanctuary," than of the "altar" itself. When therefore Theodoret states (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. cap. xix. al. cap. xxxi.) that at the consecration of a church at Jerusalem, in the time of Constantine the Great, διεκοσμεῖτο τὸ θεῖον θυσιαστήριον βασιλικοῖς τε παραπετάσμασιν καὶ κειμηλίοις λιθοκολλήτοις χρυσοῖς, the reference is in all probability to rich curtains, or "veils," hung about the sanctuary, not to altar-cloths properly so called. Much more certainly to the purpose is a passage of St. Chrysostom (*Hom.* l. al. li. in Matt. cap. xiv. 23, 24), part of a homily originally delivered at Antioch, in which he draws a contrast between the coverings of silk, often ornamented with gold (χρυσόπαστα ἐπιβλήματα), bestowed upon the holy table, and the scanty covering grudgingly given, or altogether refused, to Christ in the person of His poor members upon earth. Among the Acts of the Council of Constantinople, held in the year 536, is preserved (Labbe's *Concilia*, by Mansi,

tom. ix. pp. 1102, 3) a curious letter drawn up by the clergy of the church of Apamea in Syria Secunda. They complain of the iniquitous conduct of Severus, bishop of Antioch, and of their own bishop Petrus; and amid many grave charges brought against the latter, one is that owing to the gross carelessness (worse than carelessness is charged by the letter) with which he celebrated the Holy Liturgy, the purple covering of the altar was defiled (κατέχρωσε πτύσματι τοῦ σεπτῶ θυσιαστηρίου τὴν ἀλουργίδα). In the 7th and 8th centuries we find evidence that these richer coverings of the altar were in some cases adorned with symbolic ornaments and with pictures of saints (χαράκτῆρες ἁγίων), which incurred the condemnation of the Iconoclasts, who carried them away together with images and pictures of other kinds. So we learn from Germanus of Constantinople, early in the 8th century (Scti. Germani Patriarchae *de Sanctis Synodis*, &c. apud *Spicileg. Rom.* A. Mai, tom. vii. p. 62). On the other hand, in times of grievous public calamity, we read, in one instance at least, of the altar as well as the person of the bishop and his episcopal throne being robed in black. So Theodorus Lector records of Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople: καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν θρόνον καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον μελανοῖς ἐνδύμασιν ἡμφίεσεν. In the later liturgical offices (see Goar, *Euchol. Graec.* pp. 623, 627, sqq.), and in writers such as Symeon of Thessalonica (circ. 1420 A.D.), we find mention of an inner covering of linen, known as κατάσαρκα, and of a second and more costly covering without. Patriarch Symeon makes further mention of four pieces of cloth on each of the four corners of the altar. "The holy table hath four pieces of woven cloth (τέσσαρα μέρη ὑφάσματος) upon the four corners thereof; and that because the fulness of the Church was formed out of all the quarters of the world; and on these four pieces are the names of the four Evangelists, because it was by their instrumentality that the Church was gathered, and the Gospel made circuit of the whole compass of the world. But the [inner cover] called κατάσαρκα, has an outer covering (τραπεζοφόρον) immediately above it. For here is at once the tomb, and the throne, of Jesus. The first of these coverings is as it were the linen wherein the dead body was wrapped; but the second is as an outer garment (περιβολή) of glory according to that of the psalm, said at the putting on thereof, 'The Lord is king: he hath put on beauteous apparel'" (Symeon of Thessalonica, apud Goar, *Euchol. Graec.* p. 216). Of the two words here and elsewhere employed as the technical designation of these two altar-cloths, the first, κατάσαρκα, was originally used of an inner chiton, or tunic, worn "next the skin" (κατὰ σάρκα). Thence its secondary usage as a compound word (τὸ κατάσαρκα) in speaking of any inner covering, as here of an inner covering, of linen, for the holy table. The use of the word τραπεζοφόρον, as a designation for the more costly outer cover, belongs in all probability to a comparatively late date. The word does occur in earlier writers, but in a wholly different sense, and one more in accordance with classical analogy. [W. B. M.]

ALTARIUM (compare ALTAR). This word is sometimes used to designate not merely an altar, but the space within which the altar stood. For

instance, Perpetuus, Bishop of Tours, built a basilica in honour of St. Martin, which had "fenestras in altario triginta duas, in capso viginti;" "ostia octo, tria in altario, quinque in capso" (Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* ii. 14). Ruinart remarks upon the passage that by "altarium" we are to understand the presbytery, by "capsum" the nave. Compare Mabillon, *de Lit. Gall.* i. 8, § 1, p. 69. [BEMA.]

The plural "altaria" is also used in a similar sense; as by St. Ambrose in the passage (*Epist.* 33) quoted under ALTAR; and in the Theodosian Codex, where (Lib. ix. tit. 45, *De Spatio Ecclesiastici Aedificii*) it is provided: "Patent summi dei templa timentibus; nec sola altaria," etc. The equivalent word in the Greek version is *θυσιαστήριον*.

The same extended sense is found in some modern languages, e.g. in Portuguese "altar moço" (great or high altar) is used in the sense of choir or chancel (Burton, *Highlands of the Brazil*, i. 128). [A. N.]

**ALTINO** (near Aquileia), COUNCIL OF (ALTINENSIS CONCILIUM), A.D. 802; considered as fictitious by Mansi (xiii. 1099-1102); said to have been held by the Patriarch of Aquileia to appeal to Charlemagne for protection against the Duke of Venice. [A. W. H.]

**ALYPIUS**, Holy Father, commemorated Nov. 26 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**AMA** (*Amula, Hama, Hamula*; compare Germ. *Am, (Hau)*).

"Amæ vas sunt in quibus sacra oblatio continetur, ut vinum. . . . Amula, vas vinarium. Amulæ dicuntur quibus offertur devotio sive oblatio, simile arceolis" (Papian, in Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v.). The vessel in which wine for the celebration of the Eucharist was offered by the worshippers.

The word Ama is used by Columella and other classical authors, but the earliest instance of its use as a liturgical vessel which has been noticed is in the Charta Cornutiana of the year 471 (*Mabillon de Re Dipl.* vi. 262), where "hamulæ oblatoriæ" are mentioned. "Amæ argenteæ" are mentioned in the *Ordo Romanus I.* (p. 5) among the vessels which were to be brought from the Church of the Saviour, now known as St. John Lateran, for the Pontifical Mass on Easter-Day; and in the directions for the Pontifical Mass itself in the same *Ordo* (p. 10), we find that after the Pope had entered the senatorium or presbytery, the archdeacon following him received the amulæ, and poured the wine into the larger chalice (calicem majorem) which was held by the subdeacon; and again (r. 14, p. 11) after the altar was decked, the archdeacon took the Pope's amula (compare Amalaricus, *Ecloga*, 554) from the oblationary subdeacon, and poured the wine through the strainer (super colum) into the chalice [CHALICE]; then some of the deacons, of the primicerius, and the others. Whether the "amæ argenteæ" are identical with the "amulæ" may perhaps be doubted; but at any rate the amulæ seem to have been church-vessels provided for the purpose of the offertory. Among the presents which Pope Adrian (772-795) made to the church of St. Adrian at Rome, the *Liber Pontificalis* (p. 348) mentions "amulam unam," and also an "amulam offertoriam"

of silver which weighed sixty-seven pounds. They were, however, often of much smaller size, and the small silver vessels (see woodcut) preserved in the Museo Cristiano in the Vatican are deemed to be amulæ. They measure only about 7 inches in height, and may probably date from the 5th or 6th century. Bianchini in his edition of the *Liv. Pontif.* has given an engraving of a similar vessel of larger size. On this the miracle of Cana is represented in a tolerably good style. Bianchini supposes this to be of the fourth century.



Amæ, from the Vatican Museum.

The material of these vessels was usually silver, but sometimes gold, and they were often adorned with gems. Gregory the Great (*Epist.* i. 42, p. 539) mentions "amulæ onychinæ," meaning probably vessels of onyx, or glass imitating onyx. [A. N.]

**AMACIUS**, bishop, deposition of, July 14 (*Mart. Bedæ*). [C.]

**AMANDUS**, Bishop and confessor. *Natalis*, Feb. 6 (*Mart. Bedæ*); translation, Oct. 26 (*Ib.*). His name is recited in the Canon in one MS. of the Gregorian Sacramentary. (See Méunier's ed. p. 284.) [C.]

**AMANTIUS**. (1) Martyr at Rome, commemorated Feb. 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) Of Nyon, commemorated June 6 (*Mart. Hieron., Bedæ*). [C.]

**AMATOR**, Bishop of Auxerre, commemorated Nov. 26 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**AMATUS**, confessor, commemorated Sept. 13 (*Mart. Bedæ*). [C.]

**AMBITUS**, compass, in music. (*Toni debitus ascensus et descensus*.) The compass of the earliest Church melodies did not in some instances reach, in few did it exceed, a fifth. "Principio cantilene adeo simplices fuere apud primores Ecclesiæ, ut vix discente ascensu ac descensu impleverent. Cui consuetudini proxime accessissimè dicuntur Ambrosiani. Deinde paulatim ad Diapason devenerunt, verum omnium Modorum systema." (Giræanus, *De ecclesiâ archid.* lib. i. cap. xiv.) In Gregorian music the octave was the



limit; the four authentic scales [AUTHENTIC] moving from the key-note to its 8ve, the four plagal [PLAGAL] from the 4th below the key-note to the 5th above it. In later times this compass (*ambitus*) was much extended. A melody occupying or employing its whole compass was called *Cantus Perfectus*; falling short of it, *Cantus Imperfectus*; exceeding it, *Cantus Plusquamperfectus*. Subsequently other interpretations (such as the course of modulation permitted in fugue) have been given to the word *ambitus*. With these we are not now concerned. (Gerbert, *Script. Mus.*; Forkel; Kock, *Mus. Lex.*) [J. H.]

**AMBITUS ALTARIS** (ἱερατεῖον, Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.* i. 182). This expression is sometimes used, as apparently by Anastasius (*Lib. Pontif. in Vita Sergii II.*), for the enclosure which surrounded the altar. Pope Sergius II. (A.D. 844–877), he says, constructed at St. John Lateran an “*ambitus altaris*” of ampler size than that which had before existed.

It would seem that it was, in some cases and perhaps in most, distinct from the presbyterium or “chorus cantorum;” and according to Sarnelli (*Antica Basilicographia*, p. 84) there was usually between the presbyterium and the altar a raised space called “solea.” Various passages in the *Lib. Pontif.*—e.g. those in which the alterations made by Pope Hadrian I. (A.D. 772–795) at S. Paolo f. l. M., and by Pope Gregory IV. (A.D. 827–844) at Sta. Maria in Trastevere, are described—show that the position of the altar and the arrangement of the enclosures were not alike in all cases. It seems not improbable but that in the lesser churches one enclosure served both to fence round the altar and to form the “chorus.”

In the plan prepared for the church of St. Gall in the beginning of the 9th century (v. woodcut, s. v. CHURCH) an enclosure is marked “chorus,” and a small space or passage intervenes between this and an enclosure shutting off the apse, within which stands the altar. This is at the west end of the church; at the east end the apse is in like manner enclosed, but the enclosure of the “chorus” is brought up to the steps leading to the raised apse without a break. A small enclosure is shown round all the altars, except those which are within the enclosures of the apses.

It appears not unlikely that the square enclosure in the church at Djemla in Algeria [CHURCH] may be such an “*ambitus*;” Mr. Fergusson considers this enclosure a cella or choir, and says that it seems to have been enclosed up to the roof, but that the building is so ruined that this cannot be known for a certainty. A choir enclosed by solid walls would be a plan so anomalous in a Christian church that very strong evidence would be required to prove its having existed. The building in question may, from the purely classical character of the mosaic floor, be safely assigned to an early date, probably anterior to the fourth century.

It is doubtful whether any early example of an “*Ambitus altaris*” now exists. We may learn from the *Lib. Pontif.* that they were usually of stone or marble, no doubt arranged in posts or uprights alternating with slabs variously sculptured, and pierced in like manner with the presbyterium at S. Clemente in Rome. The *Lib.*

*Pontif.* tells us of the *Ambitus* which as above mentioned Pope Sergius II. constructed at St. John Lateran, that he “*pulchris columnis cum marmoribus desuper in gyro sculptis splendide decoravit*.” many fragments of marble slabs with the plaited and knotted ornament characteristic of this period are preserved in the cloister of that church, and may probably be fragments of this “*Ambitus*.”

In the richer churches silver columns bearing arches of the same metal were often erected on the marble enclosure, and from these arches hung rich curtains, and frequently vessels or crowns of the precious metals; repeated mention of such decorations may be found in the *Lib. Pontif.*, and a passage in the will of Fortunatus Patriarch of Grado (Hazlitt, *Hist. of the Republic of Venice*, vol. i. App.), who died in the early part of the 9th century, describes a like arrangement very clearly in the following words: “*Post ipsum altare alium parietem deauratum et deargentatum similiter longitudine pedum xv. et in altitudine pedes iv. et super ipso pariete arcus volutiles de argento et super ipsos arcus imagines de auro et de argento.*”

This expression “*ambitus altaris*” may perhaps also sometimes stand for the apse as surrounding the altar. [A. N.]

**AMBO** (Gr. ἄμβων, from ἀναβαίνειν). The raised desk in a church from which certain parts of the service were read. It has been also called πύργος, pulpitum, suggestus. By Sozomen (*Eccl. Hist.* ix. 2, p. 367) the ambo is explained to be the “βῆμα τῶν ἀναγινωστῶν”—the pulpit of the readers. From it were read, or chanted, the gospel, the epistle, the lists of names inscribed on the diptychs, edicts of bishops, and in general any communications to be made to the congregation by presbyters, deacons, or subdeacons; the bishop in the earlier centuries being accustomed to deliver his addresses from the cathedra in the centre of the apse, or from a chair placed in front of the altar; St. John Chrysostom was, however, in the habit of preaching sitting on the ambo (ἐπὶ τοῦ ἁμβωνος, Socrates *Eccl. Hist.* vi. 5), in order that he might be better heard. Full details as to the use of the ambo will be found in Sarnelli (*Antica Basilicographia*, p. 72), and Ciampini (*Vet. Mon.*, t. i. p. 21 et seq.); but the examples which they describe are probably later by several centuries than the period with which we are now concerned, and the various refinements of reading the gospel from a higher elevation than the epistle, and the like, are probably by no means of very early introduction. Two and even three ambones sometimes existed; one was then used for the gospel, one for the epistle, and one for the reading of the prophetic or other books of the Old Testament (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chrét.*). In the old church of St. Peter's there was, however, but one, which Platner (*Beschreibung von Rom*) thinks was a continuance of the ancient usage.

Something in the nature of an ambo or desk no doubt was in use from a very early period. Bunsen (*Basiliken des Christlichen Roms*, p. 48) expresses his opinion that the ambo was originally moveable. In the earlier centuries much of the church furniture was of wood, and the ambones were probably of the same material. Wherever a “presbyterium” or “chorus cantorum” (i.e. an enclosed space in front of the

altar reserved for the use of the inferior clergy) existed, an ambo was probably connected with it, being placed usually on one side of the enclosure. Where no "chorus" existed, the ambo was probably placed in the centre.

At St. Sophia's in Constantinople the ambo constructed by Justinian stood nearly in the middle of the church, but more towards the east. A full account of it is given by Paul the Silentiary in a poem in hexameter verse upon it. From this we learn that it was ascended by two flights of stairs, one from the west, the other from the east; and that it was covered by a canopy resting on eight columns. It was constructed of the most precious marbles, and adorned with gold and precious stones. The area at the top of the stairs was sufficiently spacious for the coronation of the Emperor, and the space below enclosed by railings was occupied by the singers. During the services the gospels and epistles were no doubt read from the raised part.

Pope Pelagius (555-559) erected an ambo in St. Peter's (*Liv. Pontif.*), and in the cathedral of Ravenna are the remains of one erected by Archbishop Agnellus (558-566). This last is ornamented with figures of lambs, peacocks, doves, fishes, &c., within panels, the design and execution being poor and rude.



Ambo of S. Apollinare Nuovo, at Ravenna

The ambo represented in the woodcut is in the church of S. Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna, the date of its erection has not been ascertained with certainty, but it would seem not improbable that it formed a part of the original fittings of the church built between A.D. 493 and A.D. 526. The pillars on which it is now elevated were doubtless added at some later period, when it was arranged in order to be employed as a pulpit.

The ambones in S. Clemente at Rome are of different periods: the smaller and earlier may perhaps be of the same date as the chorus with which it is connected (6th century?), but there is some difference in the character of the work. The larger dates probably from the 12th century, as no doubt does also that in S. Lorenzo f. l. M. at Rome. The circumstance upon which the Abbé Martigny (*Dict. des Antiq. Chréti.*) relies as proving the high antiquity of this last, viz. that a part of its base is formed from a bas-relief relating to pagan sacrifices, cannot be considered as having much weight, as a part of the superstructure is formed from a slab bearing an early Christian inscription, and as the whole style and character of the work are so evidently those in use at Rome during the 12th and 13th centuries.

The lesser and earlier ambo at S. Clemente has two desks—one, the most elevated, looking towards the altar, the other in the contrary direction; the later ambo has a semi-hexagonal projection on each side, and is ascended by a stair at each end. This latter plan seems to have been the more usual; the ambones at Ravenna and those at Rome of the 12th and 13th centuries are all thus planned.

In the plan for the church of St. Gall (c. A.D. 820), the ambo is placed in the middle of the nave but near its eastern end, in front of the enclosure marked "chorus," and is within an enclosure.

A tall ornamented column is often found attached to the ambo; on this the paschal candle was fixed. This usage may have existed from an early period, but perhaps the earliest existing example of such a column is one preserved in the museum of the Lateran at Rome, which however is probably not older than the 11th century. It is engraved by Ciampini (*Ved. Mon.*, t. i. pl. xiv.).

According to Sarnelli (*Ant. Bas.* p. 84), the word ambo is the proper expression for the raised platform or chorus cantorum; he however gives no authorities for this use of the word. [A. N.]

**AMBROSE.** (1) Bishop of Milan, confessor, commemorated April 4 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, *Hieron.*, *Bebe*); Dec. 7 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Bishop, commemorated Nov. 30 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**AMBROSIAN MUSIC**, the earliest music used in the Christian Church of which we have any account, and so named after Ambrose, bishop of Milan (374-396), who introduced it to his diocese about the year 386, during the reign of Constantine.

The notions prevailing among musical and other writers respecting the peculiarities of Ambrosian music are based rather on conjecture than knowledge. It may be considered certain that it was more simple and less varied than the Gregorian music which, about two centuries later, almost everywhere superseded it. Indeed it has been doubted whether actual melody at all entered into it, and conjectured that it was only a kind of musical speech—monotone with melodic closes, or *ACCENTUS ECCLESIASTICUS*, a kind of music, or mode of musical utterance, which Gregory retained for collects and responses, but which he rejected as too simple for psalms and hymns. On the other hand, it has been argued more plausibly that, to whatever extent the *Accentus* or *Modus character legendi* may

have been used in Ambrosian music, an element more distinctly musical entered largely into it; that a decided *cantus*, as in Gregorian music, was used for the psalms; and that something which might even now be called melody was employed for (especially metrical) hymns. That this melody was narrow in compass [AMBITUS], and little varied in its intervals, is probable or certain. The question however is not of quality, but of kind. Good melody does not of necessity involve many notes; Rousseau has composed a very sweet one on only three (*Consolations des Misères de ma Vie*, No. 53).

The probability that this last view of Ambrosian music is the right one is increased by the accounts of its effect in performance, given in the Benedictine Life of St. Ambrose, drawn from his own works, wherein one especial occasion is mentioned on which the whole congregation sang certain hymns with such fervour and unction that many could not restrain their tears—an incident confirmed by an eye-witness, St. Augustine. "How did I weep," he says, "in Thy hymns and canticles, touched to the quick by the voices of Thy sweet attuned Church! The voices flowed into mine ears, and the truth distilled into my heart, whence the affections of my devotions overflowed, and tears ran down, and happy was I therein."<sup>a</sup> It is difficult to attribute to mere "musical speech," however employed, such effects as these, even upon the rudest and least instructed people, *à fortiori*, on persons like Augustine, accomplished in all the learning and the arts of his time. The hymns and canticles must surely have been conjoined, and the voices attuned to a sweeter and more expressive song. "Dulcis est cantilena," says Ambrose (*Op. t. i. p. 1052*) himself, "quae non corpus effeminat, sed mentem animamque confirmat." Whatever its properties, its usefulness, or its dignity, no one would apply the epithet *dulcis* to the *Accentus Ecclesiasticus*, or speak of it, or anything like it, as *cantilena*.

That neither Augustine nor any contemporary writer has described particularly, or given us any technical account of, the music practised by the Milanese congregations of the end of the 4th century, however much we may regret it, need hardly cause us any surprise. We are very imperfectly informed about many things nearer to us in point of time, and practically of more importance. Augustine has indeed told us in what manner the psalms and hymns were sung in the church of St. Ambrose, and that this manner was exotic and new.<sup>b</sup> But of the character of the song itself—in what the peculiarity of the *Cantus Ambrosianus* consisted—he tells us nothing. Possibly there was little to tell; and the only peculiarity consisted in the employment in psalmody of more melodious strains than heretofore—strains not in themselves new, but never before


<sup>a</sup> "Quantum fleui in hymnis et canticis tuis, suave sonantis Ecclesiae tuae vocibus commotus acriter! Voces illae influebant auribus meis, et eliquabatur veritas in cor meum; et exaestuabat inde affectus pietatis, et currebant lacrimae, et bene mihi erat cum eis."—*S. Augustini Confessionum*, lib. ix. cap. vi. c. 14.

<sup>b</sup> "Tunc hymni et psalmi ut 'canerentur' secundum morem orientalium partium, ne populus maeroris taedio contabesceret, institutum est; et ex illo in hodiernum retentum, multis jam ac pene omnibus gregibus tuis, et per cetera orbis imitantibus."—*Conf.*, lib. ix. cap. 7-15.


so employed; for, "in the first ages of Christianity," says St. Isidore, "the psalms were recited in a manner more approaching speech than song."<sup>c</sup> In this view most writers on Ambrosian music have concurred; that it was veritable song, in the proper musical sense of the word, not musical speech or "half-song;" and that, not only was it based on a scale system or tonality perfectly well understood, but that its rhythmus was subject to recognised laws. S. Ubaldo, the author of a work (*Disquisitio de cantu a D. Ambrosio in Mediolanensem ecclesiam introducto*, Mediolani, 1695) especially devoted to Ambrosian music, says expressly that St. Ambrose was *not* the first to introduce antiphonal singing into the West, but that he did introduce what the ancients called *Cantus Harmonicus*, on account of its determined tonality and variety of intervals, properties not needed in, and indeed incongruous with, musical speech. With this *Cantus Harmonicus* was inseparably connected the *Cantus Rhythmicus* or *Metricus*; so that, by the application of harmonic (i. e. in the modern sense, *melodic*) rule, a kind of melody was produced in some degree like our own. That Ambrosian music was rhythmical is irrefragably attested by the variety of metres employed by Ambrose in his own hymns, and that such was held to have been the case for many centuries is confirmed by Guido Aretinus and John Cotton (11th century).

The first requisite of melody is that the sounds composing it be not only in the same "system," but also in some particular scale or succession, based upon and moving about a given sound. The oldest scales consisted at the most of four sounds, whence called tetrachords. The influence of the tetrachord was of long duration; it is the theoretical basis even of modern tonality. Eventually scales extended in practice to pentachords, hexachords, heptachords, and ultimately octachords, as with us. The modern scale may be defined as a succession of sounds connecting a given sound with its octave. The theory and practice of the octachord were familiar to the Greeks, from whose system it is believed Ambrose took the first four octachords or modes, viz. the Phrygian, Dorian, Hypolydian, and Hypophrygian, called by the first Christian writers on music Protus, Deuterus, Tritus, and Tetrardus. Subsequently the Greek provincial names got to be misapplied, and the Ambrosian system appeared as follows:

PROTUS OR DORIAN.




DEUTERUS OR PHRYGIAN.



TRITUS OR AEOLIAN.




TETRARDUS OR MIXOLYDIAN.



These scales differ essentially from our scales,

<sup>c</sup> "Ita, ut pronuntianti vicinior esset, quam psallenti."—*De Offic.*, cap. vii.

major or minor, of D, E, F, G, which are virtually transpositions of one another, or identical scales at a higher or lower pitch, the seats of whose two semitones are always in the same places,—between the 3rd and 4th and the 7th and 8th sounds severally. Whereas the Greek and Ambrosian scales above are not only unlike one another (the seats of the semitones being in all different), but they are also unlike either our modern typical major scale of C, which has its semitones between the 3rd and 4th and 7th and 8th sounds, or our typical minor scale of A, which has one of its semitones always between the 2nd and 3rd sounds, another between the 5th and 6th or the 7th and 8th, and in its chromatic form between both.



The 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Ambrosian scales or tones therefore are not what we now call "keys," but "modes," differing from one another as the modern major and minor modes differ, in the places of their semitones. Melodies therefore in this or that Ambrosian "tone" have a variety of character analogous to that which distinguishes our major and minor modes so very widely. Thus tenderness is the popular attribute of the minor mode; strength and clearness are those of the major. In like manner one Ambrosian tone was supposed to be characterised by dignity, another by languor, and so on.

The rhythmus of Ambrosian melody is thought by some to have consisted only in the adaptation to long and short syllables of long and short notes. "Of what we call time," says Forkel (*Gesch. der Musik*, ii. 168),—the proportion between the different divisions of the same melody,—the ancients had no conception." He does not tell us how they contrived to march or to dance to timeless melodies—melodies with two beats in one foot and three in another, or three feet in one phrase and four in another, nor how vast congregations were enabled to sing them; and if anything is certain about Ambrosian song it is that it was above all things congregational.

Whether Ambrose was acquainted with the use of musical characters is uncertain. Probably he was. The system he adopted was Greek, and he could hardly make himself acquainted with Greek music without having acquired some knowledge of Greek notation, which, though intricate in its detail, was simple in its principles. But even the invention, were it needed, of characters capable of representing the comparatively few sounds of Ambrosian melody could have been a matter of no difficulty. Such characters needed only to represent the pitch of these sounds; their duration was dependent on,

and sufficiently indicated by, the metre. Copies of Ambrosian music-books are preserved in some libraries, which present indications of what may be, probably are, musical characters. Possibly however these are additions by later hands. It is certain that, in the time of Charlemagne, Ambrosian song was finally superseded, except in the Milanese, by Gregorian. The knowledge of the Ambrosian musical alphabet, if it ever existed, may, in such circumstances, and in such an age, have easily been lost, though the melodies themselves were long preserved traditionally. [J. H.]

**AMBROSIANUM.**—This word in old liturgical writings often denotes a *hymn*, from S. Ambrose having been the first to introduce metrical hymns into the service of the Church. Originally the word may have indicated that the particular hymn was the composition of S. Ambrose, and hence it came to signify any hymn. Thus S. Benedict, in his directions for Nocturns, says, "Post hunc psalmus 94 (Venite) cum antiphona, aut certe decantandus." Inde sequatur *Ambrosianum*: Deinde sex psalmi cum antiphonis." Also, S. Isidore *de Divin. off. lib. i. c. 1, § 2*, speaking of hymns, mentions S. Ambrose of Milan, whom he calls "a most illustrious Doctor of the Church, and a copious composer of this kind of poetry. Whence (he adds) from his name hymns are called *Ambrosians*," (unde ex ejus nomine hymni *Ambrosiani* appellantur). [H. J. H.]

**AMEN** (Heb. אָמֵן). The formula by which one expresses his concurrence in the prayer of another, as for instance in Deut. xxvii. 15.

1. This word, which was used in the services of the synagogue, was transferred unchanged in the very earliest age of the Church to the Christian services [compare ALLELUIA]; for the Apostle (1 Cor. xiv. 16) speaks of the Amen of the assembly which followed the εὐχαριστία, or thanksgiving. And the same custom is traced in a series of authorities. Justin Martyr (*Apol. i. c. 65, p. 127*) notices that the people present say the Amen after prayer and thanksgiving. Dionysius of Alexandria (in *Euseb. H. E. vii. 9, p. 253*, Schwegler) speaks of one who had often listened to the thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία), and joined in the Amen which followed. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catechismus Mystag. 5, p. 331*) says that the Lord's Prayer is sealed with an Amen. Jerome, in a well-known passage (Prooemium in lib. ii. *Comment. Ep. Gal.*, p. 428) speaks of the thundering sound of the Amen of the Roman congregations.

2. The formula of consecration in the Holy Eucharist is in most ancient liturgies ordered to be said aloud, and the people respond *Amen*. Probably, however, the custom of saying this part of the service *secretè*—afterwards universal in the West—had already begun to insinuate itself in the time of Justinian; for that emperor ordered (*Novella 123*, in Migne's *Patrol. tom. 72, p. 1026*), that the consecration-formula should be said aloud, expressly on the ground that the people might respond *Amen* at its termination. [Compare CANON.] In most Greek liturgies also,

\* This is explained as "omnino protrahendo et ab uno aut a pluribus morose" or as "in directum sine Antiphona." *Martini de Ant. Mon. rit.*, Lib. I. cap. ii. 22.

when the priest is administering says, "σὺς Ἀμεν," the receiver answers *Amen*. So, too, in the Clementine Liturgy, after the ascription of Glory to God (*Apost. Const.* viii. 13, p. 215, *Uttzen*). (*Bona, De Rebus Liturgicis*, i. li. cc. 5, 13, 17.) [C.]

AMENESIUS, deacon, commemorated Nov. 10 (*Mart. Bedae*). [C.]

AMICE (*Amictus, Humerale, Superhumeralis* or *Ephod, Anaboladum, Anabol-gium, Anagolai-us*). § 1. The word *Amictus* is employed in classical writers as a general term for any outer garment. Thus Virgil employs it (*Aen.* iii. 405) in speaking of the toga, ornamented with purple, the end of which was thrown about the head by priests and other official persons when engaged in acts of sacrifice. (See for example "the Emperor sacrificing," from the column of Trajan, *Vest. Christ.* pl. iii.) The same general usage may be traced in the earlier ecclesiastical writers, as in St. Jerome, and in Gregory of Tours, who uses the word in speaking of a bride's veil. St. Isidore of Seville (circ. 830 A.D.) nowhere employs the word as the designation of any particular garment, sacred or otherwise. But in defining the meaning of *anaboladum* (a Greek word which at a later time was identified with *amictus* as the name of a sacred vestment), he describes it as "*amictorium lineam feminarum quo humeri operiuntur, quod Graeci et Latini sindonem vocant.*" (*Origines*, xix. 25.) With this may be compared St. Jerome on Isaiah, cap. iii., where in referring to the dress of Hebrew women, he says, "*Habent sindones quae vocantur amictoria.*" This usage of "*amictorium*," and its equivalent "*anaboladum*," in speaking of a linen garment worn by women as a covering for the shoulders, will prepare us for the first reference to the "*amictus*" as a vestment early in the 8th century, when it is compared by Rabanus Maurus (such seems to be his meaning) with the "*superhumeralis*" of Levitical use (*De Instit. Chr.* lib. i. cap. 15). Rabanus, however, does not use the word "*amictus*," though he seems evidently to refer to the vestment elsewhere so called. Amalarius of Metz, writing about the same time (circ. 825 A.D.), speaks of the "*amictus*" as being the first in order of the vestments of the Church, "*primum vestimentum nostrum quo collum undique cingimus.*" Hence its symbolism in his eyes as implying "*castigatio vocis*," the due restraint of the voice, whose organs are in the throat (*De Eccl. Off.* ii. 17.). Walafrid Strabo writing some few years later (he was a pupil of Rabanus), enumerates the eight vestments of the Church, but without including in them the amice (*De Reb. Eccl.* c. 24.). But in all the later liturgical writers the vestment is named under some one or other of the various designations enumerated at the head of this article. As to its use in this country there is no evidence till nearly the close of the Saxon period. It is not mentioned in the Pontifical of Egbert. In a later Anglo-Saxon Pontifical (of the 10th century, Dr. Rock says,) among the vestments enumerated occurs mention of the "*superhumeralis seu poderem*," an expression which has been supposed to point to the amice, though the use of "*poderem*," as an alternative name, seems to make this somewhat doubtful. (Quoted by

Dr. Rock, *Church of our Fathers*, vol. i. p. 693; from the *Archaeologia*, vol. xiv. p. 28.)

§ 2. *Shape of the Amice, its Material, and ornamentation.* The amice was originally a square or oblong piece of linen, somewhat such as that which forms the background in the accompanying woodcut, and was probably worn nearly as shown in Fig. 1, so as to cover the neck and



Amice.

shoulders. Early in the 10th century (A.D. 925) we hear, for the first time, of ornaments of gold on the amice. (*Testamentum Ratis Episcoporum in Migne's Patrologia*, tom. cxxii. p. 468, "*caligas et mandalias paria duo, amictos [sic] cum auro quattuor.*") This ornament was probably an "*aurefrigium*" or "*orrey*." From the 11th century onwards the richer amices were adorned with embroidery, and at times even with precious stones. These ornaments were attached to a portion only of the amice, a comparatively small patch, known as a *plaga*, or *parura* (i. e., *paratura*) being fastened on (see Fig. 4 in wood-



Fig. 4.

cut) so as to appear as a kind of collar above the alb (see Fig. 3). An example is given of late date, to show the shape of the *parura*, as, from the nature of the material, very early amices are not extant. These *parurae* were known in later times as "*collaria*" or "*collaria*" (see Rock, *Ch. of our Fathers*, i. 470).

§ 3. *How worn.*—All the earlier notions of the amice are such as to imply that it was worn on the neck and shoulders only. Honorius of Autun (writing circ. 1125 A.D.) is the first who speaks of it as being placed on the head. "*Humerale quod in Lage Ephod, apud nos Amictus dicitur, sibi imponit et illo caput et collum humeros (unde et Humerale dicitur) cooperit, et in pectore copulatum duabus vittis ad mammillas cingit. Per Humerale quod caput imponitur spes caelestium intelligitur.*" (*Gemma animae*, i. c. 201.) It appears to have been temporarily placed on the head (as shown in Fig. 2 of the above woodcut) till the other vestments were arranged, after which it was turned down so that the *parura* might appear in its proper place. To this position on the head is to be referred its later symbolism as a symbol of



salvation. "Amictus pro galea caput obnubit." *Durandi Rationale* iii. 1. For other symbolism see Innocent III., *De Sacro Altaris Mystero*, i. cc. 35 and 50. (The woodcut above is from Dr. Böck's *Geschichte der liturgischen Gewänder*, B. ii. Taf. ii.) [W. B. M.]

**AMICUS**, confessor at Lyons, commemorated July 14 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**AMMON.** (1) Commemorated Feb. 7 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

(2) Commemorated Feb. 9 (*M. Hieron., Bedae.*).

(3) 'Αμμεών, the deacon, with the forty women his disciples, martyrs, commemorated Sept. 1 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(4) Commemorated Sept. 10 (*M. Hieron., Bedae.*).

(5) Martyr at Alexandria, Dec. 20 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae.*). [C.]

**AMMONARIA**, martyr at Alexandria, commemorated Dec. 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**AMMONIUS.** (1) Martyr, Jan. 31 (*Mart. Hieron., Bedae.*).

(2) Infant of Alexandria, commemorated Feb. 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(3) Commemorated Oct. 6 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

**AMOS**, the prophet, commemorated June 15 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**AMPELUS** of Messana, commemorated Nov. 20 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**AMPHIBALUM** or **AMPHIBALUS.** § 1. This word appears to be confined to Gallican writers. And this fact, coupled with its Greek derivation, pointing as this does to a very early period for its introduction, is noticeable, as one among many instances of diversities of usage in minor matters, characteristic of the Gallican church, and indicating an origin distinct from that of other western churches.

§ 2. *Form of the vestment, and its prevailing use.* There are three passages to which reference may here be made as determining all that can with certainty be known with regard to the vestment now in question. St. Remigius, Archbishop of Arles, dying about 500 A.D., left to his successor in the see "Amphibalum album paschalem," a white amphibalus for use on Sundays and high festivals. (For 'paschalis' see Ducange in *roc.*) We cannot here conclude with absolute certainty that it is of a vestment for church use that he is speaking, though the context seems to imply this. (The quotation is from the *Testamentum S. Remigii Remensis, apud Galland, Bibliothec. Patr., tom. x. p. 806.*) But in the passages that follow this meaning is beyond doubt. In a life of S. Bonitus (*alias* S. Bonus), † circ. 710, A.D. written, as it is supposed, by a contemporary (*Acta Sanctorum Januar., d. xv. p. 1071 sqq.*), we are told that the saint was much given to weeping even in church; so much so, that the upper part of his amphibalus, which served as a covering for his head, was found to be wet with the tears he shed. "Lacrimarum ei gratia in sacro non deerat officio ita ut amphibali summitas, qua caput tegebatur, ex profusione earum madida videretur." This "upper part" of the amphibalus was evidently a kind of hood (like that of

the casula), separable, in some sort, from the rest of the garment. For the saint is represented as appearing after death, in a vision, to a certain maiden, devoted to God's service, and sending through her a message to the "mother" of the neighbouring monastery, bidding her keep by her (no doubt as a relic) that part of his amphibalus which covered his head. "Ut partem amphibali mei qua caput tegitur, secum retineat."

Even in this passage, however, though it is evidently spoken of as worn in church, and during the "holy office," it does not follow that a sacerdotal vestment, distinctively so called, is there intended. The mention of the hood (or hood-like appendage) as worn over the head points rather to use in the choir. But in a fragmentary account of the Gallican rite, of uncertain date, but probably of the 9th or 10th century, the word amphibalus is used as equivalent to the "casula," then regarded as specially belonging to sacerdotal ministry. "The casula, known as amphibalus," the writer says, "which the priest puts upon him, is united from top to bottom . . . it is without sleeves . . . joined in front without slit or opening . . . 'Casula, quam amphibalum vocant, quod sacerdos induetur (sic), tota unita . . . Ideo sine manicis (sic) quia sacerdos potius benedicit quam ministrat. Ideo unita prinsecus, non scissa, non aperta,' &c. (See Martene, *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, tom. v.)

From the above passages we may infer that "amphibalus" was a name, in the Gallican church of the first eight or nine centuries, for the more solemn habit of ecclesiastics, and particularly for that which they wore in offices of holy ministration. Having regard to its (probably) Eastern origin, and to its subsequent identification with the casula, we shall probably be right in thinking that it resembled in shape the white phenolia, in which Eastern bishops are represented in mosaics of the 6th century, in the great church (now Mosque) of St. Sophia at Constantinople. For these last see the article **VESTMENTS** (Greek), later in this work, and Salzenberg's *Altchristliche Baudenkmale*, plates xxviii. and xxix. [W. B. M.]

**AMPHILOCHIUS**, bishop of Iconium, commemorated Nov. 23 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**AMPIDIUS**, commemorated at Rome Oct. 14 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**AMPLIAS**, "Apostle," commemorated Oct. 31 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**AMPODIUS**, commemorated Oct. 11 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**AMPULLA** (Probably for *amb-olla*, from its swelling out in every direction), a globular vessel for holding liquid. In ecclesiastical language the word denotes —

1. The flasks or cruets, generally of precious metal, which contain the wine and water used at the altar. The word "pollen," used in some districts of Germany to designate these vessels (Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, iv. 1. 183) is probably derived from "Ampullae."

When the custom of making offerings of wine for the Holy Communion ceased, ampullae seem to have taken the place of the larger **AMAR**

The notion of the ampullae themselves having been large vessels is probably founded on the ancient etymology, "ampulla, quasi vas ampullam;" an etymology which Walafrid Strabo (*De Rob. Eccl.* c. 24) adapts to the facts of his own time by reversing it, "ampulla quasi porum ampla." The first mention of ampullae as altar-vessels, appears to be in the *Liber Pontificalis* (c. 110) in the life of John III. (559-573), who is said to have ordered that the oratories of the martyrs in the city of Rome should be supplied with altar-plate, including ampullae [al. amulae] from the Lateran church.

2. More commonly the word ampulla denotes a vessel, *ἀμφοδης*, used for holding consecrated oil or chrism. In this sense it is used by Optatus Milevitanus (*contra Donatistas* ii. 19, p. 42), when he tells us that an "ampulla chrismatis" thrown from a window by the Donatists miraculously remained unbroken. In the Gregorian *Sacramentary* (p. 65), in the directions for the benediction of Chrism on the "Feria V. post Palmas," or Thursday in Holy Week, "ampullae duo cum oleo" are ordered to be prepared, the better of which is to be presented to the Pope. [CHRISM.]



Ampulla of Monza.

By far the most renowned ampulla of this kind is that which was said to have been brought by a dove from heaven at the baptism of Clovis, and which was used at the coronation of the Frank kings. Hincmar, in the service which he drew up for the coronation of Charles the Bald (840), speaks of the first Christian king of the Franks having been anointed and consecrated with the heaven-descended chrism, whence that which he himself used was derived ("caelitus sumpto chrismate, unde nunc habemus, perunctus et in regem sacratum"), as if of a thing well known. In Flodoard, who wrote in the first half of the 10th century, we find the legend fully developed. He tells us (*Hist. Eccles. Remensis*, i. 13, in Migne's *Patrol.* vol. 133, p. 52 c.) that at the Baptism of Clovis, the clerk who bore the chrism was prevented by the crowd from reaching his proper station; and that when the moment for anointment arrived, St. Remi raised his

eyes to heaven and prayed, when "ecce subito columba ceu nix advolat candida rostro deferens ampullam caelestis doni chrismate repletam." This sacred ampulla (the "Sainte Ampoule") was preserved in the abbey of St. Remi, at Reims, and used at the coronation of the successive kings of France. It was broken in 1793, but even then a fragment was said to have been preserved, and was used at the coronation of Charles X. The ampulla represented in the woodcut, from Monza, is said to be of the 7th century. It is of a metal resembling tin, and has engraved upon it a representation of the Adoration of the Magi and of the Shepherd, with the inscription, ΕΛΘΩΝ ΜΥΛΟΥ ΖΩΗC ΤΩΝ ΑΓΙΩΝ ΧΡΙCΤΟΥ ΤΟΠΩΝ, having been used for preserving Holy Oil. [Oil, HOLY.] [C.]

**AMULETS.** The earliest writer in whom the word occurs is Pliny (*H. N.* xix. 4, 19; xxx. 15, 47, et al.), and is used by him in the sense of a "charm" against poisons, witchcraft, and the like ("veneficiorum amuleta"). A Latin derivation has been suggested for it as being that "quod malum amollitur." Modern etymologists, however, connect both the word as well as the thing with the East, and derive it from the Arabic *Amulet* (= a thing suspended). The practice which the word implies had been in the Christian Church, if not from the first, yet as soon as the Paganism and Judaism out of which it had emerged began again to find their way into it as by a process of infiltration, and the history of amulets presents a strange picture of the ineradicable tendency of mankind to fall back into the basest superstitions which seem to belong only to the savage bowing before his *fétiche*. Man has a dread of unseen powers around him—demons, spectres, an evil eye—and he believes that certain objects have power to preserve him from them. That belief fastens sometimes upon symbolic forms or solemn words that have once served as representatives of higher thoughts, sometimes upon associations which seem altogether arbitrary. When the Israelites left Egypt, they came from a people who had carried this idea to an almost unequalled extent. The scarabeus, the hawk, the serpent, the uræus, or hooded snake, an open eye, outspread wings, with or without formulae of prayer, deprecating or invoking, are found in countless variety in all our museums, and seem to have been borne, some on the breast, some suspended by a chain round the neck. The law of Moses, by ordering the *Zizith*, or blue fringe on the garments which men wore, or the papyrus scrolls with texts (Exod. xiii. 2-10, 11-17; Deut. vi. 4-9, 13-22), which were to be as frontlets on their brows, and bound upon their arms, known by later Jews as the *Tephillin*, or when nailed on their door posts or the walls of their houses as the *Mezuzah*, sought, as by a wise "economy," to raise men who had been accustomed to such usages to higher thoughts, and to turn what had been a superstition into a witness for the truth. The old tendency, however, crept in, and it seems clear that some at least of the ornaments named by Isaiah (lii. 23), especially the *ἄμυνται*, were of the nature of amulets (*Bib. Dict.* AMULETS). And the later *φουλακτῆρια* of the N. T., though an attempt has been made by some archaeologists to explain the name as though they reminded

we *phylacteria* the *edra* (Schütgen) were, there can be little doubt, so called as "protective" against demons, magic, and the evil eye." Through the whole history of Rabbinism, the tendency was to the increase, and few Jews believed themselves free from evil spirits, unless "he had on which they slept was guarded by the *Menorah*. Mystic figures—the sacred tetragrammaton, the shield of David, the seal of Solomon—with cabalistic words, AGLA (an acronym formed from the initial letters of the Hebrew words for "Thou art mighty for everlasting, O Lord"), Abraxas, and the like, shot up as a rank after-rank. Greek, Latin, Eastern Heathenism, in like manner, supplied various forms of the same usage. Everywhere men lived in the dread of the fascination of the "evil eye." Sometimes individual men, sometimes whole races (e.g. the Thabii of Pontus) were thought to possess the power of smiting youth and health, and causing them to waste away (Plutarch, *Sympos.* v. 7). And against this, men used remedies of various kinds, the *ἑρμῆς ὑπὸ κράτει*, the phallus or furorem. The latter was believed to operate as averting the gaze which would otherwise be fixed on that which kept it spell-bound (Plutarch, *l.c.*; Varr. *de Ling. Lat.* vi. 5), but was probably connected also with its use as the symbol of life as against the evil power that was working to destroy life. It is obvious that superstitions of this kind would be foreign to Christian life in its first purity. The "bonfire" at Ephesus was a protest against them and all like usages (Acts ix. 19). They crept in, however, probably in the first instance through the influence of Judaism or Orientalizing Gnostics. The followers of Basilides had their mystical Abraxas and Jaldabaoth, which they wrote on parchment and used as a charm (*Chr. Scorp.* art. BASILIDES). Scarabaei have been found, with inscriptions (*Jou. Sabaoth*, the names of angels, Bellermin, *Chr. des Scarabaeus*, l. 10), indicating Christian imitations of this nature.<sup>1</sup> The catacombs of Rome have yielded small objects of various kinds that were used apparently for the same purpose, a bronze fish (connected, of course, with the mystic anagram of IΧΘΥΣ), with the word ΙΧΘΥΣ on it, a hand holding a tablet with ΕΥΧΕΣ, medals with the monogram which had figured on the *labarum* of Constantine (Airingh, *Rom. Subterranean*, vi. 23; Costadoni, *Del Pomo*, pl. ii., iii., 19; Martigny, a. v. *Pompeii*). In the East we find the practice of carrying the Gospels (*βιβλία* or *εὐαγγέλια μυστά*) round the neck as *φυλακτήρια* (Chrysost. *Hom.* lxiii. in Matt.); and Jerome (in Matt. iv. 24) confesses that he had himself done so to guard against disease. When the passion for relics set in they too were employed, and even Gregory the Great sent to Theodolinda two of these *φυλακτήρια*, one a cross containing a fragment of the true cross, the other a box containing a copy of the Gospels, each with Greek invocations, as a charm against the evil of rits or *lumens* that beset children (*Epp.* xii. 7). In all these cases we trace some Christian asso-

ciations. *Symbia* soon passes into superstition. In other instances, the old heathen leaves were more conspicuous. Strange words, *εὐεργετα* *ρεπουρίτες* (Basil. in Pa. xlv., p. 229 A), names of rivers, and the like (Chrysost. *Hom.* lxiii. in Matt.), "*ἁγίασμα*" of all kinds (August. Tract vii. in *Joann.*), are spoken of so frequent. Even a child's caul (it is curious to note at once the antiquity and the persistency of the superstition), and the *δυσδάμιος ἰσθμῖα* became an *δυσδάμιος* in another sense, and was used by midwives to counteract the "evil eye" and the words of evil omen of which men were still afraid (Balaam, in *Conc. Trull.* c. 61). Even the strange prohibition by the Council just referred to of the practice of "leading about the bears and other like beasts to the delusion (*ὑπὸ πωλύμας*) and injury of the simple," has been referred by the same writer (*ibid.*), not to their being a show as in later times, but to the fact that those who did so carried on a trade in the *φουλακτήρια*, which they made from their hair, and which were in request as a cure for sore eyes.

Christian legislation and teaching had to carry on a perpetual warfare against these abuses. Constantine indeed, in the transition stage which he represented, had allowed "remedia humanis quaerita corporibus" (*Conc. Theodos.* ix. tit. 10, a. 3), as well as incantations for rain, but the Council of Laodicea (c. 36) forbade the clergy to make *φουλακτήρια*, which were in reality "*δυσμυστήρια* for their own souls." Chrysostom frequently denounces them in all their forms, and lays bare the plan that the old women who sold them were devout Christians, and that the practice therefore could not be so very wrong (*Hom.* viii. in *Coloss.* p. 1374; *Hom.* vi. c. 34; *Hom.* lxii. p. 536, in Matt. p. 722). Basil (*l.c.*) speaks in the same tone. Augustine (*l.c.* and *Serm.* cxcv. *De Temp.*) warns men against all such "diabolical phylacteria." Other names by which such amulets were known were *εὐεργετα*, *εὐεργετα*. We may infer from the silence of Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian that the earlier days of the Church were comparatively free from these superstitions, and from the tone of the writers just referred to that the canon of the Council of Laodicea had been so far effectual that the clergy were no longer ministering to them. [K. H. P.]

## ANACHORETAE. (HERMIT.)

ANACLETUS, the pope, martyr at Rome, commemorated April 26 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*) [C.]

ANACTORON (*Ἀνακτορον* from *ἀνακτορ*), the dwelling of a king or ruler. In classical authors, generally a house of a god, especially a temple of the Eleusinian Demeter or of the Dioscuri; also, the innermost recess of a temple, in which oracles were given (Lobeck's *Aglaophamus*, i. pp. 59, 62). Eusebius (*Præpar.* c. 9) applies the word to the church built by Constantine at Antioch, whether as equivalent to *βασιλική*, or with reference to the unusual size and splendour of the church, or with a reminiscence of the classical use of the word, is difficult to say. (Bingham's *Antiquities*, viii. l. § 5.) [C.]

ANAGNOSTES—LECTOR—READER.—Tertullian is the earliest writer who mentions this office as a distinct order in the Church (*de Prescrip.* c. 41). It would seem that, at first, the public reading of the Scriptures was performed

<sup>1</sup> This is distinctly stated in the Jerusalem Gemma (*Beck* fol. 2, c.). Comp. the exhaustive article by Leyser on "Phylacteria" in *Herzog*.

<sup>2</sup> The mention of "the horns of the Scarabaeus" as an amulet by Ptolemy (*de N. xviii. c.*) shows how widely the old Egyptian belief about it had spread in the first century of the Christian era.

indifferently by presbyters and deacons, and possibly at times by a layman specially appointed by the bishop. From Tertullian's time, however, it was included among the minor orders, and as such is frequently referred to by Cyprian (*Epp.* 29, 38, &c.). It is also one of the three minor orders mentioned in the so-called Apostolical Canons, the other two being the ὑποδιάκονος and the ψάλτης. The Scriptures were read by the Anagnostes, from the pulpitem or tribunal ecclesiae. If any portion of the sacred writings was read from the altar, or more properly from the bema or tribunal of the sanctuary, this was done by one of the higher clergy. By one of Justinian's Novels it was directed that no one should be ordained reader before the age of eighteen; but previously young boys were admitted to the office, at the instance of their parents, as introductory to the higher functions of the sacred ministry (Bingham, Thorndike). [D. B.]

**ANANIAS.** (1) Of Damascus (Acts ix. 10), commemorated Jan. 25 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); Oct. 1 (*Cal. Byzant.*); Oct. 15 (*C. Armen.*).

(2) Martyr in Persia, April 21 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(3) Martyr, with Azarias and Misael, Dec. 16 (*Id.*); April 23 (*Mart. Bedae*); Dec. 17 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**ANAPHORA.** (Ἀναφορά. The word ἀναφέρειν acquired in later Greek the sense of "lifting up" or "offering:" as ἀναφέρειν θυσίας, Heb. vii. 27; 1 Pet. ii. 5; ἀναφέρειν εὐχαριστίαν, εὐφημίαν, δοξολογίαν, Chrysostom in Suicer, s. v. Ἀναφορά was also used in a corresponding sense; in Ps. l. 21, [LXX], it is the equivalent of the Hebrew תָּרַם, "that which goeth up on the altar.")

1. In the sense of "lifting up" Anaphora came to be applied to the celebration of the Holy Eucharist; whether from the "lifting up" of the heart which is required in that service, or from the "oblation" which takes place in it; probably the latter.

In the liturgical diction of the Copts, which has borrowed much from the Greeks, the word Anaphora is used, instead of liturgy, to designate the whole of the Eucharistic service, and the book which contains it; but more commonly its use is restricted to that more solemn part of the Eucharistic office which includes the Consecration, Oblation, Communion, and Thanksgiving. It begins with the "Sursum Corda," or rather with the benediction which precedes it, and extends to the end of the office, thus corresponding with the PREFACE and CANON of Western rituals.

The general structure of the Anaphorae of Oriental liturgies is thus exhibited by Dr. Neale (*Eastern Church*, Introduction, i. 463).

*The Great Eucharistic Prayer—*

1. The Preface. [SURSUM CORDA.]
2. The Prayer of the Triumphal Hymn. [PREFACE.]
3. The Triumphal Hymn. [SANCTUS.]
4. Commemoration of our Lord's Life.
5. Commemoration of Institution.

*The Consecration—*

6. Words of Institution of the Bread.
7. Words of Institution of the Wine.
8. Oblation of the Body and Blood.
9. Introductory Prayer for the Descent of the Holy Ghost.
10. Prayer for the Change of Elements.

*The Great Intercessory Prayer—*

11. General Intercession for Quick and Dead.
12. Prayer before the Lord's Prayer.
13. The Lord's Prayer
14. The Embolismus.

*The Communion—*

15. The Prayer of Inclination (τὰς κεφαλὰς κλίνειμεν).
16. τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις and Elevation of Host.
17. The Fraction.
18. The Confession.
19. The Communion.
20. The Antidoron; and Prayers of Thanksgiving.

This table exhibits the component parts of the Anaphorae of all, or nearly all, the Eastern liturgies, in the state in which they have come down to us; but different parts are variously developed in different liturgies, and even the order is not always preserved; for instance, in the existing Nestorian liturgies, the general intercession is placed *before* the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and other minor variations are found. The principal of these will be noticed under their proper headings.

It is in the Anaphorae that the characteristics are found which distinguish different liturgies of the same family; in the introductory or pro-anaphoral portion of the liturgies there is much less variety. "In every liturgical family there is one liturgy, or at most two, which supplies the former or pro-anaphoral portion to all the others, and such liturgies we may call the normal offices of that family; the others, both in MSS. and printed editions, commence with the 'Prayer of the Kiss of Peace,' the preface to the Anaphora" (Neale, *Eastern Church*, i. 319). Thus, when the liturgy of Gregory Theologus or of Cyril is used, the pro-anaphoral portion is taken from that of St. Basil; the Ethiopian Church has twelve liturgies, which have the introductory portion in common; the numerous Syro-Jacobite liturgies all take the introductory portion from that of St. James; the three Nestorian from that of the Apostles. Further particulars will be found under CANON and COMMUNION.

2. The word ἀναφορά is sometimes used in liturgical writings as equivalent to the ἀῆρ or Chalice-veil; and has found its way in this sense, corrupted in form (*Nuphir*) into the Syrian liturgies. (Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.* ii. 61.) [C.]

**ANASTASIA.** (1) Martyr under Diocletian. Her *Natalis*, an ancient and famous festival, falls on Dec. 25 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, *Hieron.*, *Bedae*). Her name is recited in the Gregorian Canon. The proper office for her festival, in the Gregorian Sacram. (p. 7), is headed, in Ménard's text, *Missa in Mane prima Nat. Dom.*, *sive S. Anastasiae*; and is inserted between the *Missa In Vigilia Domini in Nocte* and the *Missa In Die Natalis Domini*. The titles in the other MSS. are equivalent. In the *Byzantine Calendar* she is commemorated as φαρμακολυτρία, dissolver of spells on Dec. 22 (see Neale's *Eastern Church*, *Introd.* 786).

(2) Of Rome, διομόδρυσ, commemorated Oct. 29 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**ANASTASIS.**—The Orthodox Greek Church commemorates the dedication of the Church of the Anastasis by Constantine the Great (Ἐγκαίνια τοῦ Ναοῦ τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἀναστάσεως) on Sep. 13. (Daniel, *Codes*

*Liturgicus*, iv. 268.) This festival refers to the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, or of the Resurrection of the Lord, at Jerusalem, A.D. 335. (Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iii. 26 ff.) A similar name was given to the room where Gregory of Nazianzus preached at Constantinople, afterwards converted into a magnificent church. (Gibbon's *Rome*, iii. 367, ed. Smith.) [C.]

**ANASTASIUS.** (1) The monk, martyr in Persia, commemorated Jan. 22 (*Cal. Byzant.*, *Mart. Rom. Vet.*, *Hieron.*).

(2) Saint, April 1 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(3) The pope, April 27 (*Mart. B. V.*, *Bedae*); Oct. 28 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(4) Saint, May 2 (*M. Bedae*).

(5) The Cornicularius, martyr, Aug. 21 (*Mart. B. V.*).

(6) Commemorated Aug. 26 (*M. Hieron.*).

(7) Bishop, Oct. 13 (*M. Bedae, Hieron.*). [C.]

**ANATHEMA**, the greater excommunication, answering to Cherem in the Synagogue, as the lesser form did to Niddui, i.e. Separation: this latter is called ἀφορισμός in the *Constitutions of the Apostles*.

The excision of obstinate offenders from the Christian fellowship was grounded upon the words of Christ—"If he will not hear the Church, let him be as a heathen man and a publican." So St. Gregory interprets them—"let him not be esteemed for a brother or a Christian"—"videlicet peccator gravis et scandalosus, notorius aut accusatus et convictus"; being reproved by the bishop in the public assemblies of the Church, if he will not be humbled but remains incorrigible and perseveres in his scandalous sins—"tum anathemate feriendus est et a corpore Ecclesiae separandus" (St. Gregory in Ps. v.), and St. Augustine (*Tract xxvii.* in Johan.) vindicates this severity of discipline on the Church's part in such a case—"quia neque influxum habet a capite, neque participat de Spiritu Christi."

This application of the word Anathema to the "greater excommunication" was warranted, in the belief of the ancient Church, by St. Paul's use of it (Gal. i. 8, 9), and the discipline itself being distinctly warranted by our Lord's words, as well as by other passages in the New Testament, the anathema was regarded as cutting a man off from the way of salvation; so that unless he received the grace of repentance he would certainly perish.

A milder sense, however, of the word Anathema, as used by St. Paul, has not been without its defenders, both among our own Divines as Hammond and Waterland, and by Grotius. The latter writer, commenting on Rom. ix. 3, gives the following interpretation: "Hoc dicit: Velim non modo carere honore Apostolatus, verum etiam contemptissimus esse inter Christianos, quales sunt qui excommunicati sunt."

And as to the effect of the Ecclesiastical Anathema—it is maintained by Vincentius Lirinensis that it did not bear the sense of cursing among the ancient Christians, as Cherem did among the Jews.

It is certain, however, that the word Anathema is uniformly employed by the LXX as the equivalent of Cherem; and it can hardly be questioned, therefore, that where it occurs in the N. T. it must be understood in the deeper sense—as relating to the spiritual condition—

CHRIST. ANT.

and not merely to exclusion from Church privileges, whatever may have been the force subsequently attached to the word, as expressing the most solemn form of ecclesiastical excommunication. On this point and on the history of the word in general, the reader is referred to Lightfoot on *Galatians*; Thorndike, vol. ii. 338; Bp. Jeremy Taylor (*Ductor Dubitantium*). For Ἀνάθημα, see VOTIVE OFFERINGS. [D. B.]

**ANATOLIA**, martyr, commemorated July 9 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ANATOLIUS**, bishop, commemorated July 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ANAXARBE** (SYNODS OF), A.D. 431, to confirm the deposition of St. Cyril, and those who held with him. Another was held there two years later, as at Antioch, to make peace with St. Cyril. [E. S. F.]

**ANCHOR** (AS SYMBOL). The anchor is an emblem very frequently used, from the earliest ages of Christianity, in symbolism. As the anchor is the hope and often the sole resource of the sailor, the ancients called it *sacred*; to weigh anchor was, "Anchoram sacram solvere." St. Paul adopts an obvious symbolism, when he says (Heb. vi. 19) that we have hope as "an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast;" so that, in its special Christian sense, the anchor would seem to be an emblem of hope.

By the early Christians we find it used, sometimes with reference to the stormy ocean of human life, but more often to the tempests and the fierce blasts of persecution which threatened to engulf the ship of the Church. Thus the anchor is one of the most ancient of emblems; and we find it engraved on rings, and depicted on monuments and on the walls of cemeteries in the Catacombs, as a type of the hope by which the Church stood firm in the midst of the storms which surrounded it. In this, as in other cases, Christianity adopted a symbol from Paganism, with merely the change of application.

The symbols on sepulchral tablets often contain allusions to the name of the deceased. The Chevalier de Rossi (*De Monum. IXOTN exhib.* p. 18) states that he has three times found an anchor upon *tituli* bearing names derived from Spes or Ἐλπίς; upon the tablet of a certain ELPIDIVS (Mai, *Collect. Vatican.* v. 449), and upon two others, hitherto unpublished, in the cemetery of Priscilla, of two women, ELPIZVSA and SPES. In some cases, above the transverse bar of the anchor stands the letter E, which is probably the abbreviation of the word Ἐλπίς. Further, we find the anchor associated with the fish, the symbol of the Saviour [IXΘΥΣ]. It is clear that the union of the two symbols expresses "hope in Jesus Christ," and is equivalent to the formula so common on Christian tablets, "Spes in Christo," "Spes in Deo," "Spes in Deo Christo."

The transverse bar below the ring gives the upper part of the anchor the appearance of a *cruz ansata* [CROSS]; and perhaps this form may have had as much influence in determining the choice of this symbol by the Christians as the words of St. Paul. The anchor appears, as is natural, very frequently upon the tombs of martyrs. (See Lupi, *Severae Epitaphium*, pp. 136, 137; Boldetti, *Osservazioni*, 368, 370, &c.; Fabretti, *Inscrip-*



*tionum Explic.* 568, 569; and Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chret.* s. v. 'Ancre.') [C.]

**ANCYRA.**—Two synods of Ancyra are recorded; the first of which stands at the head of those provincial synods whose canons form part of the code of the universal Church. It was held under Vitalis of Antioch, who signs first; and of the 18 bishops composing it, several attended the Nicene Council subsequently. Twenty-five canons were passed, about half of which relate to the lapsed, and the rest to discipline generally (v. Beveridge, *Synod.* ii. *ad l.*). The date usually assigned to it is A.D. 314. Another synod met there, A.D. 358, composed of semi-Arians. They condemned the second Synod of Sirmium, accepted the term *homoi-ousion*, and published 12 anathemas against all who rejected it, together with a long synodical letter. Another synod of semi-Arians was held there, A.D. 375, at which Hipsius, Bishop of Parnassus, was deposed. [E. S. F.]

**ANCYRA, THE SEVEN VIRGINS OF,** are commemorated by the Armenian Church on June 20, as fellow-martyrs with Theodotion, or Theodorus, of Salatia, the first Bishop of Ancyra of whom we have any account. (Neale, *Eastern Church, Introd.* p. 800.) [C.]

**ANDEGAVENSE CONCILIUM.** [ANGERS, COUNCIL OF.]

**ANDELAENSE CONCILIUM.** [ANDELOT, COUNCIL OF.]

**ANDELOT, COUNCIL OF (ANDELAENSE CONCILIUM),** near Langres; summoned by Guntram, King of Orleans (at a meeting to ratify a compact, also made at Andelot, between himself and Childebert, Nov. 28 or 29, 587), for March 1, A.D. 588, but nothing further is recorded of it, and possibly it was never held at all (Greg. Turon., *Hist. Fr.* ix. 20; Mansi, ix. 967-970). [A. W. H.]

**ANDOCHIUS** or **ANDOCIUS**, presbyter, commemorated Sept. 24 (*Mart. Hieron., Bedae*). [C.]

**ANDREAS.** (1) Martyr, commemorated Aug. 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) King, Hedar 16 = Nov. 12 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(3) The general, with 2953 companion martyrs, commemorated Aug. 19 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(4) Of Crete, *δσιμαδρυσ*, Oct. 17 (*Cal. Byz.*). [C.]

**ANDREW, SAINT, FESTIVAL OF.**—As was natural, the name of the "brother fisherman" of St. Peter was early held in great honour. He is invoked by name as an intercessor in the prayer "Libera nos" of the Roman Canon, with the Virgin, St. Peter, and St. Paul; and his principal festival was anciently placed on the same level as that of St. Peter himself (Krazer, *De Liturgiis*, p. 529). His "Dies Natalis," or martyrdom, is placed in all the Martyrologies, agreeing in this with the apocryphal *Acta Andreae*, on Nov. 30. It is found in the Calendar of Carthage, in which no other apostles are specially commemorated except St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. James the Great; and in St. Boniface's list of Festivals, where no other apostles are named except St. Peter and St. Paul (Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, v. i. 299). The hymn "Nunc Andreae solemnia," for the festival of St. Andrew, is attributed to Venerable Bede. Proper offices

for the Vigil and Festival of St. Andrew are found in the *Sacramentaries* of Leo and Gregory. In the latter (p. 144) there is a clear allusion to the *Acta* (see Tischendorf's *Acta Apost. Apocrypha*, p. 127), where it is said that the saint frankly proclaimed the truth, "nec pendens taceret in cruce;" and in the ancient *Liber Responsalis*, which bears the name of Gregory, is one equally clear to the same *Acta* in the words of St. Andrew's prayer, "Ne me patiaris ab impio iudice deponi, quia virtutem sanctae crucis agnovi" (p. 836). A trace of the influence of these same *Acta* is found again in the Gallo-Gothic Missal (probably of the 8th century), published by Mabillon, in which the "contestatio," or preface (*Liturgia Gall.* lib. iii. p. 222), sets forth that the Apostle, "post iniqua verbera, post carceris saepta, alligatus suspendio se purum sacrificium obtulit. . . . Absolvi se non patitur a cruce . . . turba . . . laxari postulat justum, ne pereat populus hoc delicto; interea fundit martyr spiritum." The Armenian Church commemorates St. Andrew with St. Philip on Nov. 16.

The relics of the apostle were translated, probably in the reign of Constantius, though some authorities place the translation in that of Constantine (compare Jerome, c. *Vigilantium*, c. 6, p. 391, who says that Constantius translated the relic, with Paulinus, *Carm.* 26, p. 628), to Constantine's great "Church of the Apostles" at Constantinople, where they rested with those of St. Luke; the church was indeed sometimes called, from these two great saints, the church of St. Andrew and St. Luke. Justinian built over their remains, to which those of St. Timothy had been added, a splendid tomb.

The *Martyrologium Hieronymi* places the translation of St. Andrew on Sept. 3, and has a "Dedicatio Basilicae S. Andreae" on Nov. 3; but most Martyrologies agree with the *Martyrologium Romanum* in placing the translation on May 9. Several Martyrologies have on Feb. 5 an "Ordinatio Episcopatus Andreae Apostoli," in commemoration of the saint's consecration to the see of Patras (Florentinus, in *Martyrol. Hieron.* p. 300; Baronius, in *Martyrol. Romano*, Nov. 30, p. 502; Tillemont, *Mem. Eccles.* i. 320, 589; Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, v. i. 503, ff.).

As was natural in the case of so distinguished a saint as the first-called Apostle, churches were dedicated in honour of St. Andrew in early times. Pope Simplicius (c. 470) is said to have dedicated a basilica at Rome in his honour (Ciampini, *Vet. Monum.* i. 242); and somewhat later (c. 500) Pope Symmachus converted the "Vestiarium Neronis" into a church, which bore the name "S. Andreae ad Crucem." This was not far from the Vatican (Ciampini, *De Sacris Aedif.* p. 86). Later examples are frequent.

The representation of St. Andrew with the decussate cross (X) as the instrument of his martyrdom belongs to the Middle Ages. In ancient examples he appears, like most of the other apostles, simply as a dignified figure in the ancient Roman dress, sometimes bearing a crown, as in a 5th-century Mosaic in the church of St. John at Ravenna (Ciampini, *Vet. Monumenta*, tom. i. tab. lxx. p. 235), sometimes a roll of a book, as in a 9th-century Mosaic figured by Ciampini (u. s. tom. ii. tab. lxx. p. 162), where he is joined with the favoured disciples, SS. Peter, and James, and John. [C.]

**ANDRONICUS.** (1) Saint, April 5 (*M. Badoe*).

(2) May 13 (*M. Hieron.*).

(3) "Apostle," with Junia (Rom. xvi. 7), commemorated May 17 (*Cal. Byzant.*); invention of their relics, Feb. 22 (*Id.*, Neale).

(4) Commemorated Sept. 27 (*M. Hieron.*).

(5) "Holy Father," Oct. 9 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(6) Martyr, commemorated Oct. 10 (*Mart. Hieron.*); Oct. 11 (*M. Rom. Vet.*); Oct. 12 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**ANESIUS**, of Africa, commemorated March 31 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**ANGARIENSE CONCILIUM.** [SANGARIENSE CONCILIUM.]

**ANGELS and ARCHANGELS, in CHRISTIAN ART.** The representations of angels in Christian art, at various periods, reproduce in a remarkable manner the ideas concerning them, which from time to time have prevailed in the Church. In one and all, however, we may trace, though with various modifications of treatment, an embodied commentary upon the brief but expressive declaration concerning their nature and office which is given in the Epistle to the Hebrews (i. 14). Worship or service rendered unto God (*λατρεύω*),<sup>a</sup> and work of ministration (*διακονία*) done on God's behalf to men, these are the two spheres of angelic operation suggested in Holy Scripture, and these, under various modifications<sup>b</sup> curiously characteristic of the successive ages in which they are found, come before us in a series of monuments extending from the fourth to the close of the 14th century.

§ 2. *First three Centuries.* Existing monuments of early Christian art, illustrative of our present subject, are, for the first 500 years, or more, almost exclusively of the West, and, with one or two doubtful exceptions, all these are of a date subsequent to the "Peace of the Church," under Constantine the Great, and probably, not earlier than 400 A.D. As a special interest attaches to these earliest monuments, it may be well here to enumerate them. The earliest of them all, if D'Agincourt's judgment (*Histoire*, etc. vol. v. *Peinture*, Pl. vii. No. 3.) may be trusted, is a monument in the cemetery of St. Priscilla,<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Heb. i. 14. *λατρεύοντα πνεύματα ἀποστελλόμενα εἰς διακονίαν*. The distinction of the two words noticed above is lost in our English version. It is well brought out by Origen, *cont. Celsum*, lib. v. (quoted by Bingham, *Antiq.* book xiii. cap. iii. § 2, note 2). See this further illustrated in the description of woodcut in § 6 below.

<sup>b</sup> Absent (almost, if not altogether) for the first four centuries (see § 2), they subserve purposes of dogma (§ 3) in the 5th century; they are Scriptural still, but also in one case legendary (§ 4) in the 6th. From that time forward canonical and apocryphal Scripture and mediæval legend are mixed up together. We find them imperial in character, or sacerdotal and liturgical, as the case may be; while in the later middle ages even feudal notions were characteristically mixed up with the traditions concerning them derived from Holy Scripture. (For this last see Jamieson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, 3rd edit. vol. i. p. 24, quoting from *Il Perfeito Leggendario*.)

<sup>c</sup> The Abbé Martigny (*Dictionnaire*, &c. in voc. "Anges") speaks with evident doubt of the date assigned to this fresco. D'Agincourt himself in his description gives no particulars as to the source from which his drawing was derived. Neither earlier nor later antiquaries know anything of its history. And this being so, an unsupported opinion as to its date, resting on the authority of D'Agin-

court alone, carries but little weight. The same subject is reproduced in the Cemetery of SS. Thraso and Saturninus (Perret, vol. iii. pl. xxvi.).

It is a representation of Tobias and the angel. (This same subject, suggestive of the "Guardian Angel," reappears in some of the Vetri Antichi, of the 4th and 5th century.) Another fresco of early but uncertain date in the cemetery of St. Priscilla (Aringhi, *R. S.* ii. p. 297) has been generally interpreted as representing the Annunciation. The angel Gabriel (if such be the intention of the painter) has a human figure, and the dress commonly assigned to Apostles and other Scriptural personages, but is without wings, or any other special designations. With these doubtful exceptions, no representations of angels, now remaining, are earlier than the fourth century, and probably not earlier than the fifth.

§ 3. *Fourth and fifth Centuries.* There was an interval of transition from this earlier period, the limits of which are indicated by the Council of Illiberis,<sup>d</sup> A.D. 305, on the one hand, and on the other by the Christian mosaics of which we first hear<sup>e</sup> at the close of that century, or early in the next. The first representation of angels in mosaic work is supposed (by Ciampinus and others) to be that of the Church of S. Agatha at Ravenna. These mosaics Ciampinus admits to be of very uncertain date, but he believes<sup>f</sup> them to be of the beginning of the 5th century. (See his *Vetera Monumenta*, vol. i. Tab. xlv.) The first representations of the kind to which a date can with any certainty be assigned, are those in the Church of S. Maria Major at Rome, put up by Xystus III. between the years 432 and 440 A.D. In those of the Nave of this Church (Ciampini *V. M.* tom. i. Pl. i. to lxiv.) various subjects from the Old Testament have their place; and amongst others the appearance of the three angels to Abraham (Pl. li.) and of the "Captain of the Lord's Hosts" (by tradition the archangel Michael) to Joshua (Pl. lxii.). But on the "Arcus Triumphalis"<sup>g</sup> of this same Church, there is a series of mosaics, of the greatest possible interest to the history of dogmatic theology; and in these angels have a prominent part. This series was evidently intended to be an em-

court alone, carries but little weight. The same subject is reproduced in the Cemetery of SS. Thraso and Saturninus (Perret, vol. iii. pl. xxvi.).

<sup>d</sup> The 37th canon forbids the painting upon walls the objects of religious worship and adoration. "Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur." Roman writers, for obvious reasons, seek to explain away the apparent meaning of this prohibition. As to this, see Bingham, *C. A.*, book viii. cap. viii. § 6.

<sup>e</sup> Paulinus, bishop of Nola, early in the 5th century, describes at much length in a letter (Ep. xii.) to his friend Severus the decorations with which he had adorned his own church. His descriptions accord closely with some of the actual monuments (sarcophagi and mosaic pictures) of nearly contemporary date, which have been preserved to our own time.

<sup>f</sup> The form of the Nimbus here assigned to our Lord seems to indicate a later date.

<sup>g</sup> By the "triumphal arch" of a Roman church is meant what will correspond most nearly with the chancel arch of our own churches. It was full in view of the assembled people on entering the church. And for the first six centuries (or nearly that time, it was reserved exclusively for such subjects as had immediate reference to our Lord; more particularly to His triumph over sin and death, and His session as King in heaven. See farther on this subject Ciampini, *V. M.* tom. i. p. 193, sqq.

embodiment in art of the doctrine decreed just previously in the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. The angels represented in the scenes of "The Annunciation," the Worship of the Magi (see woodcut<sup>1</sup> annexed), and the Presentation in the Temple, are here made to serve to the declaration of what had just before been proclaimed, viz.: that He who was born of Mary was not a mere man in whom the Word of God might afterward take up his abode,<sup>2</sup> but was himself God, as well as man, two natures united in one person. The angels throughout are represented as ministering as it were in homage to a king. Even in the Annunciation, not Gabriel only is represented, but two other angels are seen standing behind the seat on which the Virgin Mary is placed. Of these Ciampini rightly says, that they are to be regarded as doing homage to the Word then become incarnate. "Duo illi . . . astant, sive Gabrielis associas, sive Deiparae custodes, aut potius incarnato tunc Verbo obsequium exhibentes." They embody, as he observes, the thought expressed by St. Augustine. "All

angels are created beings, doing service unto Christ. Angels could be sent to do Him homage, (ad obsequium) could be sent to do Him service, but not to bring help (as to one weak or helpless in himself): and so it is written that angels ministered to Him, not as pitying one that needed help, but as subject unto Him who is Almighty." (S. Aug. in Psal. lvi.)

§ 4. *Sixth Century.* Between 500 A.D. and 600 A.D., the following examples may be cited: the triumphal arch of the Church of SS. Cosmas and Damianus at Rome (Ciampini *V. M.* tom. ii. Tab. xv.) circ. 530 A.D., and fifteen years later the mosaics of S. Michael the archangel at Ravenna, *ibid.* Tab. xvii.). In the apex of the tribune is a representation of Our Lord, holding a lofty cross, with Michael r. and Gabriel l. (sic) l. On the wall above, the two archangels are again seen on either side of a throne, and of one seated thereon. These two bear long rods or staves, but on either side are seven other angels (four r. and three l.) playing upon trumpets. There is here an evident allusion to Rev. viii. 2, 6, "I saw



Worship of the Magi, from S. Maria Major at Rome.

the seven angels, which stand before God, and to them were given seven trumpets." Comp. Ezek. x. 10, Tobit xii. 15, and Rev. i. 4; iv. 5. (Ciampini *V. M.* ii., xvii., comp. Tab. xix.) Michael and Gabriel appear yet again on the arch of the Tribune of S. Apollinaris in Classe (*ibid.* Tab. xxiv.); and there are representations of the four archangels, as present at the Worship of the Magi, in the S. Apollinaris Novus (*ibid.* Tab. xxvii.) towards the close of that century. To this period also is to be assigned the diptych of Milan,<sup>3</sup> which is remarkable as containing an

embodiment (probably the first in Christian art) of legends concerning the appearance of Gabriel to the Virgin Mary, derived from the Apocryphal Gospels.

§ 5. *From 600 to 800 A.D.* Art monuments of this period are but few in number. For examples, bearing upon our present subject, see Ciampini *V. M.* vol. ii. Tabb. xxxi. and xxxviii. and D'Agincourt, *Peinture*, tom. v., Pl. xvi. and xvii. They contain nothing to call for special remark, save that, in the 8th century particularly, the wings of angels become more and more curtailed in proportion to the body; a peculiarity which may serve as an indication of date where others are wanting. One such example in sculpture, of Michael and the Dragon, is referred to below, § 10.

§ 6. *Eastern and Greek Representations.* Early monuments of Christian art in the East are un-

<sup>1</sup> For further particulars as to this see § 15 below.


<sup>2</sup> See Cyril. Alex. *Epist. ad Monachos*, in which the patriarch of Alexandria, the chief opponent of Nestorius, represents in these terms the doctrine condemned at Ephesus.

<sup>3</sup> Figured and described in Bogasi, *Memoirs de S. Celsus Martire*, Append. tab. i. and ii. The particular group above referred to is figured in Martigny, *Dictionnaire*, &c., under 'Annunciation.' The whole diptych is published in facsimile of bottle ivory by the Arundel Society.

<sup>4</sup> See also his pl. x. and xii., containing frescoes of late but uncertain date from the catacombs.

fortunately, very rare, the seal of the Iconoclasts, and at a later period of Saracens and Turks, having been fatal to many, which might otherwise have been preserved. The earliest example in Greek art is a representation of an angel in a MS. of Genesis in the Imperial Library at Vienna, believed to be of the 4th or 5th century. It is figured by Seroux D'Agincourt, *Peinture*, Pl. xix. It is a human figure, winged, and without nimbus or other special attributes. The

fery sword, etc., spoken of in Gen. III. is there represented not as a sword, in the hand of the angel, but as a great wheel\* of fire beside him. Next in date to this is an interesting picture of the Ascension, in a Syriac MS. of the Gospels, written and illuminated in the year 586 A.D. at Zagba in Mesopotamia. We have engraved this, as embodying those Oriental types of the angel form which have been characteristic of Eastern and Greek art from that time to this. It



The Ascension, from an ancient Syriac MS.

will be seen that the Saviour is here represented in glory. And the various angelic powers appear in three different capacities. Beneath the feet of the Saviour, and forming as it were a chariot upon which He rises to Heaven, is what the Greeks call the Tetramorphon. The head and the head of a man (or rather, according to Greek tradition, of an angel), the heads of an eagle, a lion, and an ox, are united by wings that are full of eyes (comp. Ezekiel I. 18). On either side of these again are two pairs of fiery wheels, "wheel within wheel," as suggested again by the description in Ezek. I. 16. These serve as

symbolic representations of the order of angels known as "thrones" (comp. § 7 below), and of the cherubim. Of the six other angels, here represented in human form, and winged, four are ministering to Our Lord (*Acrotypoi*), either by active service, as the two who bear Him up in

\* Compare the mosaic of the S. Vitale at Ravenna (Camp. V. M. II. tab. xix.), in the upper part of which two angels are seen upholding a mystic "wheel." Clamplona, apparently without understanding what was the symbolism intended, rightly describes it in the words (p. 72) "duo angeli .... quondam rotam præ manibus tenentes."

their hands, or by adoration, as two others who are offering Him crowns of victory (*strophai*). Two others, lastly, have been sent on work of ministry to men (comp. note \* above), and are seen, as St. Luke's narrative suggests, making of the eleven disciples, "Why stand ye here gazing up into heaven?" and the rest. (The central figure of the lower group is that of the Virgin Mary.)

§ 7. *The Celestial Hierarchy of Dionysius.* The best comment on the picture last described is to be found in the 'Celestial Hierarchy' of Dionysius. The whole number of celestial beings are to be divided (as he tells us), into three orders, in each of which a triple gradation is contained. In the first order are contained the "thrones," the seraphim and cherubim. And these are continually in the immediate presence of God, nearer than all others to Him, reflecting, without intervention of any other created being, the direct effluence of His glory. Next to these, and of the second order, are dominions, authoritias, powers (*dynameis*, *δυνάμεις*, *dynameis*), forming a link between the first and the third order. To these last (principalities [*ἀρχαί*], archangels, and angels) he assigns that more immediate execution of the divine purposes in the sphere of creation, and towards mankind, which in the belief of religious minds is generally associated with the idea of angelic agency.

This teaching of Dionysius, regarded as it was both in East and West as of all but apostolic authority, has served as a foundation upon which all the later traditions have been built up. And this language, with the additional comments quoted in the next section, will give the reader the key to much that would be otherwise obscure in the allusions of Greek fathers, and in the forms of Greek art.

§ 8. *Angels in later Greek Art.* The language of the *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Γραμματική*, or 'Palatine Guide' of Panselinos, a monk of Mount Athos in the 11th century, may be regarded (see under *ΑΓΓΕΛΙΑ*) as embodying the unchanging rules of Greek religious art from the 8th century to the present time. Taking up the division quoted above, the writer says, as to the first order, that "the thrones are represented as wheels of fire, compassed about with wings. Their wings are full of eyes, and the whole is so arranged as to produce the semblance of a royal throne. The cherubim are represented by a head and two wings. The seraphim as having six wings, whereof two rise upward to the head, and two droop to the feet, and two are outspread as if for flight. They carry in either hand a hexapteryx,\* inscribed with the words 'Holy, Holy, Holy.' It is thus that they were seen by Isaiah." Then, after describing the "Tetramorphi," he proceeds to speak of angels of the second order. "These are dominions, virtues, powers. "These," he says, "are clothed in white tunics reaching to the feet, with golden girdles and green outer robes." They hold in the right hand staves of

gold, and in the left a seal formed thus ☉.† Then, of the third order, (principalities, archangels, angels), he writes thus. "These are represented vested as warriors, and with golden girdles. They hold in their hands javalins and axes; the javalins are tipped with iron, as lances."

§ 9. *Attributes of Angels.* There are two sources from which we may infer the attributes regarded as proper to angels in early times; the description given of them in the treatise of Dionysius already quoted, and the actual monuments of early date which have been preserved to our times. As to these Dionysius writes that angels are represented as of human form in regard of the intellectual qualities of man, and of his heavenward gaze, and the lordship and dominion which are naturally his. He adds that bright vesture, and that which is of the colour of fire, are symbolical of light and of the divine likeness, while sacerdotal vesture serves to denote their office in leading to divine and mystical contemplations, and the consecration of their whole life unto God. He mentions, also, girdles, staves or rods (significant of royal or princely power), spears and axes, instruments for measurement or of constructive art (ὡς γεωμετρικὰ καὶ οὐρανοῦ ἐργα), among the insignia occasionally attributed to angels. If, from the pages of Dionysius, we turn to actual monuments, we find the exact counterpart of his descriptions. They may be enumerated as follows:—1. *The human form.* In all the earlier monuments (enumerated above, §§ 3, 4), angels are represented as men, and either with or without wings. In this Christian art did but follow the suggestions of Holy Scripture. But St. Chrysostom expresses what was the prevailing (but not the universal) opinion of early Christian writers, when he says (*De Sacrad. lib. vi. p. 424 D*) that although angels, and even God Himself, have oftentimes appeared in the form of man, yet what was then manifested was not actual flesh, but a semblance assumed in condescension to the weakness of mankind\* (ὡς οὐρανοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμοίαν ἐμφανίσαντο). Both in ancient and in modern art examples are occasionally found of angels thus represented as men, without any of the special attributes enumerated below. 2. *Wings.* As heavenly messengers ascending and descending between heaven and earth, angels have, with a natural propriety† as well as on Scriptural

But we suspect that in the original he found *οὐρανοῦ*, a word which Greek writers never use in the technical sense of "heaven" (the ecclesiastical vestment known as *stola* in the West since the 16th century).

\* This is what was known in mediæval times as the "Signatum Iud," or seal of God. Such a seal is represented in the head of Lucifer before his fall, in the *Marburg Heliolum*, a MS. now in the Library of Strasbourg.

† With this agrees the language of Tertullian, *De Resurrectione Carnis*, cap. lvi. "Angeli aliquando hominum humanum formam, colore et habitu, et pedes leviores purpureos, humeros omnes instrumentum experientiam, mixta inter substantia propria. Igitur et angelus, sancti linguam hominum, in eodem sublimis spiritus permanens," &c. Similar language reappears in other Latin Fathers.

† Camp. Philo. Quæst. in Gen. xlv. 30, αὐτοὶ θεοὶ ὡς ἀνθρώποι ὁμοιωμένοι. ἵνα δὲ αὐτοὶ εἰς τὸν ἕλεον ἵδωσι φανερωθῶσι καὶ οὐκ ἀποκρυφθῶσι. And very beautifully elsewhere he speaks of the angels as going up and down between heaven and earth, and surveying (*θεωροῦν*)

\* Obtained by M. Dabon in 1851 at Mount Athos, and published by him in a French translation.

† The "Sebastos" or "San" of the Greeks was called *ἡγεμὼν*, as containing the representation of a six-winged seraph. The "thronos" represented as wheels (with wings of flame), described by Panselinos, may be seen in the second of the illustrations of this article.

† Outer robes. "ἡν δὲ δὴν ἔσθην," says M. Dabon.



authority," been represented in all ages of the church as furnished with wings. We may add that this mode of expressing the idea of ubiquity and power, as superhuman attributes, had prevailed in heathen art from the earliest times, and that in East and West alike. Examples of this in Assyrian art are now familiar to us. Similar figures are found in Egypt. They were less common in classical art. Yet Mercury, as the messenger of the gods, had wings upon his feet; and little winged genii were commonly represented in decorative work, and thence were transferred (probably as mere decorations) into early Christian works of art. As to the number of these wings, two only are to be found in all the earlier representations. We do not know of any example of four, or of six wings, earlier than the 9th century, though the descriptions given in Holy Scripture of the "Living Creatures" with six wings, and the four-winged deities of primitive Eastern art, might naturally have suggested such representations. As to later representations of cherubim and seraphim, and the like, see below, section 14.

3. *Vesture.* The vesture assigned to angels, in various ages of the Church, has ever been such as was associated in men's minds with the ideas of religious solemnity, and in the later centuries, of sacerdotal ministry. In Holy Scripture the vesture of angels is described as white (Matt. xxviii. 3; John xx. 12; Rev. iv. 4; xv. 6),<sup>7</sup> and in mosaics of the 5th and 6th centuries, at Rome and Ravenna (where first we can determine questions of colour with any accuracy), we find white vestments generally assigned to them (long tunic and pallium), exactly resembling those of apostles. But in mosaics, believed to be of the 7th century (St. Sophia at Thessalonica)<sup>8</sup> angels have coloured himatia (outer robes) over the long white tunic, and their wings, too, are coloured, red and blue being the prevailing tints. And these two colours had, long ere that time, been recognised as invested with a special significance, red as the colour of flame, and symbolical of holy love (caritas), blue as significant of heaven, and of heavenly contemplation or divine knowledge. And in the later traditions of Christian art (from the 9th century onwards)<sup>9</sup> these two colours were as a general rule assigned, red more especially to the seraphim as the spirits of love, and blue to the cherubim as spirits of knowledge or of contemplation; while the two colours combined, as they often are found, are regarded as

ἀγγελία) the biddings of the Father to His children, and the wants of the children to their Father.

<sup>7</sup> See the passages in Exodus, Isaiah, and Ezekiel already referred to; and compare the expression in Rev. xiv. 6, of an angel flying (πτερόπτερος) there.

<sup>8</sup> For examples see Aringhi, *Roma Subterranea*, tom. i. pp. 323, 615; tom. ii. p. 167. Compare p. 29, where similar figures, without wings, are introduced in an ornamental design.

<sup>9</sup> See Ciampini, *V. M.* ii. pp. 58 and 64. He speaks of "tunicæ" and "pallia" as being white; and of "stoles" (really stripes on the tunic), and wings of violet.

<sup>10</sup> Texter and Pullan, *Byzantine Architecture*, pl. xl. Compare the curious picture of the Holy Family, a bishop (or other ecclesiastic), and two angels, from Urgub, figured in plate v., where the robes of the angels are white, their wings blue and reddish yellow.

<sup>11</sup> "The distinction of hue in the red and blue angels we find wholly omitted towards the end of the 15th century" (Mrs. Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*).

suggesting the union of the two qualities of love and knowledge, the perfection of the angelic nature. It should be added that the vestments of angels have not unfrequently such ornament appended to them as was of ordinary usage from time to time in ecclesiastical dress, viz., coloured stripes on the tunic, in the earlier centuries, afterwards oraria or stoles, and even "omophoria," the distinctive insignia of episcopal office in the East.

4. *The Nimbus.* In the early Greek MS. already noticed, § 6, and in one or two early representations in the catacombs at Rome, angels are represented without the Nimbus. But from the middle of the 5th century onward, this ornament is almost invariably assigned to them. [NIMBUS.]

5. *The Wand of Power.* Only in exceptional instances during the first eight centuries, are angels represented as bearing anything in the hand. Three examples may be cited, in mosaics,<sup>b</sup> of the 6th century, at Ravenna, in which angels attendant on our Lord (see § 3) hold wands<sup>c</sup> in their hands, which may either represent the rod of divine power, or, as some have thought, the "golden reed"—the "measuring reed," assigned to the angel in Rev. xxi. 15, as in Ezek. xl. 3. The representations of archangels, particularly of Michael, as warriors with sword, or spear, and girdle, are of later date.

6. *Instruments of Music.* One early example has been already referred to (§ 4) of a Ravenna mosaic, in which the "Seven Angels" are represented holding trumpets in their hands. In the later traditions of Christian art, representations of angels as the "Choristers of Heaven" have been far more common, various instruments of music being assigned to them.

§ 10. *Michael.*—The archangel Michael is first designated by name in mosaics of the 5th century, at Ravenna (Ciampini, vol. ii. pl. xvii. and xxiv.). And in other cases where we see two angels specially marked out as in attendance on our Lord, we may infer that Michael and Gabriel are designated. For the names of these two alone are prominent in Holy Scripture. And according to a very ancient tradition, traced back to Rabbinical belief, perpetuated as many such traditions were in the East, and thence handed on to Western Christendom, these two archangels personified respectively<sup>d</sup> the judgment

<sup>b</sup> Ciampini, *V. M.* ii. tab. xvii., xix., and xxiv. Compare in his plate xvi. of vol. i. the mosaic at S. Agatha, which we believe to be of nearly the same date.

<sup>c</sup> In the church dedicated in the name of the archangel Michael at Ravenna, in the year 545, an indication of special honour is given to him by the small cross upon his wand, which is wanting in that of Gabriel (Ciamp. *V. M.* ii. tab. xvii.).

<sup>d</sup> In yet other traditions the mercy of God, and more particularly His healing grace, is ministered by Raphael. There is great variety in the older Jewish traditions. According to one (Joma, p. 37, quoted by Böhmer in Herzog's *Encycl.*), when the three angels appeared to Abraham, Michael, as first in rank, occupied the central place, having Gabriel, as second, on his right hand, and Raphael, as third in rank, on his left. This place on the right hand of God is elsewhere assigned to Gabriel, as being the angel of his power (comp. Origen, *περί ἀρχόντων*, i. 8), and to Raphael that on the left (near the heart), as being the angel of His mercy. And again in Philo (*Quæst. in Gen.* iii. 24), the two cherubim on either side of the mercy-seat represent respectively the messengers of the Wrath, and of the Mercy, of the Lord (comp. Exod. xxxiv. 5-7).

and the mercy of God, and were therefore fitly placed, Michael, as the angel of power, on the right hand, Gabriel, nearer to the Aeast, on the left hand. For the special traditions concerning "St. Michael," his appearances in vision at Mount Gargano in Apulia, to St. Gregory the Great on the mole of Hadrian, now the castle of *St. Angelo*, and to Aubert, Bishop of Avranches in 706, A.D., at "Mount St. Michel" in Normandy (to this our own St. Michael's Mount owes its designation), see Jameson's *Sacred and Legendary Art*, pp. 94 sqq. The oldest example in sculpture of St. Michael treading under foot the dragon (see Rev. xii. 7, 8), is on the porch of the Cathedral of Catania, believed to be



St. Michael.

of the 7th century. [Figured above.] Later pictures often represent St. Michael as the angel of judgment, holding scales in his hand, in which souls are weighed.


§ 11. *Gabriel* (Heb. "Man of God,") as the messenger more especially of comfort and of good tidings, occupies a prominent place in the New Testament, as announcing the birth both of John the Baptist to Zacharias and of our Lord to the Virgin Mary. (In apocryphal legend he is represented as foretelling to Joachim the birth of the Virgin Mary.) In the language of Tasso he is "l'Angelo Annunziatore." Though only twice (as far as I have observed) designated by name in early Christian Art (Ciampini, *V. M.* ii., Tab. xvii. and xxiv.), yet in the various pictures of the Annunciation, which are many, it is he, of course, who is to be understood. By a singular fate, having been regarded by Mahomet as his immediate inspirer, he is looked upon in many parts of the East as the great protecting angel of Islamism, and, as such, in direct opposition to Michael the protector of Jews and Christians.

§ 12. *Raphael* (Heb. the Healer who is from God, or "Divine Healer") is mentioned in the book of Tobit as "one of the seven holy angels which go in and out before the glory of the Holy One," esp. xii. 15. Through the influence of this beautiful Hebrew story of Tobias and Raphael, his name became associated in early times with the idea of the guardian angel. As

such he is twice figured in the Roman catacombs, and allusions to the same story are frequent in the *Vetri Antichi*. [GLASS, CHRISTIAN.] In mediæval Greek art the three archangels already named are sometimes represented together, designated by their initial letters M, Γ, and P, Michael as a warrior, Gabriel as a prince, and Raphael as a priest—the three supporting between them a youthful figure of our Lord, himself represented with wings as the "angelus" or messenger of the will of God. (Figured in Jameson's *S. L. A.*, p. 93.)

§ 13. *Uriel*. (The Fire of God.) The fourth archangel, named Uriel in *Ecdras* ii. 4, has been much less prominent in legend and in art than the three already named.\* He is regarded as charged more particularly with the interpretation of God's will, of judgments and prophecies (with reference, doubtless, to *Ecdras* ii.). These "archangels" of Christian tradition are to the Jews the first four of those "Seven Angels" who see the glory of God (*Tobias* xii. 15); the other three being Chamuel (he who sees God), Jophiel (the beauty of God), and Zadkiel (the righteousness of God). But these last three names have never been generally recognised either in East or West. And in the first example of the representation of these Seven Angels in Christian art they are distinguished from the two archangels Michael and Gabriel, who hold wands, while to the seven, as already noticed, § 4, trumpets are assigned. (Ciampini, *V. M.* ii., pl. xvii.)

§ 14. *Seraphim and Cherubim*. These two names appear, the first in *Isaiah* vi. 2 (there only), and the latter in *Exodus* xxv. 18, where two are spoken of, and in *Ezekiel* i. 4-14, who speaks of four (compare the four "living creatures" of *Rev.* iv. 6). They have been perpetuated in



Seraphim and Cherubim

Christian usage, and the descriptions given of them in Holy Scripture have been embodied (those of the cherubim or four "living creatures," first, and somewhat later those of the seraphim) in Christian art from the 5th century onwards. They were regarded (see above § 8) as the spirits of love and of knowledge respectively. For fuller details concerning the two in Holy Scripture see

\* From the name of Uriel being little known, the fourth archangel is designated in some mediæval manuscripts (Jameson, *S. and L. Art*, p. 93) as "St. Cherubin."

'Dictionary of the Bible.' In art they do not appear as *Angel* forms, with any special modification of the ordinary type, as far as we have observed, in any earlier representation than that of the Syriac MS. already described and figured. Later modifications of this oldest type may be seen in Jameson, *S. and L. Art*, p. 42 sqq., from which the cut given above is taken; D'Agincourt, *Sculpture*, pl. xii. 16 (the diptych of Rambona, 9th century), *Peinture*, pl. l. 3 (Greek MS. of 12th century). Cherubic representations of the four "Living Creatures" will be separately treated under EVANGELISTS.

§ 15. *The Illustrations to this Article.* Great interest attaches to the mosaic of Xystus III., which forms the first of the illustrations to this article, from its bearing upon the history of doctrine, and especially of the cultus of the Virgin Mary, and as restorations made in the time of Benedict XIV. (1740-1758) have produced considerable changes in the mosaic here figured, it will be well to state the authority for the present representation. The only published picture of the mosaic in its older state (that here reproduced), is a very rude engraving in Ciampini, *Vetera Monumenta*, i. p. 200, Tab. xlix. In some important particulars of archaeological detail his engraving varies from the carefully drawn and coloured pictures, from which the illustration above given has been taken. But in the general arrangement and outline of the figures the two are in accord. The coloured drawings of which we speak, form part of a collection (in two large folio volumes) which was made by Pope Clement XI. when Cardinal Albano. These, with a number of other volumes containing classical antiquities of various kinds, were purchased at Rome by an agent of George III., and are now in the Royal Library at Windsor.

The second of the illustrations (from a Syriac MS.) is from a photolithograph, reproducing the outline given by Seroux d'Agincourt, *Peinture*, pl. xxvii. That author speaks of it as "calqué sur l'original," and from a comparison with an exact copy made from the original by Professor Westwood, we are able to vouch for the perfect accuracy of the present illustration. [W. B. M.]

**ANGELS OF CHURCHES—Bishops.** It does not appear that the bishops of the Primitive Church were commonly spoken of under this title, nor indeed did it become in later times the ordinary designation of the episcopal office. Instances, however, of this application of it occur in the earlier Church historians, as, e.g., in Sozomen, who so styles Serapion Bishop of Thomaïs (Lib. iv. c. 23). The word *Bydel* also, which is Saxon for angel or messenger, is found to have been similarly employed (see Hammond on *Rev.* i. 20). But though no such instances were forthcoming, it would prove nothing against the received interpretation, as it may be considered, of the memorable vision of St. John, recorded in the first three chapters of the Apocalypse, in which he is charged to convey the heavenly message to each of the seven churches through his "Angel." It should be remembered that the language of this vision, as of the whole book to which it belongs, is eminently mystical and symbolical; the word "Angel," therefore, as being transferred from an heavenly to an earthly ministry, though it would very signifi-

cantly as well as honourably characterize the office so designated, could yet scarcely be expected to pass into general use as a title of individual ministers. By the same Divine voice from which the Apostle receives his commission the "mystery" of the vision is interpreted. "The seven stars," it is declared, "are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks which thou sawest, are the seven churches." The symbol of a star is repeatedly employed in Scripture to denote lordship and pre-eminence (e.g. Num. xxiv. 17). "There shall come a star out of Jacob," where it symbolises the highest dominion of all. Again, the actual birth of Him who is thus foretold by Balaam is announced by a star (Matt. ii. 2; cf. Is. xiv. 12). Faithful teachers are "stars that shall shine for ever" (Dan. xii. 3); false teachers are "wandering stars" (Jude 13), or "stars which fall from heaven" (Rev. vi. 13, viii. 10, xii. 4). Hence it is naturally inferred from the use of this symbol in the present instance that the "angels" of the seven churches were placed in authority over these churches. Moreover, the angel in each church is *one*, and the responsibilities ascribed to him correspond remarkably with those which are enforced on Timothy and Titus by St. Paul in the Pastoral Epistles. Again, this same title is given to the chief priest in the Old Testament, particularly in Malachi (ii. 7),—where he is styled the angel or messenger of the Lord of Hosts, whose lips therefore were to keep knowledge, and from his mouth, as from the oracle, the people were to "seek the law," to receive knowledge and direction for their duty. To the chief minister, therefore, of the New Testament, it may be fairly argued, the title is no less fitly applied.

By some, however, both among ancient and modern writers, the word "angel" has been understood in its higher sense as denoting God's heavenly messengers; and they have been supposed to be the guardian angels of the several churches—their angels—to whom these epistles were addressed. It is contended that wherever the word angel occurs in this book, it is employed unquestionably in this sense; and that if such guardianship is exercised over individuals, much more the same might be predicated of churches (Dan. xii. 1). Among earlier writers this interpretation is maintained by Origen (Hom. xiii. in *Luc.* and Hom. xx. in *Num.*) and by Jerome (in *Mich.* vi. 1, 2). Of later commentators, one of its most recent and ablest defenders is Dean Alford. But besides the obvious difficulty of giving a satisfactory explanation to the word "write" as enjoined on these supposed heavenly watchers, there remains an objection, not easily to be surmounted, in the language of reproof and the imputation of unfaithfulness, which on this hypothesis would be addressed to holy and sinless beings,—those angels of His who delight to "do His pleasure." So is it observed by Augustine (*Ep.* 43, § 22): "Sed habeo adversum te, quod caritatem primam reliquisti." Hoc de superioribus angelis dici non potest, qui perpetuam retinent caritatem, unde qui defecerunt et lapsi sunt, diabolus est et angeli ejus."

By presbyterian writers the angel of the vision has been variously interpreted:—1. Of the collective presbytery; 2. Of the presiding presbyter, which office, however, it is contended was soon to be discontinued in the Church, because

of its foreseen corruption. 3. Of the messengers sent from the several churches to St. John. It hardly falls within the scope of this article to discuss these interpretations. To unprejudiced readers it will probably be enough to state them, to make their weakness manifest. It is difficult to account for them, except as the suggestions of a foregone conclusion.

On the other hand, as St. John is believed on other grounds to have been pre-eminently the organiser of Episcopacy throughout the Church, so here in this wonderful vision the holy Apostle comes before us, it would seem, very remarkably in this special character; and in the message which he delivers, under divine direction, to each of the seven churches through its angel, we recognize a most important confirmation of the evidence on which we claim for episcopal government, the precedent, sanction, and authority of the apostolic age. (Bingham, Thorndike, Archbishop Trench on *Epp. to Seven Churches*.) [D. B.]

**ANGERS, COUNCIL OF (ANDEGAVENSE CONCILIUM)**, A.D. 453, Oct. 4; wherein, after consecrating Talasius, Bishop of Angers, there were passed 12 canons respecting submission of presbyters to bishops, the inability of "digami" to be ordained, &c. (Mansi, vii. 899-902). [A. W. H.]

**ANGLICAN COUNCILS** (*Concilia Anglicana*); a designation given to English general councils, of which the precise locality is unknown; e. g. A.D. 756, one of bishops, presbyters, and abbats, held by Archbishop Cuthbert to appoint June 5 to be kept in memory of the martyrdom of St. Boniface and his companions (Cuthb. *ad Lullum*, intr. *Epist. S. Bonif.* 70; Wilk. i. 144; Mansi, xii. 585-590); A.D. 797 (Alford), 798 (Spelman), held by Ethelheard preparatory to his journey to Rome to oppose the archbishopric of Lichfield (W. Malm. *G. P. A.* lib. i.; Pagi *ad an.* 796, n. 27; Mansi, xiii. 991, 992). [A. W. H.]

**ANIANUS**. (1) Patriarch, commemorated Hedar 20 = Nov. 16 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(2) Bishop; translation, June 14 (*Mart. Bedae, Hieron.*); deposition at Orleans, Nov. 17 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

**ANICETUS**, martyr, commemorated Aug. 12 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**ANNA**, the prophetess, commemorated Sept. 1 (Ado, *De Festiv., Martyrol.*); Jakatit 8 = Feb. 2 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [C.]

**ANNATES**: lit. the revenues or profits of one year, and therefore synonymous with first-fruits so far; but being, in their strict and technical sense, a development of the Middle Ages, the only explanation that can be given of them here is how they arose. Anciently, the entire revenues of each diocese were placed in the hands of its bishop, as Bingham shews (v. 6. 1-3), who with the advice and consent of his senate of presbyters distributed, and in the Western Church usually divided them into 4 parts. One part went to himself; a 2nd to his clergy; a 3rd to the poor; a 4th to the maintenance of the fabric and requirements of the diocesan churches. Of these the 3rd and 4th were claimants, so to speak, that never died; but in the case of the two former, when offices became vacant by death or removal, what was

to be done with the stipend attaching to them, till they were filled up? Naturally, when endowments became fixed and considerable, and promotions, from not having been allowed at all, the rule, large sums constantly fell to the disposal of some one in this way; of the bishop, when any of his clergy died or were removed; and of whom, when the bishop died or was removed, by deposition or by translation, as time went on, but of the metropolitan or primate at last, though, perhaps, at first of the presbytery? And then came the temptation to keep bishoprics vacant, and appropriate "the annates," or else require them from the bishop elect in return for consecrating him. It was but a step further in the same direction for Rome to lay claim to what primates and archbishops had enjoyed so long, when the appointment of both, so far as the Church was concerned, became vested in Rome. But, on the other hand, it is equally certain, that had the primitive rule, founded as it was in strict justice, been maintained intact, each parish, or at least each diocese, would have preserved its own emoluments, or, which comes to the same thing, would have seen them applied to its own spiritual exigencies in all cases. The 34th Apostolical canon, the 15th of Ancyra, and the 25th of Antioch, alike testify to the old rule of the Church, and to what abuses it succumbed. Still, De Marca seems hardly justified in ascribing the origin of annates to direct simony (*De Concord. Sac. et Imp.* vi. 10). [E. S. F.]

**ANNE** (*Ἄννα*, ἡ ἁγία). Mother of the Virgin Mary. July 25 is observed by the Orthodox Greek Church as the commemoration of the "Dormitio S. Annae," a Festival with abstinence from labour (*ἀργία*). The same day is said to have been anciently dedicated to S. Anne in the West also, and the feast was probably transferred in the Roman Calendar to the 26th (the day on which it is at present held) from a desire to give greater prominence to S. Anne than was possible on S. James's Day. In the Greek Calendar, also, Joachim and Anna, "Θεοπατόρες," have a festival on Sep. 9, the day following the Nativity of the Virgin Mary. Both the Armenian and the Greek Calendars have on Dec. 9 a "Festival of the Conception of the Virgin Mary," or (as it is called in the latter) Ἡ σύλληψις τῆς ἁγίας καὶ Θεοπρομητόρος Ἀννης, i. e. S. Anne's Conception of the Virgin, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ ἀπεκύησε τὴν ὑπὲρ λόγον τὸν Λόγον κυήσασαν. In the Ethiopic, "Joachim, avus Christi," has April 7; and on July 20 is commemorated the "Ingressus Annae Matris Mariae in Templum" or "Purificatio Annae." (Daniel's *Codex Liturgicus*, tom. iv.; Alt's *Kirchenjahr*.) There is no evidence of any public recognition of S. Anne as a patron saint until about the beginning of the 6th century, when Justinian I. had a temple built in her honour, which is described by Procopius (*De Aedific. Justin.* ch. iii.) as ἱεροπρεπὲς τε καὶ ἀγαστὸν ὅλως ἔδος Ἀννῇ ἁγίᾳ, "whom," he adds, "some believe to be μητέρα Θεοτόκου and grandmother of Christ;" and we are informed by Codinus that Justinian II. founded another in 705.

Her body was brought from Palestine to Constantinople in 740, and her "Inventio Corporis" was celebrated with all the honour due to a saint. [C.]

**ANNOTINUM PASCHA.** In the Gregorian *Liber Responsalis*, and in some MSS. of the *Sacramentary*, following the *Dominica in Albis* (First after Easter), we find an office in *Pasche Annotina*. That it was not, however, invariably on the day following the Octave of Easter is shown by Martene (quoted by Binterim, v. i. 246), who found it placed on the Thursday before Ascension Day in an ancient ritual of Vienna. And it is mentioned in later authorities as having been celebrated on various days, as on the *Sabbatum in Albis*, the Saturday after Easter-Day.

As to the meaning of the expression there are various opinions. Natalis Alexander (*Hist. Eccl. Diss. ii. quæst. 2*), with several of the older authorities, supposed it to be the anniversary of the Easter of the preceding year. If this anniversary was specially observed, when it fell in the Lent of the actual year it would naturally be omitted, or transferred to a period when the Fast was over; for the services of the *Pasche Annotina* were of a Paschal character, and consequently unsuited for a season of mourning.

Probably, however, the nature of the *Pasche Annotina* is correctly stated by the *Micrologus* (c. 56); *Annotina Pascha* is a term equivalent to anniversary Pascha; and it is so called because in olden times at Rome those who had been baptized at Easter celebrated the anniversary of their baptism in the next year by solemn services. Honorius of Autun, Durand, and Baleth, give the same explanation, which is adopted by Thomasius, Martene, and Mabillon. To this calling to mind of baptismal vows the collects of the Gregorian *Sacramentary* (p. 82) refer. The words of the *Micrologus*, that this was observed in olden times (*antiquitus*) seem to imply that even at the time when that treatise was written (about 1100), it had become obsolete (Gregorius *Sacram. Ed. Mûnch*, p. 399; Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, v. i. 245 ff.). [C.]

**ANNUNCIATION.** [MARY THE VIRGIN, FESTIVALS OF.]

**ANointing.** [UNCTION.]

**ANOVICUS**, of Alexandria, commemorated July 7 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

**ANSENIUS**, Commemorated August 7 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**ANTEMPNUS**, bishop, commemorated April 27 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**ANTEPENDIUM** (or Antependium), a veil or hanging in front of an altar. The use of such a piece of drapery no doubt began at a period when altars, as that at S. Alessandro on the Via Nomentana near Rome [ALTAR], began to be constructed with cancellated fronts: the veil hanging in front would protect the interior from dust and from profane or irreverent curiosity. Campini (*Ist. Mon. t. ii. p. 57*) says that in a crypt below the church of SS. Cosmo e Damiano at Rome there was in his time an ancient altar "cum duabus columnis ac epistulis et coronis; nec non sub ipso epistillo anni sunt ferrei e quibus vela pendebant." (Compare t. i. p. 64.)

In the 7th and 8th centuries veils of rich and costly stuffs are often mentioned in the *Lit. Pand.* as suspended "ante altare," as in the

case where Pope Leo III. gave to the church of St. Paul at Rome "velum rubeum quod pendet ante altare habens in medio crucem de chrysocloavo at periclysin de chrysocloavo," a red veil which hangs before the altar, having in the middle a cross of gold embroidery and a border of the same. It is possible, however, that in this and like cases the veil was not attached to the altar, but hung before it from the ciborium or from arches or railings raised upon the altar enclosure. [A. N.]

**ANTEROS**, the pope, martyr at Rome, commemorated Jan. 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedæ*). [C.]

**ANTHEM.** [ANTIPHON.]

**ANTHEMIUS**, commemorated Sept. 26 (*Cal. Armen.*). [C.]

**ANTHIA**, mother of Eleutherius, commemorated April 18 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ANTHIMUS**. (1) Bishop, martyr at Nicomedia, commemorated April 27 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) Presbyter, martyr at Rome, May 11 (*Jb. at Bedæ*).

(3) Martyr at Aegæa, Sept. 27 (*Mart. R. V.*). [C.]

**ANTHOLOGIUM** (*Ἀνθολόγιον*), a compilation from the Paracletica, Menæa, and Horologium, of such portions of the service as are most frequently required by ordinary worshippers. It generally contains the offices for the Festivals of the Lord, of the Virgin Mary, and of the principal saints who have festivals (*τῶν ἑορταζομένων ἁγίων*); and those ordinary offices which most constantly recur. (Neale, *Eastern Church, Introd.* 890.) This book, which was intended to be a convenient manual, has been so swollen by the zeal of successive editors, that it has become, says Leo Allatius, a very monster of a book. (*De Libris Ecclesiasticis Græcorum*, p. 89.) [C.]

**ANTIGONUS**, of Alexandria, commemorated Feb. 26 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**ANTIMENSIUM**, a consecrated altar-cloth, "cujus nominis ratio hæc est, quod ex adhiæcent loco mensæ sive altaris" (Bona, *De Rebus Lit. l. xx. § 2*). This seems the natural derivation, especially if, as Suidas says (in Suicer's *Thesaurus* s. v.) the word was a Latin one, meaning a table placed before a tribunal (*ἐπὶ δικαστηρίου κειμένη*). Nevertheless, the Greeks always write the word *ἀντιμηνσίον*, and derive it from *ulvros*, a canister (Neale, *Eastern Church, Introd.* p. 186).

These Antimensia were, and are, consecrated only at the consecration of a church (Goar's *Euchologion*, p. 648), when a piece of cloth large enough to form several antimensia was placed on the altar, consecrated, and afterwards divided and distributed as occasion required. "Relics being pounded up with fragrant gum, oil is poured over them by the bishop, and, distilling on to the corporals, is supposed to convey to them the mysterious virtues of the relics themselves. The Holy Eucharist must then be celebrated on them for seven days, after which they are sent forth as they may be wanted" (Neale, u. s. p. 187). As to the antiquity of these ceremonies it is difficult to speak with certainty.

Theodore Balsamon (in Suicer, s. v.) says that these Antimensia were for use on the Tables of



Oratories (τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν), which were probably for the most part unconsecrated; and Manuel Charitopulus (in Bona, u. s.) says that they were for use in cases where it was doubtful whether the altar was consecrated or not. They were required to be sufficiently large to cover the spot occupied by the paten and chalice at the time of consecration.

The Syrians do not use these cloth antimensia, but in their stead consecrate slabs of wood, which appear to be used even on altars which are consecrated (compare the Ethiopic Arca [ARCA]). The Syriac Nomocanon quoted by Renaudot (*Lit. Orient.* i. 182) in the absence of an Antimensium of any kind permits consecration of the Eucharist on a leaf of the Gospels, or, in the desert and in case of urgent necessity, on the hands of the deacons. [C.]

**ANTIOCH, COUNCILS OF.** Cave reckons only 13 Councils of Antioch between A.D. 252 and 800, at which date the first vol. of his *Hist. Literaria* stops: Sir H. Nicolas as many as 33, and Mansi nearly the same number. Numbering them, however, is unnecessary, as there are no first, second, and third Councils of Antioch as of Carthage and elsewhere. They may be set down briefly in chronological order, only three of them requiring any special notice.

A.D. 252—under Fabian, against the followers of Novatus (Euseb. vi. 46).

— 264, 269—On their dates see Mansi i. 1089–91: both against Paul of Samosata, who was also Bishop of Antioch after Demetrian (Euseb. vii. 27–9). For details, see below.

— 331—Of Arians, to depose Eustathius, Bishop of Antioch, for alleged Sabellianism (Soc. i. 24).

— 339—Of Arians, to appoint Pistus to the see of Alexandria, to which St. Athanasius had just been restored by Constantine the younger (*Life of St. Athanasius* by his Benedictine editors).

— 341—known as the Council of the Dedication: the bishops having met ostensibly to consecrate the great church of the metropolis of Syria, called the “Dominicum Aureum,” the only council of Antioch whose canons have been preserved (Soc. ii. 8). For details, see below.

— 345—Of Arians: when the creed called the “Macrostiche,” from its length, was put forth (Soc. ii. 18).

— 348—Of Arians: at which, however, Stephen, Bishop of Antioch, himself an Arian, was deposed by order of Constantius for the monstrous plot organised by him against the deputies from Sardica (Newman's *Arians*, iv. 3, 4).

— 354—Of Arians: against St. Athanasius.

— 358—under Eudoxius: rejected the words Homoousion and Homoiousion equally: but “without venturing on the distinct Anomoean doctrine” (Newman's *Arians*, iv. 4).

— 361—To authorise the translation of St. Meletius from Sebaste to Antioch. A second was held shortly afterwards, by the same party, to expel him for having made proof of his orthodoxy.

— 363—Of semi-Arians: addressed a sy-

nodical letter to the new emperor Jovian, as had been done by the orthodox at Alexandria. St. Meletius presided, and signed first (Soc. iii. 25).

A.D. 367—Creed of the Council of the Dedication confirmed.

— 379—under St. Meletius: condemned Marcellus, Photinus, and Apollinarius. Addressed a dogmatic letter to St. Damasus and the bishops of the West, who had sent a similar one to St. Paulinus.

— 380—For healing the schism there: when it was agreed that whichever survived—St. Meletius or St. Paulinus—should be accepted by all. Here the *τόμος* or synodical letter of the Westerns was received (at least so says De Marca, *Explic. Can. V. Concil. Const.* A.D. 381, among his Dissertations). St. Meletius signed first of 146 others. St. Paulinus, apparently, was not present at all. A meeting of Arians took place there the same year on the death of their bishop Euzoius, when Dorotheus was elected to succeed him (Soc. iv. 35, and v. 3 and 5).

— 389—To prevent the sons of Marcellus, Bishop of Apamea, from avenging his murder by the barbarians.

— 391—Against the Messalians.

— 424—or, as Mansi thinks (iv. 475) in 418: at which Pelagius was condemned.

— 431—under John of Antioch, condemning and deposing St. Cyril and five others (Mansi, 5, 1147).

— 432—under John also; for making peace with St. Cyril: after which he in this, or another synod of the same year, condemned Nestorius and his opinions.

— 435—Respecting the works of Theodorus of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus lately translated into Armenian.

— 440—On the same subject: occasioned by a letter of Proclus, patriarch of Constantinople.

— 445—under Domnus: in which a Syrian bishop named Athanasius was condemned.

— 448—under Domnus also: when Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, was accused; but his accusers were excommunicated.

— 471—At which Peter the Fuller was deposed, and Julian consecrated in his room; then Peter, having been restored by the usurper Basiliscus in 476, was again ejected by a synod in 478 on the restoration of Zeno.

— 482—At which the appointment of Calendio to that see was confirmed; but he in turn was ejected by the emperor Zeno in 485, and Peter the Fuller restored, who thereupon held a synod there the same year, and condemned the 4th Council.

— 512—at which Severus was appointed patriarch.

— 542—Against Origen.

— 560—under Anastasius: condemning those who opposed the 4th Council.

— 781—under Theodoric: condemning the Iconoclasts.

Of these, the two synods A.D. 264 and 269, against Paul of Samosata were conspicuous both from the fact that the accused was bishop of the city in which they were held, and from the novel

character of their proceedings. They came to the stern resolution of deposing him, yet had to apply to a pagan emperor to enforce their sentence, who, strange to say, did as they requested. No such case had occurred before: it was the gravity of their deliberations and the justice of their decisions that caused them to be respected. With the first of them, as we learn from Eusebius, there were some celebrated names associated. Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, the well-known advocate for re-baptising heretics with St. Cyprian, St. Gregory the wonder-worker, and Athenodorus his brother, the bishops of Tarsus and Jerusalem, and others. Dionysius of Alexandria was invited, but sent excuses on account of his age; declaring his sentiments on the question in a letter addressed to the whole diocese, without so much as naming the accused, its bishop. Those who were present exposed his errors; but Paul, promising amendment, managed to cajole Firmilian, and the bishops separated without passing sentence. At the second council, having been convicted by a presbyter named Malchion, occupying the highest position in the schools of Antioch as a sophist, he was cut off from the communion of the Church; and a synodical letter was addressed in the name of those present, headed by the bishops of Tarsus and Jerusalem—Firmilian had died on his road to the council—and of the neighbouring churches, to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, and the whole Church generally, setting forth all that had been done in both synods, as well as all the false teaching and all the strange practices—so much in harmony with what is attributed to the sophists of Athens in Plato—for which Paul had been deposed, also that Domnus, son of Demetrian, his predecessor in the see, had been elected in his place. Still, condemned as he had been, Paul held his ground till the emperor Aurelian, having been besought to interfere, commanded that “the house in which the bishop lived should be given up to those with whom the bishops of Italy and of the city of Rome communicated as regards dogma.” This settled his fate once for all.

The remaining council of Antioch to be specially noticed is that of the Dedicatio A.D. 341. It was attended by 90 bishops, says St. Athanasius, or by 97 as St. Hilary. Of these but 36 are said to have been Arian: yet they carried their point through Constantius so far as to substitute Eusebius of Hems for St. Athanasius, and, on his hesitating, to get George or Gregory of Cappadocia sent out to be put in possession of the see of Alexandria without delay.

Not content with this, they got their 12th canon levelled against those who, having been deposed in a synod, presume to submit their case to the emperor instead of a larger synod, averring that they deserved no pardon, and ought not ever to be restored again. In this way the restoration of St. Athanasius to Alexandria by Constantine the younger was virtually declared uncanonical and his see vacant. To this canon St. Chrysostom afterwards objected, when it was adduced against him, that it was framed by the Arians. Lastly, they managed to promulgate four different creeds, all intended to undermine that of Nicaea. Yet, strange to say, the 25 canons passed by this council came to be among the most respected of any, and at length

admitted into the code of the Universal Church. They are termed by Pope Zacharias “the canons of the blessed Fathers;” by Nicholas I. “the venerable and holy canons of Antioch;” and by the Council of Chalcedon “the just rules of the Fathers.” Hence some have supposed two councils: one of 50 orthodox bishops, or more, who made the canons; another of 30 or 40 Arians, who superseded St. Athanasius (Mansi, ii. 1305, note). But canon 12 plainly was as much directed against St. Athanasius as anything else that was done there. On the other hand, it laid down a true principle no less than the rest; and this doubtless has been the ground on which they have been so widely esteemed. Among them there are five which cannot be passed over, for another reason. The 9th, for distinctly proving the high antiquity of one at least of the Apostolical canons, by referring to it as “the ancient canon which was in force in the age of our fathers,” in connexion with the special honour now claimed for metropolitans—on which see Bever., *Synod.* ii. ad loc.—canons 4 and 5, for having been cited in the 4th action of the Council of Chalcedon, or rather read out there by Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, from a book as “canons 83 and 84 of the holy Fathers;” and likewise canons 16 and 17, for having been read out in the 11th action of the same council by Leontius, Bishop of Magnesia, from a book as “canons 95 and 96;” being in each case the identical numbers assigned to them in the code of the Universal Church, thus proving this code to have been in existence and appealed to then, and therefore making it extremely probable, to say the least, that when the Chalcedonian bishops in their first canon “pronounced it to be fit and just that the canons of the holy Fathers made in every synod to this present time be in full force,” they gave their authoritative sanction to this very collection. Hence a permanent and intrinsic interest has been imparted to this council irrespectively of the merits of its own canons in themselves, though there are few councils whose enactments are marked throughout by so much good sense. [E. S. F.]

ANTIPAS, Bishop of Pergamus, traditionally the “angel” of that church addressed in the Apocalypse, commemorated April 11 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

ANTIPHON—(Gr. Ἀντίφωνον: Lat. *Antiphona*: Old English, *Antefn*, *Antem* [Chaucer]: Modern English, *Anthem*. For the change of *Antefn* into *Antem*, compare O. E. *Stefn* [prow] with modern *Stem*. French, *Antienne*.) “Antiphona ex Graeco interpretatur vox reciproca; duobus scilicet choris alternatim psallentibus ordine commutato.” (Isidore, *Origines* vi. 18.)

There are two kinds of responsive singing used in the Church; the Responsorial, when one singer or reader begins, and the whole choir answers in the alternate verses; the present Anglican practice when the Psalms are not chanted; and the Antiphonal (described in Isidore’s definition) when the choir is divided into two parts or sides, and each part or side sings alternate verses. Of these forms of ecclesiastical chant we are now concerned only with the second, the *Antiphonal*. We shall endeavour, as briefly as may be, to mention (1) Its origin. (2) The different usages of the term “Antiphon.” (3) Its application in the

Missal, and in the Breviary; pointing out as they occur any peculiarity or difference of usage between the Eastern and the Western Churches.

I. Its origin may be found in the Jewish Church. For we read (1 Chron. vi. 31 &c.), that David divided the Levites into three bands, and "set them over the service of song in the house of the Lord, after that the ark had rest. And they ministered before the dwelling-place of the tabernacle of the congregation with singing, until Solomon had built the house of the Lord in Jerusalem; and then they waited on their office according to their order." It appears further that the sons of the Kohathites, under "Heman a singer" (v. 33), stood in the centre while the Gershomites, led by Asaph, stood on the right hand, and the Merarites, led by Ethan (or Jeduthun), on the left. These arrangements, and the further details given in 1 Chron. xxv. clearly point to some definite assignment of the musical parts of the tabernacle and temple worship. Some of the psalms, moreover, as the xxiv. and the cxxxiv. appear to be composed for antiphonal singing by two choirs.

It appears on the evidence of Philo, that this mode of singing was practised by the Essenes. Speaking of them he says: "In the first place two choirs are constituted; one of men, the other of women. They then sing hymns to the praise of God, composed in different kinds of metre and verse—now with one mouth, now with antiphonal hymns and harmonies, leading, and directing, and ruling the choir with modulations of the hands and gestures of the body; at one time in motion, at another stationary; turning in one direction, and in the reverse, as the case requires. Then, when each choir by itself has satisfied itself with these delights, they all, as though inebriated with divine love, combine from both choirs into one."

Pliny appears to allude to antiphonal chanting when, in a well-known passage (*Epist.* x. 97), he says that the Christians sing a hymn to Christ as God, "by turns among themselves" (*secum invicem*).

The introduction of antiphonal singing among the Greeks is ascribed by an ancient tradition to Ignatius of Antioch (*Socrates, Eccl. Hist.* vi. 8), who saw a vision of antiphonal chanting in heaven. And this tradition probably represents the fact, that this manner of singing was early introduced into Antioch, and spread thence over the Eastern Church.

We learn from S. Basil that it was general in his time. He says (*Ep.* ccvii. *ad Cleric. Neo-caesar.*) prefacing that what he is going to speak of are the received institutions in all the churches (*τὰ νῦν κεκρατηκότα ἐθῆ πάσαις ταῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαις σύμφωδ' ἐστὶ καὶ σύμφωνα*), "that the people, resorting by night to the house of prayer . . . . at length, rising from prayer, betake themselves to psalmody. And now, divided into two parts, they sing alternately to each other (*διχῇ διανεμηθέντες, ἀντιψάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις* . .). Afterwards they commit the leading of the melody to one, and the rest follow him."

Theodoret (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. 19) ascribes the introduction of antiphonal singing to Flavian and Diodorus, who, while still laymen, he says, were the first to divide the choirs of singers into two parts, and teach them to sing the songs of David alternately (*εὗροι πρῶτοι, διχῇ διελόντες*

*τους τῶν ψαλλόντων χοροὺς, ἐκ διαδοχῆς ἄδεν τὴν Δαυιδικὴν ἐδίδαζον μελωδίαν*), and then he adds that this custom, which thus took its rise at Antioch, spread thence in every direction.

In the Western Church the introduction of Antiphonal singing after the manner of the Orientals (*secundum morem Orientalium*), is attributed to S. Ambrose, as S. Augustine says (*Confess.* ix. c. 7, § 15), and he gives as a reason, that the people should not become weary.

A passage, indeed, is adduced from Tertullian (*ad Uxor.* ii.), from which it is argued that the practice of alternate singing was in vogue before the time of S. Ambrose. It has also been contended that Pope Damasus, or again Caelestine, was its originator in the Western Church. As these opinions do not seem to be generally adopted, and as the arguments by which they are supported may easily admit of another interpretation, it does not appear to be necessary to occupy space by discussing them here.

II. The word Antiphon, however, has been used in several different senses.

1. Sometimes it appears to denote the psalms or hymns themselves, which were sung antiphonally. Thus Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* vi. 8) calls certain hymns which were thus sung "Antiphonas." When the word is used in this sense there is generally a contrast expressed or implied with a "psalmus directus," or "directaneus." "Psallere cum antiphona" is a phrase much used in this connexion, to which "psallere in directum" is opposed. Thus S. Aurelian in the order for psalmody of his rule, "Dicite Matutinos, id est primo canticum in antiphonā: deinde directaneum, *Judica me Deus* . . . in antiphonā dicite hymnum, *Splendor paternae gloriae*." It is not quite certain what is meant by these two expressions; the general opinion is that "psallere cum (or in) antiphonā," means to sing alternately with the two sides of the choir; and "psallere directaneum" to sing either with the whole choir united, or else for one chanter to sing while the rest listened in silence (this latter mode of singing, however, is what is usually denoted by "tractus;") while some think that "psallere in" or "cum antiphonā" means to sing with modulation of the voice; and that "psallere directaneum" denotes plain recitation without musical intonation. Thus Cassian (*De Instit. Coenob.* ii. 2), speaking of psalms to be sung in the night office, says, "et hos ipsos antiphonarum protelatos melodiis, et adjunctione quarundam modulationum;" and S. Benedict directs that some psalms should be said "in directum," but many more "modulatis vocibus." A third opinion is that "psallere cum antiphonā" means to sing psalms with certain sentences inserted between the verses, which sentences were called antiphons, from their being sung alternately with the verses of the psalm itself. Of this method of singing we shall speak more fully presently. In opposition to this sense, "psallere directum" would mean to sing a psalm straight through without any antiphon; and it may be remarked that the "psalmus directus," said daily at Lauds, in the Ambrosian office, has no Antiphon. The expression "oratio recta" seems also to be used in much the same sense.

2. The word Antiphona<sup>a</sup> is also used to denote

<sup>a</sup> "A distinction is made by liturgical writers between

a sacred composition, or compilation of verses from the Psalms, or sometimes from other parts of Scripture, or several consecutive verses of the same psalm appropriate to a special subject or festival. This was sung by one choir, and after each verse an unvarying response was made by the opposite choir; whence the name.

Compilations of this nature are to be found in the old office books, *e.g.*, in the Mozarabic office for the dead, where, however, they are called "a Psalm of David," as being said in the place of psalms in the Nocturns; and they have this peculiarity, that each verse (with very few exceptions) begins with the same word. Thus the verses of one such "psalm" all begin with "Ad te;" those of another with "Miserere;" of another with "Libera;" of another with "Tu Domine," and so on. They are also found in the Ambrosian burial offices, where they are called Antiphonae, each verse being considered as a separate Antiphon, and are headed Antiph. i. Antiph. ii. and so on. The Canticles, which were appointed to be said instead of the "Venite" in the English state services, there called "hymns," and directed to be said or sung "one verse by the Priest, and another by the Clerk and people" (*i.e.* antiphonally), are of this nature.

3. The word "Antiphona" denotes (and this is the sense in which we are most familiar with its use), a sentence usually, but by no means invariably, taken from the psalm itself, and originally intercalated between each verse of a psalm, but which, in process of time, came to be sung, wholly or in part, at the beginning and end only. We shall speak more at length on this head presently.

4. The word "Antiphona" came to denote such a sentence taken by itself, and sung alone without connexion with any psalm. These Antiphons were frequently original compositions. (We thus arrive at our common use of the word anthem as part of an Anglican choral service.) Antiphons of this description are of common occurrence in the Greek offices.

As an example take the following from the office for the taking the greater monastic habit (*τῷ μεγάλῳ σχήματι*). In the Liturgy, after the entrance of the Gospels, the following Antiphons (*Ἀντίφωνα*) are said:—

*Ant. 1.* "Would that I could wipe out with tears the handwriting of my offences, O Lord: and please Thee by repentance for the remainder of my life: but the enemy deceives me, and wars against my soul. O Lord, before I finally perish, save me."

"Who that is tossed by storms, and makes for it, does not find safety in this port? Or who that is tormented with pain and falls down before it, does not find a cure in this place of healing? O thou Creator of all men, and physician of the sick, O Lord, before I finally perish, save me."

"I am a sheep of Thy rational flock; and I flee to Thee, the good Shepherd; save me the wanderer from Thy fold. O God, and have mercy on me."

Then follows "Gloria Patri" and a "Theotokion," which is a short Antiphon or invocation addressed to the B.V.M. as "Theotokos." Then Antiphon ii., after the model of the first, but in

antiphona, and antiphonum, the neuter form denoting antiphons of the nature here described; and the feminine a sentence or modulation sung as a prefix or adjunct to a given psalm 'quasi ex opposito respondens.'—*Guar, Euchar.* p. 124.

two clauses only. So after another "Gloria" and "Theotokion," Antiphon iii. in one clause.

III. We shall now refer to the principal uses of Antiphons in the services of the Church.

1st. In the Liturgy, or office of the Mass.

We will take the Greek offices first. In these (and we will confine ourselves to the two Liturgies of SS. Basil and Chrysostom) before the lesser entrance (*i.e.* that of the Gospels) 3 psalms, or parts of psalms are sung with a constant response after each verse. These are called respectively the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Antiphon, and each is preceded by a prayer, which is called the prayer of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Antiphon respectively.

The Greek liturgical Antiphons consist each of four versicles with its response, though occasionally, as on Christmas Day, the third Antiphon has but three; that "Gloria Patri" is said after the first and second Antiphons, but not after the third. (This is doubtless because the office passes on immediately after the third Antiphon to other singing with which we are not now concerned.) In the first Antiphon the antiphonal response is always the same, and is that given in the cases quoted; in the second it varies with the day to the solemnity of which it has reference; it always begins with the words "Save us," and ends with "Who sing to Thee, Alleluia" (*σῶσον ἡμᾶς . . . ψάλλοντάς σοι Ἀλληλούϊα*); in the third it varies likewise with the day, but is not of so uniform a type. It is, as a rule, the same as the "Apolyticon," an Anthem which is sung near the end of the preceding vespers. That after the "Gloria" in the second Antiphon, instead of repeating the proper response of the Antiphon "O only begotten Son and Word of God," &c., is sung as a response. (This invocation occurs in the office of the "Typica.")

Other compositions, which are virtually Antiphons, are found in Greek offices, and will be spoken of under their proper heads; see *CONTAKION*, *THEOTOKION*.

We turn now to the Liturgies of the Western Church.

The three Antiphons of the Greek Liturgies correspond both in structure and position with the single Antiphon of the Western Church. The chant which the Church uses at the beginning of the Mass is commonly called "Introitus," or "Antiphona ad Introitum," from its being sung Antiphonally when the priest enters upon the service, or mounts to the altar; for both explanations are given [*INTROIT*]. It still retains its name of "Introitus" in the Roman missal; and the word "Introit" is frequently used among ourselves at the present day with a similar meaning.

In the Ambrosian Liturgy the corresponding Antiphon was called "Ingressa" for the same reason; while in the Mozarabic and Sarum Liturgies it was called "Officium." In the Gallican rite it was called "Antiphona" or "Antiphona ad praelegendum," or "de praelegere."

The institution of the Antiphon at the Introit is almost universally ascribed to S. Caelestine, who was Pope A.D. 422, and who is said to have borrowed this kind of singing from S. Ambrose, and to have appointed that the cl. psalms of David should be sung antiphonally before the Sacrifice, which was not done previously, but only the Epistles of S. Paul and the Gospel



were read, and thus the Mass was conducted.<sup>b</sup> In the account given by S. Augustine (*de Civ. Dei*, xiii. 8 sub fin.) of a Mass which he celebrated, A.D. 425, there is no mention of such an Introit. After speaking of certain preliminary thanksgivings (as we should say occasional) for a recent miracle, he says, "I saluted the people" . . . when silence was at length established, the appointed lections of Holy Scripture were read as though that was the beginning of the Mass.

It seems, however, doubtful what we are to understand by the singing of Psalms thus instituted by Caesarius—whether an entire Psalm, varying with the office, was sung, or only certain verses taken from the Psalms, and used as an Antiphon. The former opinion is held by Neorinus (*Gemma animarum*, 87), who says that "Caesarius appointed Psalms to be sung at the Introit of the Mass, from which (*de quibus*) Gregory the Pope afterwards composed Antiphons for the Introit of the Mass with musical notations (*modulando composuit*).<sup>c</sup> Also by Pricus in his "Acts of the Popes," and by Cardinal Bona.

The latter opinion is held by Micrologus (*cap. i.*), and by Amalarius (*De Eccl. Of.* lib. 8), who, in explaining this addition of Caesarius's, says, "Which we understood to mean that he selected Antiphons out of all the Psalms, to be sung in the office of the Mass. For previously the Mass began with a lection, which custom is still retained in the vigils of Easter and Pentecost."

It has again been argued with much force that it was customary to sing Antiphons taken from the Psalms at the Mass before the time of Caesarius.<sup>d</sup> S. Ambrose (*de Myst.* cap. 8) and the writer of *Sacr.* (iv. 2) speak as though the use of the verse "Introibo," &c., at the Introit were familiar. So, too, Gregory Nazian. says, When he (the priest) is vested, he comes to the altar saying the Antiphon "I will go unto the altar of God" (*Introibo ad altare Dei*). It is also noticeable that some of the verses said to have been used as Antiphons in early times differ somewhat from Jerome's version. This is strong evidence that the use of Antiphons at the Introit was anterior to the time of Caesarius. However this may be, Caesarius may well have so organized or altered, or developed the custom, as to be called its inventor. And on the whole the more probable opinion seems to be that he appointed entire Psalms to be sung before the Mass and that afterwards Gregory the Great selected from them verses as an Antiphon for the "Introit," and others for the "Responsory," "Offertory," and "Communion," which he collected into the book which he called his Antiphonary. In support of this view it may be observed that the Responsory &c. (which are really Antiphons, though the Introit soon monopolized that name) are often taken from the same Psalm as the Introit.

The form of the Antiphon at the Introit was as follows. After the Introit, properly so called, a psalm was sung, originally entire, but after-

wards a single verse with "Gloria Patri." The Introit was then repeated, and some churches used to sing it three times on the more solemn days.

The Introit in the Antiphonary of S. Gregory is taken from the Psalms, with a few exceptions, which Durandus (*Rat.* iv. 5) calls "Irregular Introits." These Introits, taken from other parts of Scripture, are in all cases followed by their appointed "Psalmus." There are also a few Introits which are not taken from any part of Scripture. Such is that for Trinity Sunday in the Roman and Sarum missals.

"Blessed be the Holy Trinity, and the undivided Unity; we will give thanks to it, for it has dealt mercifully with us."

And that for All-Saints Day in the same Missal.

"Let us all rejoice celebrating the festival in honour of all the Saints, over whom solemnly the angels rejoice, and join in praising the Son of God."

These non-scriptural Introits, however, are mostly, as will be observed, for festivals of later date, and are not found in Gregory's Antiphonary. A metrical Introit is sometimes found. Thus in the Roman Missal in Masses, "in Commemorations B.V.M., a purif. aquas ad pasch." the Introit is—

Salve, sancta Parens, cunctis peccatis Regem.

Qui cunctos terrarum regis in aula monuisti.

Psalmus.—Virgo Dei genitrix, quem totum non exprit orbis  
In ore et clementi viscera flexum hominis.

Gloria Patri.

Here the "Psalmus" is not from the Psalms, which is very unusual, though this is not a solitary case. That of Trinity Sunday is another. The lines are the beginning of an old hymn to the Virgin, which is used in her office in various Breviaries.

The different Sundays were often popularly distinguished by the first word of their "Officium," or "Introitus." Thus, the first four Sundays in Lent were severally known as, "Invocavit," "Reminiscere," "Oculi," "Laetare." Low Sunday as "Quasimodo," and so in other cases. So too we find week days designated, i.e. Wednesday is the third week in Lent called in Missals, "Feria quarta post Oculi." In rubrical directions this nomenclature is very frequent.

The Ambrosian "Ingressus" consists of one unbroken sentence, usually but by no means always, taken from Scripture, and not followed by a "Psalmus," or the "Gloria Patri." It is often the same as the Roman "Officium." It is never repeated except in Masses of the Dead, when its form approaches very nearly to that of the Roman "Introitus."

The form of the Mozarabic "Officium" though closely approaching that of the Roman "Introitus" differs somewhat from it. The Antiphon is followed by a "versus," corresponding to the Roman "Psalmus," with the "Gloria Patri," before and after which the second clause alone of the Antiphon is repeated.<sup>e</sup>

Durandus (*Rat.* lib. iv. cap. 5) and Belet (*De Div. Of.* cap. 35) state that in their time a Tractus was sung, in some churches, on the more solemn days before the Antiphon.

<sup>b</sup> The line is then given in the Roman and Sarum Missals. It was probably read "in voce stichorum."

<sup>c</sup> This is the Roman manner of repeating the "Responsory" at Matins.

<sup>b</sup> *Inter pontificatus in vita S. Carolini.* See also the Catalogue of the Roman Pontiffs, April, vol. I. (Benziger and Pappebrock).

<sup>c</sup> Vide Radolph. Tungius. *De Can. Officiis*, prop. 53. *Canon.* lib. II. 11.

<sup>d</sup> Afterwards known as the "Gradual." In the Antiphonary it is called "Responsorium gradale."



We now come to that use of Antiphons with which we are probably most familiar—as sung as an accompaniment to Psalms and Canticles. In general terms an Antiphon in this sense is a sentence which precedes a Psalm or Cantic to the musical tone of which the whole Psalm or Cantic is sung, in alternate verses by the opposite sides of the choir which at the end unite in repeating the Antiphon. This sentence is usually, but by no means universally, taken from the Psalm itself, and it varies with the day and occasion. Originally the Psalm was said by one choir, and the Antiphon was intercalated between each verse by the opposite choir: whence the name. Ps. 136 (*Confitemini*) and the Cantic “Benedicite” are obvious examples of this method of singing. Indeed in Ps. 135 (v. 10–12) we have very nearly the same words, without what we may call the Antiphon (“for His mercy endureth for ever”), which occur in Ps. 136 with that Antiphon inserted after each clause, and the “Benedicite” is often recited without the repetition of its Antiphon after every verse. Ps. 42 and 43 (*Quemadmodum* and *Judica*), 80 (*Qui regis Israel*), and 107 (*Confitemini*) will at once suggest themselves as containing an Antiphonal verse which is repeated at intervals.

There are many examples of this earlier use of Antiphons in the Greek Services. For instance: at Vespers on the “Great Sabbath” (i. e. Easter Eve), Ps. 82 (*Deus stetit*) is said with the last verse, “Arise, O God, and judge Thou the earth, for Thou shalt take all heathen to Thine inheritance,” repeated with beautiful application, as an Antiphon between each verse.

Again, in the Office for the Burial of a Priest, Ps. 23 (*Dominus regit me*), 24 (*Domini est terra*), 84 (*Quam dilecta*), are said with “Alleluia, Alleluia,” repeated as an Antiphon between each verse. Here the three Psalms are called respectively the first, second, and third Antiphons.

It appears that in the Roman Church the same custom of repeating the Antiphon after each verse of the Psalm originally prevailed. In an old mass, edited by Menard, in the Appendix to the *Sacramentary* of S. Gregory, we read, “Antiphona Episcopo, incipiat psalmus a Cantore, cum Introitu recipiente.”<sup>1</sup>

Amalarius, too (*De Ordine Antiphonarii*, cap. 11.), speaking of the Nocturns of weekdays, has the words, “Ex senis Antiphonis quas vicissim eam per singulos versus repetunt.” We have evidence that this custom was not obsolete (in places at least) as late as the 10th century, in the life of Odo, Abbot of Cluny, where we are told that the monks of that house, wishing to prolong the office of the Vigils of S. Martin (Nov. 11), when the Antiphons of the office are short,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E.g. in the Lands of the Ambrosian Breviary, and in a still more compressed form in the Mozarabic Lauds; where the word “Benedicite” is omitted from the beginning of each verse after the first.

<sup>2</sup> The use of “Alleluia” on this and on similar occasions of mourning (e.g. during Lent) is different from the usage of the Western Church.

<sup>3</sup> This seems to point more to the mode of singing the Introit than Psalms in the daily office.

<sup>4</sup> The circumstance of their frequent repetition has been suggested as a reason why the Antiphons to the Psalms in the daily office are, as a rule, so much shorter than that at the Introit of the Mass.

and the nights long, till daybreak, used to repeat every Antiphon after each verse of the Psalm. We find also, in a letter by an anonymous author to Batheric, who was appointed Bishop of Ratisbon, A.D. 814 (quoted by Thomasius), the writer complaining that he has in the course of his travels found some who, with a view to get through the office as rapidly as possible, that they may the quicker return to their worldly business, recite it “without Antiphons, in a perfunctory manner and with all haste” (“sine Antiphonis, cursim, et cum omni velocitate”). Theodoret also relates (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 10) that Christians, in detestation of the impiety of Julian, when singing the hymns of David, added to each verse the clause, “Confounded be all they that worship carved images.”

A familiar instance of this older use of an Antiphon is found in the “Reproaches” (“versiculi impropertii” or “improperia”) of the Roman Missal for Good Friday.

These are Gregorian: the introductory rubric as it stands in the Roman Missal is cited, as it is so precise as to the manner of singing them. It runs thus: “Versiculi sequentes impropertii a binis alternatim cantantur, utrosque choro simul repetente post quemlibet versum *Popule*, &c.”<sup>3</sup>

Sometimes metrical hymns were sung antiphonally after this manner. Thus at the “Salutation of the Cross” the verse of the hymn “*Pange lingua*,” which begins “*Cruz fidelis*,” is sung in the Sarum rite at the beginning, and after every verse of the hymn, the rubric being—

“Chorus idem repetat post unumquemque versum.

“*Cruz fidelis inter omnes*,” &c.

(. . . *Sacerdotes cantent hunc versum sequentem*.)

“*Pange lingua gloriosi proelium certaminis*,” &c.

Chorus—“*Cruz fidelis*,” &c.

And so on. So also before the Benediction of the Paschal Candles on Easter Eve, according to the Sarum rite, the hymn “*Inventor rutili*” is sung in the same manner, with the first stanza repeated antiphonally after each stanza.

A variation of this form of antiphonal interpolation is when the interpolated clause itself varies. The following is a striking example:—

On the morning of Easter Eve in the Greek office, the following Antiphons (*τροπάρια*) are said with Ps. 119, “saying” (as the rubric directs) “one verse (*στίχον*) from the Psalm after each troparium.” These are known as τὰ ἐγκώμια.

“Blessed art Thou, O Lord, O teach me Thy statutes. Blessed are those that are undefiled in the way, and walk in the law of the Lord.”

“Thou, O Christ, the Life, wast laid low in the grave, and the angelic hosts were amazed, glorifying Thy condescension.”

“Blessed are they that keep His testimonies, and seek Him with their whole heart.”

“O Life, how is it that Thou dost die? How is it that Thou dost dwell in the grave? Thou payest the tribute of death, and raisest the dead out of Hades.”

“For they who do no wickedness walk in His ways.”

“We magnify Thee, O Jesu the King, and honour Thy burial, and Thy passion, by which Thou hast saved us from destruction.”

And so on throughout the whole Psalm.

In the same manner at the burial of monks, the blessings at the beginning of the Sermon on

<sup>3</sup> The rubrical directions with respect to the “Improperia” in the Mozarabic Missal are very full.

the Mount (of *panagynon*) are recited with a varying antiphonal clause after each, beginning from the fifth.

As an example from the Western Church, we may refer to the following, which belongs to Vespers on Easter Eve. It is given in S. Gregory's Antiphonary, with the heading *Antiph.* and *Ps.* to the alternate verses.

*Antiph.* "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary to see the sepulchre." *Alleluia.*

*Ps.* "My soul doth magnify the Lord."

*Antiph.* "And behold, there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven." *Alleluia.*

*Ps.* "And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour."

And so the Magnificat is sung with the successive clauses of the Gospel for the day used as Antiphons after each of its verses.

The missal Litanies which are said in the Ambrosian Mass on Sundays in Lent, and the very beautiful *Proces* with which the Mozarabic Missal and Breviary abound, are so far antiphonal that each petition is followed by an unvarying response. Their consideration, however interesting, scarcely belongs to our present subject.

The repetition of the Antiphon after each verse was called "Antiphonaria." In the old Antiphonaries we frequently find such directions as "*Hoc die Antiphonamus ad Benedictus*," or simply "*Hoc die antiphonamus*." The word "antiphonaria" is explained to mean to repeat the Antiphon after each verse of the Canticle. The "Greater Antiphons" (i. e. "O Sapientia," &c.) are directed to be sung at the *Benedictus*, with the rubric, "*Quas antiphonamus ab In Sanctissimis*," which means that the repetition of the Antiphon begins from the verse of which those are the first words.

At a later period the custom of repeating the Antiphon after each verse of the Psalm dropped, and its use was gradually limited to the beginning and end of the Psalm. A relic of the old usage still survives in the manner of singing the "Venite" at Nocturns, in which Psalm the Antiphon is repeated, either wholly or in part, several times during the course of the Psalm.

It remained a frequent custom, and more particularly in the monastic usage, at Lauds and Vespers on the greater feasts to sing the Antiphon three times at the end of *Benedictus* and of *Magnificat*, once before *Gloria Patri*, once before *Sicut erat*, and once again at the conclusion of the whole. This seems to have been the general use of the Church of Tours; and the Church of Rome retained the practice in the 12th century, at least in certain offices of the festivals of the Nativity, the Epiphany, and S. Peter. It was called "*Antiphonam triumphare*," which is explained by Martene (*De Ant. Eccl. Bn. iv. 4*) as "*ter fari*." *Antiphonam laudare*,<sup>2</sup> or *imponere*, means to begin the Antiphon.

Other variations in the manner of singing the Antiphon are mentioned by other writers. Thus

<sup>1</sup> This differs from the later (and the present) practice, according to which three Antiphons are said in the *Magnificat* at Vespers.

<sup>2</sup> This is the manner in which the "*panagynon*" mentioned above are recited. The first four are followed by an antiphonal sentence.

<sup>3</sup> Compare our English use of the word to *curse*.

we are told<sup>4</sup> that sometimes the Antiphon was said twice before the Psalm; or at least, if only said once, the first half of it would be sung by one choir, and the second half by the other. This was called "*responder ad Antiphonam*."

It appears that this method of singing the Antiphon was confined to the beginning and end of the Psalm or Canticle. When repeated during the Psalm, the Antiphon was always sung by one choir, the other taking the verse.

The repetition of the Antiphon was in later times still further curtailed, and the opening words only sung at the beginning of the Psalm or Canticle, the entire Antiphon being recited at the close. Still later, two or more Psalms were said under the same Antiphon, itself abbreviated as just stated. This is the present custom of the Roman Breviary. When the Antiphon was taken from the beginning of the Psalm or Canticle, after the Antiphon the beginning of the Psalm or Canticle was not repeated, but the recitation was taken up from the place where the Antiphon comes. For instance, the opening verses of the 92nd Psalm are said at Vespers on Saturday in the Ambrosian rite in this manner:—

*Ant.* "Beatus es."

*Ps.* "Et psallere volumus Tuo Altissimo," &c.

"Gloria Patri" &c.

*Ant.* "Beatus es confessor! Dominus Deus noster."

Where the recitation of the Psalm begins with the verse following the Antiphon, though the opening words *only* of the Antiphon are said at the beginning.

On the more important festivals the Antiphons at Vespers, Matins, and Lauds (but not at the other hours), were said entire before as well as after the Psalms and Canticles. These feasts were hence called "double;" those in which the Antiphons were not thus repeated, "simple."

There are a few peculiarities in the use of Antiphons to the Psalms and Canticles in the Ambrosian and Mozarabic rites which may be mentioned.

1. The Ambrosian Antiphons are divided into simple and double. The simple Antiphons are said in the same manner as the Roman Antiphons on days which are not "double." They are always so said whatever be the nature of the feast. In Eastertide the Antiphon is said entire before the Psalm, and instead of its repetition at the end, "*Alleluia, Alleluia*," is said.

The double Antiphons consist of two clauses, the second being distinguished by a *V. (i. e. versum)*, and is said entire both before and after the Psalm. The following is a specimen which is said to be one of the Psalms on Good Friday:—

*Ant. duplex.* "Simon, sleepest thou? Couldst not thou watch with me one hour?"

*V.* "Or do ye are Judas, how he sleeps not, but hath us to deliver us to the Jews?"

These double Antiphons occur occasionally and irregularly on days which have proper Psalms.

<sup>4</sup> By Amalaricus, *De Eccl. Off. iv. 7.*

<sup>5</sup> In the Vatican Antiphonary we find the following direction on the Epiphany:—"Hic ad omnes Antiphonas responderemus," and so in other instances. In a MS. of the church of Rouen the antiphon before and after the "Magnificat" at first Vespers of the Assumption is divided, into four alternate parts between the two sides of the choir and after the "Gloria Patri" is again sung by both sides together.

Thus on Wednesday before Easter, out of nine Psalms, one was a double Antiphon; on Thursday, out of ten, none, and on Good Friday, out of eighteen, one; on Christmas Day, out of twenty-one, four; and on the Epiphany, out of twenty-one, six. Festivals are not divided into "double" and "simple" as distinguished by the Antiphons.

2. The Mozarabic Antiphons are said entire before as well as after their Psalm or Cantic. Occasionally two Antiphons are given for the same Cantic.<sup>a</sup> They are often divided into two clauses, distinguished by the letter *P*,<sup>b</sup> in which case at the end of the Psalm the "Gloria" is intercalated between the two clauses.

Of the nature of the sentence adopted as an Antiphon little is to be said. It is, for the most part, a verse, or part of a verse, from the Psalm it accompanies, varying with the day and the occasion, and often with extreme beauty of application. Sometimes it is a slight variation of the verse; or it is taken from other parts of Scripture; sometimes it is an original composition, occasionally even in verse. *E. g.* in the 3rd Nocturn on Sundays between Trinity and Advent in the Sarum Breviary:

To Ps. 19 (*Cœli enarrant*),

"Spansus ut e thalamo processit Christus in orbem:  
Descendens cœlo jure salutifero."

The Antiphons for the Venite are technically called the INVITATORIA.<sup>c</sup>

The corresponding Antiphons of the Eastern Church need not detain us, as they are less prominent and important, and present no special features. They are always taken from the Psalm itself, and are said *after* the Psalm *only*, and are prefaced by the words καὶ πάλιν (and again), and are introduced before the "Gloria Patri."

Thus Ps. 104 (*Benedic anima mea*) is said daily at Vespers. It is called the *proœmiac* Psalm; and the Antiphon at the end is—

And again.

"The sun knoweth his going down. Thou makest darkness that it may be night.

"O Lord, how manifold are Thy works. In wisdom hast Thou made them all."

"Glory be," &c. "As it was," &c.

*Antiphona Post Evangelium.*—An Antiphon said, as its name indicates, after the Gospel, in the Ambrosian rite. It consists of a simple unbroken clause, and is sometimes taken from the Psalms or other parts of Scripture; sometimes it is composed with reference to the day. One example will show its form, that for the *Christophory* or *return of Christ out of Egypt* (Jan. 7).

"Praise the Lord, all ye angels of His; praise Him all His host. Praise Him sun and moon: praise Him all ye stars and light."

There is nothing corresponding in the Roman Monastic and Sarum Missals, in which the Gospel

<sup>a</sup> We do not feel sure whether in these cases it is intended that both Antiphons be used at once, or a choice given between the two.

<sup>b</sup> It does not seem quite clear what this *P* represents. Probably it stands for *Psalmus*.

<sup>c</sup> The Roman is taken rather than any other Breviary as giving a short form. The Invitatories of the Sarum Breviary are nearly the same for the weekdays. For ordinary Sundays there is a greater variety, which would have made them longer to quote, without adding to the value of the illustration.

is immediately followed by the Creed. In the Mozarabic office the *Lauds* followed the Gospel. (The Creed, it will be remembered, is sung after the consecration.)

*Antiphona ad Confractionem Panis.*—An Antiphon said in the Mozarabic Mass on certain days at the breaking of the consecrated Host.<sup>a</sup> It occurs for the most part during Lent, and in votive Masses. Also on Whitsunday and on Corpus Christi. It is usually short and said in one clause. Thus from the 4th Sunday in Lent (*Mediante die Festo*), up to Maundy Thursday (*In coenâ Domini*), and also on Corpus Christi, it is—

"Do Thou, O Lord, give us our meat in due season. Open Thine hand, and fill all things living with plentifulness."

In the Ambrosian Missal the *Confractorium* corresponds to the *Antiph. ad Confrac.* There is no Antiphon appointed at the same place in the Roman and Sarum Missals.

*Antiphona in Choro.*—An Antiphon said in the Ambrosian rite at Vespers on certain days. It occurs near the beginning of the office, before the Hymn, and is said on Sundays, and at the second Vespers of festivals. It is also said at the first Vespers of those festivals which have the office not solemn<sup>7</sup> (*officium non solemne*) and of some, but not of all, "Solemnities of the Lord." It is not said at first Vespers of a Solemn Office. This is the general rule, though there are occasional exceptions. It varies with the days, and is usually a verse of Scripture, in most cases from the Psalms, and has no Psalm belonging to it. Sometimes it is an adaptation of a passage of Scripture, or an original composition. Thus, on Easter Day, we have—

*Ant. in cā. Hallel.* Then believed they His words, and sang praise unto Him." Hallel.

*Antiphona ad Crucem.*—An Antiphon said in the Ambrosian rite at the beginning of Lauds after the *Benedictus*. It is said on Sundays (except in Lent), on Festivals which have the "Solemn Office" (except they fall on Saturday), in "Solemnities of the Lord" (even though they fall on Saturday), and during Octaves. It is usually a verse from Scripture, but sometimes an original composition with very much of the character of a Greek τροπῶδιον, and always ends with Kyr. Kyr. Kyr. (*i. e.* Kyrie eleison, sometimes written K. K. K.). It is said five times, the Antiphon itself is repeated three times, then follows *Gloria Patri*, then the Antiphon again, then *Sicut erat*, and then the Antiphon once more. On Sundays in Advent, except the 6th, on Christmas Day, the Circumcision, and the Epiphany, it is said seven times, *i. e.*, is repeated five times before the *Gloria Patri*.

<sup>a</sup> In the Mozarabic rite the Host after consecration is divided, as is well known, into nine parts, which are arranged on the paten in a prescribed order, which it would be foreign to our present purpose to describe. In the Eastern Church the Host is broken into four parts by the Priest, who recites an unvarying form of words. But this is not an Antiphon, and therefore beyond our province.

<sup>7</sup> Festivals are divided in the Ambrosian rite into *Solemnities of the Lord* (*Solemnitates Domini*), and those which have the office *solemn* (*officium solemne*), or *not solemn* (*officium non solemne*).

Thus on Ascension Day—

*Ant. ad crucem quinquies.* "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? As ye have seen Him go into heaven, so shall He come." Hallel. Kyr. Kyr. Kyr.

"Ye men," &c.  
 "Ye men," &c.  
 "Glory be," &c.  
 "Ye men," &c.  
 "As it was," &c.  
 "Ye men," &c.

An *Antiphona ad crucem*, apparently recited once only, often occurs in the Antiphonary of Gregory the Great, after the Antiphons of Vespers or Lauds. The early writers on the offices of the Roman Church make no mention of it, so that it was probably peculiar to the monastic rites, which more readily admitted additions of this nature. It has been conjectured that the monastic orders derived it from the Church of Milan.

*Antiphona ad Accedentes or ad Accedendum.*—

An Antiphon in the Mozarabic Mass, sung after the Benediction, and before the Communion of the Priest. They do not often change. There is one which is said from the Vigil of Pentecost to the first day of Lent inclusive, one which is said from Easter Eve to the Vigil of Pentecost. In Lent they vary with the Sunday, that for the first Sunday being said on weekdays up to Thursday before Easter exclusive. The first of these which is said during the greater part of the year, is as follows:—

"O taste and see how gracious the Lord is." Allel. Allel. Allel.

V. "I will always give thanks unto the Lord. His praise shall ever be in my mouth." P. Allel. Allel. Allel.

V. "The Lord delivereth the souls of His servants; and all they that put their trust in Him shall not be destitute." P. Allel. Allel. Allel.

V. "Glory and honour be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, world without end." Amen. P. Allel. Allel. Allel.

In the *Apostolical Constitutions*, Ps. 24 (Benedicam), from which this Antiphon is taken, is appointed to be said during the Communion, as it is in the Armenian Liturgy during the distribution of the Azymes.\* (During the communion of the people another Cantic is sung.) S. Ambrose alluded to the practice in the words "Unde et Ecclesia videns tantam Gratiam, hortatur, Gustate et videte."

The second Antiphon, that used between Easter and Pentecost, has reference to the Resurrection. It is adapted from the words of the Gospel narrative, and we need not quote it.

That for Thursday before Easter is much longer, and is broken into many more antiphonal clauses, and is an abstract of the Gospel narrative of the institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Those in use during Lent are of precisely the ordinary form.

There is nothing in the other Western Liturgies which exactly corresponds to this Antiphon. The Roman and Sarum *Communio*, and the Ambrosian *Transitorium*, which are the analogous parts of those offices, are said after the Reception. [H. J. H.]

**ANTIPHONARIUM** (also *Antiphonale*, *Antiphonarius*, *Antiphonarius liber*), an office book of the Latin Church, containing the Antiphons

\* These correspond to the French *pain béni*. [EULOGIUS.]

and other portions of the Service, which were sung antiphonally.

The name *Antiphonarium* is applied to such books by John the Deacon, in his Life of Gregory the Great, who says that that Pontiff was the author of Antiphonaries. The complete collection, however, of Antiphons and Responsories, known by the general name of *Antiphonarium* or *Responsorium*, was usually divided into three parts in the Roman Church.

Amalarius writes:<sup>a</sup> "It is to be observed that the volume which we call *Antiphonarium* has three names<sup>b</sup> (*tria habet nomina*) among the Romans. That part which we term *Gradual* (*Gradale*) they term *Cantatory* (*Cantatorium*), which is still, according to their old custom, in some churches bound in a separate volume. The following part they divide under two headings (*in duobus nominibus*). The part which contains the Responsories is called the *Responsorial* (*Responsoriale*); and the part which contains the Antiphons is called the *Antiphonary* (*Antiphonarius*)."

As to the name *Cantatorium*, we find in the "Ordo Romanus I." (§ 10) the direction:—"After he [the Subdeacon] has finished reading [the epistle], the singer (Cantor), with the *Cantatory*, mounts,<sup>c</sup> and sings the Response." And Amalarius (*De Eccl. Off.* iii. 16) says: "The singer holds the *Tablets* (*Tabulas*)," where the word *Tabulas* is thought to mean the same thing as *Cantatorium*, i. e. the book itself.

The derivation of these words is obvious. The book was called *Cantatorium* from its containing the parts of the Service which were sung: *Gradale*, *Gradalis*, or *Graduale* (Gradual or Graile), from their being sung at the steps of the ambo or pulpit; and *Tabulae* in all probability from the plates in which the book was contained, and which appear to have been of bone, or perhaps horn. Amalarius, in the context of the passage quoted, says that the *tabulae* which the Cantor holds are usually made of bone (*solent fieri de osse*).

By whatever name this book was known, it contained those portions of the office of the Mass which were sung antiphonally, and was the first of the three divisions above alluded to. The second part, the *Responsoriale*, contained the Responsories after the lessons at Nocturns; and the third part, the *Antiphonarium*, the Antiphons for the Nocturns and diurnal offices.

The three parts together make up what is generally understood by the *Antiphonale* or *Antiphonarium*. The book is also sometimes called the *Official Book*, or the *Office Book* (*Liber officialis*). A MS. of the Monastery of St. Gall, of part of an Antiphonary and Responsorial of the usual type, is headed "Incipit officialis liber". It seems also to have been occasionally called the *Capitular Book* (*Capitulare*). In a MS. of St. Gall, of apparently about the beginning of the 11th century, we find the direction, "Responsoria et Antiphonae sicut in *Capitulari* habetur;" and though, according to the old Roman use of words, "*Capitulare*" means the Book of Epistles and Gospels, the context in this place necessitates

<sup>a</sup> *De ord. Antiph.*, Prologus.

<sup>b</sup> i. e. consists of three parts, as the context shows.

<sup>c</sup> i. e. the Ambo or its steps, for the custom would seem to have varied.

the meaning of Antiphrasy. The word occurs, moreover, throughout the MS. in the same sense.

Antiphonaries are sometimes found in old MSS. divided into two parts—one beginning with Advent, and ending with Wednesday or some later day (for the practice is not uniform) in the Holy Week, and the other comprising the rest of the year. Sometimes, again, they were divided into two parts, containing respectively the services for the daily and the nocturnal offices. Among the books of the Monastery of Fim (Muratori, *Ann. Ital.* iv.) we meet with "*Antiphonarios octo, quinque diurnales, tres nocturnales*," and in an old inventory of the church of Tarbes "*Antiphonarium de die*" and "*Antiphonarium de nocte* are mentioned. We have then to distinguish between—

- (2) The *Antiphonarium* (properly so called), which contained the Antiphons for the Nocturns and daily office.
- (3) The *Liber Responsorialis* of Antiphonaria, frequently, and in the Roman Church usually, called for brevity *Antiphonarium*, which comprised the contents of the last-mentioned book, together with the Responsories, originally divided into two distinct parts, but afterwards united into one, and arranged in order of sequence.
- (4) The *Antiphonarium*, otherwise called *Graduale*, *Gradale*, or *Gradalia*, and which contains those portions of the missal which are sung antiphonally. This is what is called by some *Constitution*.

Those which are most frequently met with are of classes 2 and 3.

2. As to the origin of Antiphonaries.—St. Gregory the Great is, as we have stated, usually considered to have been the author of Antiphonaries. It is, however, maintained by some,<sup>6</sup> and with much reason, that as the use of Antiphons and Responsories in the Roman Church was older than the time of Gregory, it is likely that books of Antiphons and Responsories existed likewise previously, and that that Pontiff merely revised and rearranged the Antiphonal and Responsorial books he found in use, much in the same manner as he recast the old *Sacramentary* of Gelasius into what is now universally known as the *Gregorian Sacramentary*.

It has been also questioned by some whether Gregory, the reputed author of *Antiphonaria*, may not be Pope Gregory II, A.D. 715. But as the title of the *Great* was not ascribed to Gregory I till long after his death,<sup>6</sup> the argument founded on the absence of that title, which is much relied on, does not seem of great force.

The Roman Antiphony, substantially, we may suppose, as Gregory compiled it, was sent by Pope Adrian I. (A.D. 772-795) to Charlemagne. The received story is that the Pope sent two Antiphonaries to the Emperor by two singers (Cantores) of the Roman Church.<sup>1</sup> Of these, one fell ill on his journey, and was received at the Monastery of St. Gall, to which monastery

\* As by Thomson, *Opera*, iv, p. xxvii.

• In the writings of Basil, Gregory of Tours, etc. etc., he is called *S. Gregorius*, or *Gregorius Papa*, or *Gregorius Abbot*, but not *Gregorius Magnus*.

It was after this, according to Thomsen (Ap. I. of the book), that the Antislavery was divided into the parts shown instead.

he left an Antiphony. The other book reached its destination, and was deposited at Metz. This Antiphony was held in high estimation, as we learn from St. Bernard, who says that the early Cistercians, who could find nothing more authentic, sent to Metz to transcribe the Antiphony, which was reputed to be Gregorian, for their use. It is also said that the clergy of Metz excelled the rest of the Gallic clergy in the Roman Church song (Roman Cantilena) as much as the Roman clergy excelled them.

A Roman Antiphony was also sent by Pope Gregory IV. (A.D. 827-844) to the then Abbot of Corbie, which was known as the Corbie Antiphony; and as this often varies from that of Metz, it is inferred (as is probable) that certain changes and variations between different copies had by that time crept into the Antiphony as compiled by Gregory.

After the Gregorian Antiphonary was introduced into France, it soon underwent many additions and modifications.

Walafrid Strabo, who lived in the 9th century, says that the Church of Gaul, which possessed both learned men and ample materials for the divine offices of its own, intermingled some of these with the Roman offices. Hence a great variety in the usages of the different French churches, on which we need not touch.

3. As examples of the contents of these books, we will give a sketch of two.

(1.) The Antiphony for the Mass, or Gradual, attributed to St. Gregory. This is headed "In Dei nomine incipit Antiphonarius ordinatus a St. Gregorio per circulum anni."

This title is followed in the St. Gall MS. by the well-known lines—

<sup>10</sup>Gregorius Praeui mortis et nominis dignus,  
Tunc sumus ducti sumusque amovendi: Horum." etc.

The book contains the various Antiphons sung at the Mass for the course of the ecclesiastical year, divided into two parts; that for the Sundays and moveable feasts, and that for the Saints' days. The first part, corresponding to the *Temporale* of the Missal, has no special heading. It begins with a rule for finding Advent (that it must not begin before V. Kal. Dec., or after III. Non. Dec.), and then proceeds, with the Sundays and Festivals in their course, beginning with the first Sunday in Advent (*Dom. 1<sup>us</sup> de Adventu Domini*), giving for each day the *Stations*, the *Antiphona ad Introitum*, with the *tone for the Psalm*; the *Responsorium Graduale*, the *Tractus*, when it occurs; the *Antiphona ad Offertorium*, and the *Antiphona ad Communionem*, each with its *versus ad repetendum*, and the last with its *versus alone*.

In the arrangement of the year, there is little to be noticed. The Sundays during the summer are counted from the Octave of Pentecost, and are called *Dominica prima post Octavam Pentecostes*; and so on until the 5th, which is called in some MSS. *Dominica prima post Nativitatem Apostolorum*,<sup>1</sup> the numbering from the Octave of Pentecost being likewise continued till Advent. After six of these Sundays post-Nativitatem &c. comes

§ These are now called respectively the *Gradual* (*Graduale*, or *Gradale*), the *Offertory* (*offertorium*), and the *Communion* (*communio*), and the last two are shortened into a single verse.

**9. 10. 11. Peter and Paul**



*Dominica prima post St. Laurentii*,<sup>1</sup> and so on for six Sundays more, when we come to *Dominica prima post S. Angeli*,<sup>2</sup> of which last set of Sundays seven are provided. Trinity Sunday does not appear, but the last Sunday before Advent is called "*de SS. Trinitate*, [al.] *Dom. xxiv. post Octav.-Pentec.* ; and the Antiphons are those now used in the Roman Church on Trinity Sunday, i.e., the Octave of Pentecost. The Festival of the Circumcision does not appear, the day being called *Oct. Domini*. There is also a second office provided for the same day, according to an old practice, called variously *In Natal. Sanctae Mariae* or *De Sancta Maria in Octava Dni*, or *Ad honorem Sanctae Mariae*.<sup>3</sup>

The offices for Good Friday "*ad crucem adorandam*," and the Reproaches (called here simply *Ad crucem Antiphona*) and that for baptism on Easter Eve, as also various Litanies and other occasional additions to the usual office, are found in their proper places.

The second part is headed "*De natalitiis Sanctorum*," and corresponds with the *Sanctorale* of later books. It begins with the festival of St. Lucy [Dec. 13], and ends with that of St. Andrew [Nov. 30]. This is followed in the St. Gall MS. by offices for St. Nicholas, the Octave of St. Andrew, St. Damasus [Dec. 11], and the Vigil of St. Thomas, and one for the Festival of St. Thomas, which differs from that previously given. There are also a variety of occasional and votive offices.

The Festival of *All Saints* is found in some MSS. There is one Festival of the *Chair of St. Peter* in one of the St. Gall copies on Jan. 18,<sup>4</sup> and one in three MSS. on Feb. 22.<sup>5</sup> There is no addition in either case of the words *Romae* or *Antiochiae*, and both are not, it seems, found in the same MS.

As a specimen of the arrangement, take the first Mass for Christmas Day, that in *media nocte* or in *galli cantu*.

"VIII. Kalendas Januarii  
Nativitas Domini nostri Jesu Christi.  
Ad Sanctam Mariam.

*Antiphona ad Introitum.*

Dominus dixit ad me, Filius meus es tu, Ego hodie genui te. [Dominus dixit.]

*Tm. II. oia, euonae.*

*Ps. 2.* Quare fremuerunt gentes? et populi meditati sunt inania? [Dominus dixit.] [Gloria. Dominus dixit.]

*V. ad repetendum.* Postula a me, et dabo tibi gentes haereditatem tuam, et possessionem tuam terminos terrae. [Dominus dixit.]

Then follow successively the *Responsorium gradale*, the *Antiphona ad offerenda*, and the *Antiphona ad Communionem*, each with its *versus*, and the last with its *psalm* and *versus ad repetendum*. All these Antiphons are repeated in the manner which has been explained in the article on Antiphons; and as they are of the

<sup>1</sup> i.e. Aug. 10.

<sup>2</sup> i.e. Michaelmas, as we should say.

<sup>3</sup> This has been put forward as an argument for the Gregorian authorship of this Antiphonary, as it is said that St. Gregory was in the habit of celebrating two masses on this day, the second of which was "*de Sancta Maria*."

<sup>4</sup> This corresponds with the present festival of the Chair of St. Peter at Rome.

<sup>5</sup> This corresponds with the present festival of the Chair of St. Peter at Antioch.

ordinary form, it does not seem necessary to set them out at length here.

(2.) As an example of an Antiphonary for the canonical hours, we will take the Antiphonary of the Vatican Basilica. It is a MS. with musical notation differing from that adopted later. It represents the use of the Roman Church in the 12th century, and may be considered as embodying the substance of the Gregorian Antiphonary, together with some later additions. It is headed—"In nomine Domini Jesu Christi incipit Responsoriale et Antiphonarium Romanae Ecclesiae de circulo anni juxta veterem usum Canonico-rum Basilicae Vaticanae St. Petri." It begins with a calendar, with the usual couplets of hexameters at the head of each month, and then, without any further title, proceeds with the Antiphons at the first Vespers of the first Sunday in Advent, and thence onwards throughout the course of the year, giving the Antiphons at Nocturns and all the hours; and the Responsories after the lessons at Nocturns. These Antiphons and Responsories are so nearly the same as those in the present Roman Breviary that it is unnecessary to quote more than the following specimen of the manner in which they are set out:—

"Dominica I. de Adventu Domini.

Statio ad Sanctam Mariam Majorem ad Praesepe.

Istud Invitatorium cantamus eo die ad Matutinum usque in Vigil. Natal. Domini, exceptis Festivitatibus Sanctorum.

Regem venturum Dominum, venite adoremus. Venite.  
In I. Nocturno.

*Ant.* Missus est Gabriel Angelus ad Mariam Virginem desponsatam Joseph. *Psalm.* Beatus vir. Quare fremuerunt. Domine quid. Domine ne in.

*Ant.* Ave Maria, gratia plena, benedicta tu inter mulieres. *Psalm.* Domine Deus meus. Domine Dominus noster. Confitebor. In Domino confido.

*Ant.* Ne timeas Maria, invenisti gratiam apud Dominum; ecce concipies et paries Filium. Alleluja. *Psalm.* Salvum me fac. Usquequo. Dixit insipiens. Dominus quia.

*V.* Ostende nobis Domine misericordiam Tuam.

*R.* Et salutare Tuum da nobis."

Then follows a long rubric, directing how the Responsories should be sung, and then the three well-known Responsories:—

- (1) *Aspiciens a longe*, &c.
- (2) *Aspiciebam in visu noctis*, &c.
- (3) *Missus est Gabriel*, &c.

The lessons are not indicated; but the Responsories are usually taken from the book which is being read in its course. Thus, on the Octave of Pentecost the Books of the Kings<sup>6</sup> were begun; and we have the rubric, "*Historia Regum cantatur usque ad Kalendas Augusti*," followed by a series of Responsories taken or adapted from those books for use during that time.<sup>7</sup>

The Antiphons, &c., for ordinary week days (*Feriae*) are given after the Octave of the Epiphany. On days on which there are nine lessons, nine Responsories are given. According to the present Roman custom, the ninth is replaced by *Te Deum* on those days on which it is said.

There is also an Antiphonary of this description

<sup>6</sup> Including what we call the Books of Samuel.

<sup>7</sup> The older Roman custom was to sing in the Octave of Pentecost and during the following week Responsories from the Psalms (*de Psalmista*) after that from the Kings.

attributed to St. Gregory, which exists at St. Gall. It is headed by an introduction in verse, which begins thus—

• Hoc quoque Gregorius Patres de more secutus,  
Instauravit opus, auxit et in melius.  
His vigili Clerus mentem conamine subdat  
Ordinibus, pascens hoc sua corda favo."  
(and so on for 14 lines.)

The MS. bears the heading—"Incipiunt Responsoria et Antiphonae per circulum anni." These are in the main identical with those in the Antiphonary just mentioned, but are arranged with reference to the monastic distribution of psalms and lessons.

Towards the end of the Antiphonary is a large number of Antiphons, given for the *Benedicta*, the *Benedictus*, and the *Magnificat* respectively.

In a portion of an Antiphonary ("ex vetustissimo codice MS. membranaceo Palatino signato num. 487 in Bibliotheca Vaticana, in quo continentur vetustiores, germanioresque libelli Ordinis Romani"), containing the service for Easter week, one or more of the Antiphons to the psalms for each day is given in Greek, but written in Roman characters, the others remaining in Latin. Thus at Vespers on Easter Tuesday, the Antiphon to Ps. cxii. is thus given—

"Alleluja. Prosechete laos mu to nomo mu: cline to os hymon is ta rhimata tu stomatos mu.

V. Anizo en parabolas to stoma mu: phthenxomae problemata sparches."

Those to the other psalms at the same Vespers are in Latin.

This may suffice to explain the general nature of Antiphonaries. The consideration of the many points of interest which their details present is beyond the scope of this article. [H. J. H.]

**ANTISTES.**—This title appears to have been common to bishops and presbyters in the Early Church. As the name "sacerdos" is common to both estates in respect of the offices of divine service which were performed by both, so in respect of the government of the Church in which they were associated, we find them designated alike, sometimes as "Presbyters" as marking their age and dignity—sometimes in respect of their "cure" or charge—as "antistites," *προεστῶτες*, *praepositi*. Thus in the first canon of the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, the bishop and presbyter are both expressly classed among the *προεστῶτες*, and the corresponding title of "Antistites" is evidently extended to the second order of the ministry by St. Augustine (*Serm. 351 de Poenitentia*), as follows: "Veniat (peccator) ad antistites, per quos illi in ecclesiā claves ministrantur, et . . . a praepositis sacramentorum accipiat satisfactionis suae modum." Here it is plain that "antistites in ecclesiā" are not the bishop alone, but the bishop and the presbyters. This usage of the word agrees with that of Archisynagogus in the Jewish synagogue, and may have been suggested by it. (Thorndike, *Primitive Government of Churches*, vol. i. p. 34.) [D. B.]

**ANTONIOUS**, saint, commemorated April 19 (*Mart. Bedae*). [C.]

• προσέχετε λαός μου τῷ νόμῳ μου • κλίνετε τὸ οὖς ὑμῶν εἰς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ στόματός μου.

ἀνίζω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, φθέγγομαι πρὸς λαόν μου ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.

**ANTONINA**, martyr, commemorated June 10 (*Cal. Byzant.*, Neale). [C.]

**ANTONINUS.** (1) Abbat, Jan. 17 (*M. Hieron.*).

(2) Martyr at Nicomedia, May 4 (*M. Hieron.*).

(3) Martyr at Apamea, commemorated Sept. 2 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); Sept. 3 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**ANTONIUS.** (1) The hermit, Jan. 17 (*Mart. Bedae, Cal. Byzant., Armen.*).

(2) Martyr at Rome, commemorated Aug. 22 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(3) In Piacenza, Sept. 30 (*M. Hieron.*).

(4) In Caesarea, commemorated Nov. 18 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**ANYSLA**, martyr of Thessalonica, commemorated Dec. 30 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**APER**, bishop, commemorated Sept. 15 (*Mart. Bedae, Hieron.*). [C.]

**APOCREOS** (Ἀπόκρεως).—The Sunday in the Orthodox Greek Calendar, which corresponds to our Sexagesima Sunday, is called Κυριακὴ Ἀπόκρεως, because from it the abstinence from flesh begins, though the more strict observance of the Lent fast does not commence until the following Sunday. [LENT.] The whole of the preceding week is also named from this Sunday, and is a kind of carnival. [C.]

**APOCRISIARIUS.** [LEGATE.]

**APODOSIS** (Ἀπόδοσις).—When the commemoration of a Festival is prolonged over several days, the last day of this period is called in the Greek Calendar the "Apodosis" of the Festival. For instance, on the Thursday before Pentecost is the Apodosis of the Ascension (ἀποδίδεται ἡ ἑορτὴ τῆς Ἀναλήψεως). In this case, and in some others (for instance, the Exaltation of the Cross and the Transfiguration) the Apodosis coincides with the octave; but this is not always the case. Sometimes the period is more than an octave; Easter-day, for instance, has its Apodosis on the eve of the Ascension: but generally it is less; the Nativity of the Theotokos (Sept. 8), for instance, has its Apodosis Sept. 12. (Neale's *Eastern Church*, *Introd.* 764; Daniel's *Codex Liturgicus*, iv. 230.) [C.]

**APOLLINARIS.** (1) Bishop, martyr at Ravenna, commemorated July 23 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae*). Antiphon for *Natalis Sancti Apollinaris* in *Liber Antiphon.* p. 704.

(2) Commemorated Aug. 23 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(3) "Avernus," Sept. 26 (*M. Hieron.*).

(4) Bishop, Oct. 5 (*Ib. et Hieron.*). [C.]

**APOLLINARIUS**, martyr, commemorated June 5 (*Mart. Bedae*). [C.]

**APOLLONIA**, virgin, martyr at Alexandria, commemorated Feb. 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**APOLLON**, bishop and martyr, commemorated Feb. 10 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**APOLLONIUS.** (1) Commemorated March 19 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(2) Of Egypt, commemorated April 5 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); Dec. 14 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(3) Presbyter, of Alexandria, April 10 (*Ib. et Hieron.*).

(4) Senator, martyr at Rome, April 18 (*Ib. et Bedae*).

(5) Commemorated July 7 (*Mart. Bedue et Hieron.*).

(6) Commemorated Dec. 23 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

**APOSTASY** (*ἀποστασία, apostasia, praevariatio*) is of three kinds. 1. Apostasy *a fide*, or *perfidiae*; 2. Apostasy *a religione*; 3. Apostasy *ab ordine suscepto*. Of these the two last will be more appropriately considered under the articles **MONASTICISM** and **DESERTION**.

Apostasy *a fide* is the voluntary and complete abandonment of the Faith by those who have been made members of the Church by baptism. It is *voluntary*, and herein to be distinguished from the sin of the lapsed [**LAPSI**], who fall away through compulsion or the fear of death; it is also *complete*, and consequently a graver crime than heresy, which is the denial of one or more of the articles of the Faith, but not an entire rejection of the Faith itself. Lastly, Apostasy is an *abandonment* of the Faith, and therefore an offence which could only be committed by members of the Church, by those who had in baptism taken the soldier's oath to fight under her standard. For this reason apostates were accounted to be betrayers of their Master's cause, and deserters from the ranks in which they had sworn to serve. "*Praevaricatores eos existimamus, qui susceptam fidem et cognitionem Dei adeptam relinquunt; aliud pollicitos, et aliud nunc agentes*" (St. Hilar. *Pict. in Ps. 118, vers. 119*).

It would also appear that catechumens were by some considered capable of committing the sin of apostasy (Cod. Theod., *De Apostat.* xvi. 7, 2), although their guilt was not so great as that of the baptized apostate.

Apostates *a fide* were of two classes: those who became Jews, and those who became Pagans. Of the former class there were those who entirely abandoned the Christian Faith, and who therefore were properly called apostates; and those who did not altogether reject it, but mingled together Christianity and Judaism, and, as it were, made for themselves a new religion. Such were the Coelicolae, Cerinthiani, Ebionaei, Nazaraei, Elcesaei, and Samsaei. There were others, again, who were also called apostates, who, without embracing any distinctive Jewish doctrines, observed parts of the ceremonial law, such as resting on the Sabbath, or who kept the Jewish feasts and fasts, or consulted Jews with the object of procuring charms for the cure of sickness.

And, secondly, there were those who voluntarily abandoned Christianity and returned to heathenism. And persons, who without going to this length, accepted the office of flamen, or who attended sacrifices (except in the discharge of duty), or joined as actors, stage players, or charioteers in the heathen games, or who sold animals or incense for sacrifice, or manufactured idols and the like, were considered to have betrayed their faith and to be guilty of a sin almost as grave as that of apostasy, and to merit the name of apostates (*Devoti. Inst. Can. iv. 3; Bingham, Antiq. xvi. 6, 4*).

The crime of apostasy was punished in the same way as heresy, though it was a graver offence. There are also special enactments in reference to it, both in the canons of Councils and in the constitutions of the Christian emperors.

By the 11th canon of the Oecumenical Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325), those who had voluntarily denied Christ, if they gave proof of hearty repentance, were admitted for three years amongst the *audientes*. For the next seven years they were permitted to become *substrati*, and were obliged to leave the church at the same time as the catechumens. After the expiration of this term they were allowed to join as *consistentes* in the prayers of the faithful; but two years had still to elapse before they were permitted to make oblations, or to partake of the Holy Eucharist; then they were said *ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον* (cf. Beveridge, *Pand. Can. Annotationes* in loc., and Bingham, *Antiq. viii. 3; xviii. 1*).

These provisions were an amelioration of the earlier discipline of the Church, as we learn from St. Cyprian (A.D. 252). "*Apostatae vero et desertores vel adversarii et hostes et Christi Ecclesiam dissipantes, nec, si occisi pro nomine foris fuerint, admitti secundum Apostolum possunt ad ecclesiae pacem, quando nec Spiritus nec Ecclesiae tenuerunt unitatem*" (St. Cyprian, *Ep. lv. ad fin.*).

By the 63rd (or 64th) of the Canons of the Apostles, clerks who went into synagogues to pray were deposed and excommunicated; and if laymen committed a like offence they were excommunicated (on the interpretation of this canon with regard to the question whether or not clerks were to be excommunicated as well as deposed, see Beveridge, *Pand. Can. Annotationes*, in loc.). The same punishments were by the 65th (or 66th) canon inflicted on clerks and laymen who fasted on the Lord's Day, or upon any Sabbath Day except the Great Sabbath, Easter Eve; and by the 69th (or 70th) canon, those were included who observed Jewish fasts or feasts, or (canon 70 or 71) who gave oil for consumption in synagogues or heathen temples.

By the 11th canon of the "Concilium Quinisextum," or "in Trullo" (A.D. 691 or 692), the clergy and laity were forbidden—the former under pain of deposition, and the latter under pain of excommunication—to eat unleavened bread with Jews, or to have any friendly intercourse with them, or to consult them in sickness, or even to enter the baths in their company.

In Africa, by the 35th canon of the 3rd Council of Carthage (A.D. 397) "*Apostaticis conversis vel reversis ad Dominum gratia vel reconciliatio non negetur.*"

In the East, by the 29th canon of the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 365, according to Beveridge) Christians were forbidden to Judaize (*ἰουδαΐζειν*) under the penalty of anathema. By the 37th and following canons of the same Council they were forbidden to be present at Jewish or Pagan feasts.

In Spain, the Council of Eliberis (A.D. 305 or 306) contains several provisions for the suppression and punishment of apostasy; for example, by the first canon persons of full age, who after baptism went to a heathen temple and sacrificed to an idol were refused communion, even at the hour of death. By the 46th canon of the same Council apostates who have not been guilty of idolatry are admitted to communion after ten years' penance; by the 49th the blessing of the fruits of the earth by Jews is forbidden, and those who allow that ceremony to be performed are cast out altogether from the Church. Upon

this canon Hefele (*Conciliengeschichte*, i. 148) observes: "In Spain the Jews had become so numerous and powerful during the early ages of the Christian era that they believed they might venture to attempt to convert the whole country. . . There is no doubt that at that period many Christians in Spain of high standing became converts to Judaism."

Again, by the 59th canon of the 4th Council of Toledo (A.D. 633), apostate Jews who practise circumcision are punished; but (canon 61) their children, if believers, are not excluded from succession to their property. The next canon (62) forbids any intercourse between converted Jews and those who remain in their old faith; and there are several other canons which show that apostasy to Judaism was still a prevalent crime in Spain; as, for instance, the 64th canon, which ordains that the evidence of apostate Jews should not be received in a court of justice.

In the French Councils there are several canons relating to apostasy. By the 22nd canon of the 1st Council of Arles (A.D. 314) it was forbidden to give communion to apostates who sought it in sickness, until they were restored to health, and had exhibited proper evidence of their repentance.

By the 12th canon of the Council of Vannes (A.D. 465) the clergy were forbidden to attend Jewish banquets or to invite Jews to their own tables—a prohibition which was repeated in the 40th canon of the Council of Agde (A.D. 506), and extended to laymen by the 15th canon of the Council of Epone (A.D. 517), and also by the 13th canon of the 3rd Council of Orleans (A.D. 538), and the 15th canon of the 1st Council of Macon (A.D. 581).

In the collections of the Imperial Law—the 'Codex Theodosianus' (which was promulgated A.D. 438) contains various provisions made by the Christian emperors for the punishment of apostasy. Constantine the Great ordained (A.D. 315) that apostates to Judaism should suffer "poenas meritas" (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 8, 1*), which were defined by Constantius (A.D. 357) to be the confiscation of the property of the offender (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 8, 7*). They were deprived by Valentinian the Younger (A.D. 383) of the *jus testandi*, but the action upsetting the will had to be brought within five years of the death of the testator, and by persons who had not in his lifetime known of his offence, and remained silent (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 7, 3*). Apostates to Paganism were deprived by Theodosius the Great (A.D. 381) of the *jus testandi* (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 7, 1*); but another constitution of the same emperor, promulgated A.D. 383, made a distinction between the baptized (*Christiani ac fideles*) and catechumens (*Christiani et catechumens*), and the latter were permitted to execute testamentary dispositions in favour of their sons and brothers german. By this constitution it was further provided that apostates should not only be unable, with the foregoing exceptions, to bequeath property by will, but should also be incapable of receiving property under the will of another person (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 7, 2*). One day later Valentinian the Younger promulgated throughout the Western Empire the constitution cited above, which applied to all classes of apostates alike (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 7, 3*). By a constitution of the year 381 the same emperor ordained that

baptized apostates professing Paganism should be deprived of the right of bequeathing by will, of receiving property under a will, of bearing witness in a court of justice, and of succeeding to an inheritance. They were also condemned "a consortio omnium segregari" (on the meaning of this expression see the note of Godefroi, *in loc.*), and were dismissed from all posts of civil dignity. It was also declared that these penalties remained in force even though the apostate repented of his sin—"perditis, hoc est sanctum Baptismum profanantibus, nullo remedio poenitentiae (quae solet aliis criminibus prodesse) succurritur" (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 7, 4-5*). Arcadius (A.D. 396) extended the power which his father Theodosius the Great had given to apostate catechumens to make certain testamentary dispositions, and ordained that all apostates, whether baptized or catechumens, should have the power to bequeath property to their father and mother, brother and sister, son and daughter, and grandson and granddaughter (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 7, 6*). The last constitution contained in the Codex Theodosianus under this title is a very severe enactment of Valentinian the Third (A.D. 426), abrogating the provisions of the above-cited constitution of Valentinian the Younger of the year 323, as far as it related to apostates to Paganism. Under its provisions a person could be accused of apostasy at any time, although five years may have passed since his death, and it was immaterial whether the accuser had or had not been privy to the offence. Apostates were also prohibited from disposing of their property by will and from alienating it by sale or gift (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 7 ult.*). The "Paratitlon" prefixed to this title in the edition of Godefroi (Leipsic, 1736, &c.) gives a brief but very useful summary of its contents.

The "Codex Repetitae Praelectionis" promulgated by Justinian in December A.D. 534 contains a title, "De Apostatis" (Lib. i. tit. 7), the first four Sections of which relate to this subject, and consist of extracts from the "Codex Theodosianus."

The first section re-enacts the constitution of Constantius (A.D. 357), by which the property of apostate Jews is confiscated (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 8, 7*). The second section contains that part of the constitution of Valentinian the younger (A.D. 383), which limits the time in which an accusation of apostasy could be brought (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 7, 3*). In the third section the constitution of the same emperor (A.D. 391) is re-enacted, which is contained in the Codex Theodosianus (xvi. 7, 4), and is cited above. The fourth section repeats the enactment of Valentinian the Third (A.D. 426), by which very severe penalties were inflicted on apostates (*Cod. Theod. xvi. 7 ult.* cited above). It appears, therefore, that the legislation of Justinian was not more tolerant than that of his predecessors in its treatment of this offence.

Although beyond the limits of this article, it may be noted that the title of the Decretals relating to apostasy is the 9th title of the fifth book ("De Apostatis et Reiterantibus Baptisma"). The subject is also considered by St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theol. 2-2, quaestio 12*). [I. B.]

APOSTATE (ἀποστάτης, *apostata*, *praevaricator*). See APOSTASY.

APOSTLE (in Hagiology). The word Ἀπό



*ερωλος* is used in the Greek Calendar to designate not only those who are called Apostles in the New Testament, but the Seventy Disciples and others who were companions of the Apostles, strictly so called. It is applied, for instance, to Agabus, Rufus, Asyncritus, and others, supposed to be of the Seventy (April 8); and to Ananias of Damascus (Oct. 1). But the Apostles, in the narrower sense, are distinguished from others to whom the title is applied by some epithet or description. For instance, Nov. 30 is described as the Festival *τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδόξου καὶ πανευφάρμου Ἀποστόλου Ἀνδρέου τοῦ Πρωτοκλήτου, κ.τ.λ.*; SS. Peter and Paul are described by the terms *πρωτοκορυφαῖοι*, in addition to the epithets applied to St. Andrew. It is noteworthy that the Constantinople "Typicon" expressly forbids St. Peter to be called the Apostle of Rome,

inasmuch as he was a teacher and enlightener of the whole world; and it hints that if any place is to be connected with his name, it should be Antioch (Daniel, *Codex Lit.* iv. 281).

The term *ἰσούεστος*, the equal of the Apostles, is applied to

1. Bishops supposed to be consecrated by Apostles; as Abercius of Hierapolis (Oct. 22).

2. Holy women who were companions of the Apostles: as Mary Magdalene, Junia, and Thekla.

3. Princes who have aided the spread of the Faith; as Constantine and Helena in the Orthodox Greek Church, and Vladimir in the Russian Church.

4. The first preachers, or "Apostles," of the Faith in any country; as Nina, in the Georgian Calendar (*Neale, Eastern Church*, Introd. p. 761). [C.]



The Twelve Apostles on thrones, with Our Lord in centre.

**APOSTLES IN CHRISTIAN ART.** § 1. In representations of the Twelve, antecedent to the year 1300 A.D. or thereabouts, only slight variations of treatment are to be observed, whether in Eastern or in Western monuments. It will be convenient to speak separately of these two classes.

§ 2. *Of the Eastern and Greek Churches.*—Eastern monuments of an early date are very limited in number, owing to the destructive zeal, first of the Iconoclasts, and afterwards, in many cases, of the Turks. And among these the only representations of the Twelve Apostles known to the present writer are the following. In an early Syriac manuscript of the Gospels written at Zagba in Mesopotamia in the year 585 A.D., now in the Library of the Medici at Florence, is a picture of the Ascension, in which twelve (not eleven only) Apostles are represented, the Virgin Mary standing in the midst of them (see this figured under ANGELS). Of about the same date are some mosaics in the church of St. Sophia at Thessalonica, figured by Texier and Pullan in their 'Byzantine Architecture,' pl. xl., xli. Separate representations of many of the Apostles will be found among the illuminations of the Menologium Græcorum of the emperor Basil. These, though of considerably later date (10th or 11th century), are all but identical in character

with those above mentioned. Indeed the religious art of the Greeks, as everything else pertaining to religion, has been stereotyped once for all from the close of the 8th century until now. "Greek art," says M. Didron, "is wholly independent of time and place. The painter of the Morea reproduces at this day art such as it was at Venice in the 10th century; and those Venetians again reproduce the art of Mount Athos four or five centuries before. The costume of the personages represented is everywhere and at all times the same, not only in shape, but in colour and drawing, even to the very number and size of the folds of a dress." For in the eyes of the Greeks, at all times, religious art has been, what one of the Fathers of the Seventh General Council described it—not a matter to be regulated by the inventive power of painters, but by the prescriptions and tradition of the Church (*Labbe's Concil.* tom. vii. col. 831).

§ 3. *Early Monuments in the West.*—Representations of the Apostles in monuments of early date, still existing in Italy and in France, are very numerous, and of very various kinds; as, for example, in mosaics, frescoes, marble sarcophagi, and even in smaller objects of art, such as vessels of glass or ornaments of bronze. The principal works in which these are figured (re-described are enumerated in § 12 below.



§ 4. *Costume and Insignia*.—In all the early monuments above referred to, whether of the East or of the West, in which the Twelve are represented, almost exactly the same costume and insignia are attributed to them. Only St. Peter and St. Paul [see PAUL and PETER below] have any special attributes. The dress assigned to them is a long tunic reaching to the feet (with rare exceptions, which are confined, as far as the writer knows, to some of the Roman catacombs) and with a pallium (*himation*) as an outer garment. The insignia by which they are designated are a roll of a book (*volumen*) generally in the left hand, indicative of their office as Preachers of the Divine Word, or a chaplet (*corona*), also held in the hand, significant either of the Martyr's crown, or of what is but a slight variation of the same idea, the crown of Victory which the Lord bestows upon them who contend faithfully unto the end. The scroll above spoken of is sometimes replaced by a codex or book of the more modern form (this latter is generally the distinctive mark of a bishop). In the mosaics of St. Sophia at Thessalonica above mentioned (§ 2) the roll is assigned to some, the codex to others, while others are represented without either. [For an example of the codex assigned to an apostle in Western Art, see Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.* tom. ii. tab. xliii., a monument of the 9th century.] They are occasionally represented as seated on 'thrones' or chairs of state (see woodcut, p. 106) in reference to their delegated authority (compare Luke xxii. 30) to rule in Christ's name over the Church. And in one mosaic, probably of the 5th century, in the church of St. John in Fonte at Ravenna, all the Twelve wear a kind of tiara or peaked cap, suggestive of the thought that the office of the Apostles in the Church corresponds to that of the High Priest under the Law. [See further under TIARA.] This monument is engraved by Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.* tom. i. tab. lxx.

§ 5. *Names of the Apostles in early Monuments*.—In early representations of the whole number of the Twelve the addition of names to each is of very exceptional occurrence. The only example known to the present writer is that of a mosaic referred to above in the church of St. John in Fonte at Ravenna. The arrangement there is a circular one, the figures being so disposed that St. Peter and St. Paul occupy the principal position, while the names, and figures, of the rest occur in the following order: ANDREAS—JACOBUS—JOANNES—PHILIPUS—BAR-TOLOMEUS—SIMON—JUDAS THADEUS—JACOBUS NI—MATEUS—THOMAS. It will be observed that the number Twelve is obtained, after inserting the name of St. Paul, by omitting that of Mathias. This last omission is generally made in similar enumerations of the Twelve in later centuries.

§ 6. *Mode of representation*.—In Western monuments of the first eight centuries (the period with which we are here principally concerned) the Twelve are almost invariably represented as standing, or as seated, on either side of our Lord, who is either figured in His human person, or (much more rarely) symbolically designated. In either case He is distinguished from the Apostles themselves by conventional designations of higher dignity. And in the case of the Apostles themselves symbolical designations sometimes take the

place of any more direct representation, while in other cases, as on many of the sarcophagi, the two modes of representation are combined.

§ 7. *Direct representation*.—In many early monuments (see under PAUL and PETER) there has been an evident attempt at portraiture in the case of the two "chiefest Apostles." Of the rest, some are represented as of youthful appearance, and beardless, others as bearded, and of more advanced years. But beyond this no special traditional rules of representation can be traced in early monuments.


§ 8. *Symbolical designation*.—Of the symbols employed to represent the Twelve, the most common is that of twelve sheep, adopted (so it has been thought) with reference to those words of Our Lord, "Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves." These twelve sheep are commonly represented six on either side of Our Lord (personally or symbolically represented), who is generally seen standing upon a rock, whence flow four streams. To such a representation Paulinus refers (in his Epist. xxxii. addressed to his friend Severus, bishop of Milevis in Africa; Migne, *P. C. C.* tom. lxi. p. 366) in speaking of his own church at Nola in Campania. He is writing circ. 400 A.D.

"Petram superstat Ipse petra Ecclesiae,  
De qua sonori quatuor fontes meant,  
Evangelistae, viva Christi flumina."

The two groups, each of six sheep, are generally represented as issuing from two towers representing Bethlehem and Jerusalem, the cities of the birth and the passion of Our Lord, the beginning and the end, as it were, of that Life upon earth, of which the Apostles were the chosen witnesses. Another symbol, founded also, in all probability on words of Our Lord ("Be ye . . . harmless as doves," Matt. x. 16) is that of twelve doves. Paulinus, bishop of Nola, in the letter already quoted, speaks of a mosaic picture on the roof of the apse of his church, on which was represented, *inter alia*, a Cross surrounded with a 'Corona,' a circle of light, to use his own words, and round about this Corona the figures of twelve doves, emblematic of the twelve Apostles. Beneath this picture was the following inscription, descriptive of its meaning:—

"Pleno cornescat Trinitas mysterio:  
Stat Christus agno; vox Patris caelo tonat;  
Et per columbam Spiritus sanctus fluit,  
Crucem corona lucido cingit globo,  
Cui coronae sunt corona Apostoli,  
Quorum figura est in columbarum choro."

A representation\* of the Twelve, nearly answering to this description, forms the frieze of an early sarcophagus preserved in the Museum at Marseilles, and figured below (after Millin, *Voyages*, etc. plate lvi. 6). Yet other symbols are




occasionally used in designation of Apostles, but these, as being less capable of definite interpretation, are rather accompaniments of personal

\* A crucifix with twelve doves upon the four portions of the cross itself, in the apse of the church of St. Clement at Rome, is of the 13th century. See Didron, in the *Annales Archaeologiques*, tom. xxvi. p. 17. This cross is figured by Alicgranza, *Spiegazione*, &c., tom. i. p. 118.

representations of the Twelve, than substitutes for them. Such are palm trees, vines, and other trees, to which a mystical reference was given in Christian art as well as in early Christian literature. St. Hilary of Poitou, commenting on Matt. xiii. (the parable of the 'Sinapis' or Mustard Plant), sees in the seed committed to the ground, and then springing up therefrom, a type of Christ, and in the branches of the tree, put forth by the Power of Christ, and embracing the whole earth beneath their shade, a type of the Apostles, branches to which the Gentiles, like birds of the air, should fly from the world's troubling storms, and find rest. St. Augustine uses nearly similar language in reference to the same parable. (*Sermo in Festo S. Laurentii*.) And this traditional application affords a pro-

bable interpretation of the small bush-like trees<sup>b</sup> which are seen associated in some early frescoes with figures of Our Lord and the Apostles. The symbolism of the vine resulted naturally from the words addressed to His disciples by Our Lord ("I am the vine; ye are the branches," Joh. xv. 5). The palm-tree, as the recognised symbol of victory and of triumph, was suggestive of the same thoughts as those indicated by the victor's chaplet (corona) which Apostles often bear in their hands, or have bestowed upon them by a hand from heaven.

Yet one other symbol may be referred to, unique of its kind, adopted, so it has been ingeniously suggested,<sup>c</sup> by some poor man who could not by any other more elaborate means express the Christian faith and hope in which he rested. On



Apostles.

the walls of the cemetery of St. Callistus is an inscription, in rude characters, much such as that here given:—



The central letters of the inscription are believed to represent the A and Ω, which frequently occur in early monuments as symbols of Our Lord; while the twelve letters on either side signify the twelve Apostles, who in early monuments, and especially on sarcophagi, are frequently represented, six on either hand.

§ 9. *Later conventional designations of the different Apostles.*—Christian art in the West for the last five centuries, or rather more, has assigned special attributes to each one of the Twelve, most of them having reference to late traditions concerning them, unknown to the early Church. These traditions, by their late date, lie beyond the range properly embraced by the present work. But for the sake of comparison and contrast with the older representations above described, it may be well very briefly to notice them. For fuller particulars, the reader should consult Didron's *Manuel d'Iconographie* (see below § 12) and Jameson's *Sacred and Legendary Art*.

§ 10. *As Authors of separate Articles of the Creed.*—Probably the earliest of these later modes (after 1300 A.D.) of designating the several Apostles, is that of assigning to each (written on a scroll held in the hand) the particular article of the Creed of which each was, by tradition, the author. (For the tradition as to this authorship, see Durandi, *Rationale*, lib. iv. cap. xxv.) In the cathedral church of Albi (Didron, *Manuel d'Iconographie*, p. 304) the Apostles are represented in this manner.

§ 11. *Distinguished by special Insignia.*—As an example of yet another mode of designating the Apostles individually, we may refer (with M. Didron) to a series of enameled by Leonard Limousin in the church of St. Peter at Chartres. The Twelve are there represented with the following insignia:—St. Peter with the Keys; St. Paul with a Sword;<sup>d</sup> St. Andrew with a Cross, saltier-wise;<sup>e</sup> St. John with a Chalice;<sup>f</sup> St. James the Less with a Book<sup>g</sup> and a Club;<sup>h</sup> St. James the Elder with a Pilgrim's Staff,<sup>i</sup> a broad Hat<sup>j</sup> with scallop-shells, and a Book;<sup>k</sup> St. Thomas with an Architect's Square;<sup>l</sup> St. Philip with a small

<sup>b</sup> As, for example, in that of our Lord as the giver of the Divine Word, with two Apostles on either side, in the cemetery of St. Agnes at Rome. *Art. R. & L.* tom. II. p. 329; figured also in *Patristic Christianity*, pl. xli.

<sup>c</sup> Lupi (Antiochensis), *Dissertationes*, de Faciis, 1788, 4to.; tom. I. p. 360.

<sup>d</sup> As the instrument by which he was believed to have suffered martyrdom: or (so Durandus, *Ref. I.* cap. III. 16) as a soldier of Christ, armed (so he probably would suggest) with "the sword of the Spirit."

<sup>e</sup> "En sautoir" the "crux decussata," shaped like an X, and generally known as St. Andrew's Cross. In Greek Martyrologies (and in one or two Western examples) St. Andrew is depicted as crucified on a cross of the ordinary form. See the *Menologium Græcorum*, vol. I. p. 232 (Nov. 30).

<sup>f</sup> Originally perhaps with reference to the words (Matt. xx. 23), "Ye shall indeed drink of my cup." For the later legendary stories of a poisoned chalice given to him, see Jameson, *S. and L. Art.* vol. I. p. 189.

<sup>g</sup> Equivalent to the scroll (see § 4) of primitive Christian art.

<sup>h</sup> All the insignia here mentioned are assigned to St. James (the St. Iago of Spanish legend), as the patron of pilgrims. The pilgrimage to Compostella, the reputed place of St. Iago's burial, was a favourite object of medieval devotion.

<sup>i</sup> In allusion to a beautiful legendary story (Jameson, *S. and L. Art.* p. 246), in respect of which St. Thomas is recognised as the patron of architects and builders.

Cross, the staff of which is knotted like a reed;<sup>b</sup> St. Matthew with a Pike (or Spear);<sup>c</sup> St. Matthias with an Axe;<sup>d</sup> St. Bartholomew with a Book<sup>e</sup> and a Knife;<sup>f</sup> St. Simon with a Saw.<sup>g</sup>

§ 12. *Authorities referred to.*—In the following section are enumerated the principal works in which the monuments above referred to are figured or described. For the Syriac MS. referred to in § 2, see the *Bibliotheca Medicea* of S. E. Assemanus, Florentiae, fol. 1742. For the Greek Monuments, see Texier and Pullan, *Byzantine Architecture*, fol. London, 1864. The *Menologium Graecorum* referred to in § 2 was published at Urbino, 3 vols. fol. 1727. And on the subject of the later Greek Religious Art generally, see Didron, *Manuel d'Iconographie Chrétienne, Grecque, et Latine*, Paris, 1845. (This is a French translation of the 'Ερμηνεία τῆς ζωγραφικῆς, or 'Painter's Guide' of Panselinos, a monk of Mount Athos in the 11th century, and the recognised authority in the school of Greek Art which has its centre in the same "holy mountain" to this day. It is enriched with very valuable notes by the editor. For what relates to the Apostles, see p. 299 sqq.) For early monuments at Rome and Ravenna — Ciampini, *Vetera Monumenta, Romae*, fol. 1699; and for those of the Roman Catacombs more particularly — Aringhi, *Roma Subterranea*, 2 vols. fol. Romae, 1651, or Bottari, *Sculture e Pitture sagre*, etc., Romae, fol. 1737; Perret, *Catacombes de Rome*, 6 vols. fol. Paris, 1851 (not always to be depended on in matters of detail); Alemannus, *de Parietinis Lateranensibus*, Romae, 4° 1625; and for ancient ornaments in Glass, chiefly from the Roman Catacombs, Garrucci, *Vetri ornati*, etc. Roma, 1864. For monuments at Verona, Maffei, *Verona Illustrata*, fol. 1732; and at Milan, Allegranza (Giuseppe), *Spiegazione e Riflessioni*, etc., Milano, 4° 1757. For early sarcophagi at Arles, Marseilles, Aix, and other towns in France, the chief authority is Millin, *Voyages dans les Départemens du Midi de la France*, 8° and 4° Paris, 1807–1811. One monument of special interest, that of the Sancta Pudientiana at Rome (the figures of the Twelve, *ten* only of which now remain, are believed with good reason to be of the 4th century, though the upper part of the mosaic is of the 8th) may best be studied in the coloured drawing and description given by Labarte, *Histoire des Arts Industriels*, etc., xol. iv. p. 166 sqq., and the *Album of Plates*, vol. ii. pl. cxxi. This mosaic is also represented in Gally Knight, *Ecclesiastical Architecture of Italy* (London, 1842), vol. i. pl. xxiii.

[W. B. M.]

## APOSTLES' FESTIVALS AND FASTS.

—I. *Festivals.*—1. In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (viii. 33, § 3) we find abstinence from labour enjoined on certain "days of the Apostles" (τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀργεῖν τωσαν), but

what these days were does not appear, though the injunction to abstain from labour betokens a great festival.

2. As the services of Easter week, following the evangelic narrative of the events after the Resurrection, placed a commemoration of the solemn sending and consecration of the Apostles (St. John xx. 21–23) on the first Sunday after Easter, this day appears to have been sometimes called "the Sunday of the Apostles." This Sunday was one of the highest festivals in the Ethiopian Calendar (Alt, *Christliche Cultus*, ii. 33, 184).

3. In the West the commemoration of all the Apostles was anciently joined with that of the two great Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul; and this festival appears to have been, at the time of its first institution, the only festival in honour of the Apostles; for we find in the Missae for that festival in the Leonine *Sacramentary* (Migne's *Patrol.* vol. 55, p. 44) an "oratio super oblata," which runs, "Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui nos omnium apostolorum merita sub una tribuisti celebritate venerari." And this seems to have been the case also when the "Epistola ad Chromatium" quoted by Cassiodorus (in Leonine *Sacram.* p. 44) was written; for we there read that the Apostles were commemorated on one day, "ut dies varii non videantur dividere quos una dignitas Apostolatus in coelesti gloria fecit esse sublimes."

4. It was no doubt from this close connection with the Festival of SS. Peter and Paul (June 29) that the Festival of the Twelve Apostles (Σύναξις τῶν δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων) came to be celebrated in the orthodox Greek church on the morrow of that festival—June 30—as it is to this day. This is a great festival, with abstinence from labour (Ἀργία).

5. In the Armenian calendar, the Saturday of the sixth week after Pentecost is dedicated to the Twelve Holy Apostles, and their chiefs, Peter and Paul; and the Tuesday in the fifth week after the elevation of the Cross is dedicated to Ananias of Damascus, Matthias, Barnabas, Philip, Stephen, Silas and Silvanus, and the Twelve Apostles. (Alt, *Christliche Cultus*, ii. 242, 256.)

6. The Micrologus tells us (c. 55) that on May 1, "invenitur in Martyrologiis sive in Sacramentariis festivitas SS. Philippi et Jacob. et omnium Apostolorum." The existing Martyrologies and Sacramentaries, however, mention no commemoration on May 1, beyond that of SS. Philip and James; but the mention of a commemoration of all Apostles may have arisen from the "Deposition" of the bodies of SS. Philip and James in the "Basilica omnium Apostolorum." (Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, v. i. 365; Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexicon*, xii. 57.)

7. The 15th of July is in the Roman calendar the Feast of the "Division of the Apostles," (Divisio SS. Apostolorum). This was probably intended to commemorate the traditional event related by Rufinus (*H. E.*, i. 9), that the Apostles, before leaving Jerusalem to begin their work of preaching the Gospel to all nations, determined by lot the portions of the world which each should evangelise. By others, however, the Feast is supposed to commemorate the "Divisio ossium Petri et Pauli." The legend to which this refers is as follows:—The remains of St. Peter and St. Paul were placed together after their

<sup>b</sup> "Petite croix de roseaux." So Didron. A reference to Jameson's *N. and L. A.* p. 242, and to the drawing there given, suggests the explanation above given. The shape described is that of a traveller's staff; and the emblem marks the apostle as a preacher of Christ crucified to distant nations.

<sup>c</sup> See note <sup>d</sup>, preceding page.

<sup>d</sup> See note <sup>e</sup>, preceding page.

<sup>e</sup> According to Western tradition he was sawn asunder; but in the Greek representation of his martyrdom he is affixed to a cross exactly like that of our Saviour (Jameson, vol. i. p. 253).

martyrdom, and when Pope Sylvester, at the consecration of the great church of St. Peter, desired to place the sacred remains of the patron saint in an altar, it was found impossible to distinguish them from those of St. Paul; but after fasting and prayer, a divine voice revealed that the larger bones were those of the Preacher, the smaller of the Fisherman; and they were consequently placed in the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul respectively. (Ciampini, *de Sacris Aedificiis*, p. 53, quoting Belet, *Explicat. Divin. Offic.* c. 138.)

II. *Fasts*.—1. As early as the *Apostolical Constitutions* (v. 20, § 7) we find the week following the octave of Pentecost marked as a fast. The intention of this probably was, as no fast was allowable in the joyful season between Pasch and Pentecost, that men should endeavour to render themselves fit recipients of the gifts of the Holy Spirit by subsequent mortification. This fast was afterwards extended to the eve of the Festival of SS. Peter and Paul, and as it now filled the whole space between the "Apostle Sunday" and the great commemorations of the Apostles on June 29 and June 30, it came to be called the "Apostles' Fast," *ἡ νηστεία τῶν ἀποστόλων*. (Augusti, *Handbuch der Christl. Archäologie*, iii. 481.)

2. There is a collect for a Fast in the mass already referred to in the *Leonine Sacramentary*. This, perhaps, indicates that an extraordinary fast, instituted in the time of St. Leo for the relief of Rome, or for some other reason, concurred with the Festival of All Apostles. (Note in the *Leonine Sacram.* Migne's *Patrol.* vol. 55, p. 44.)

III. *Dedications*.—A church (*Ματθρίσιον*), dedicated to the Twelve Apostles, second in splendour only to that of St. Sophia, was built at Constantinople by Constantine the Great, who intended it for the place of his own sepulture (Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, lib. iv., cc. 58–60). He also dedicated at Capua, in honour of the Apostles, a church to which he gave the name of Constantinian (*Liber Pontif.*, under 'Sylvester,' Muratori *Scriptores*, iii. 1). The ancient church at Rome dedicated to the Apostles, is said to have been begun by Pope Pelagius I. (555–560), and completed by his successor John III. (560–573). (Ciampini, *de Sacris Aedif.* p. 137.) [C.]

APOSTOLUS, the formal missive of the judge of a lower court, whereby a cause was transferred to a higher court to which appeal had been made from him. See Justinian, *Code* vii. 62, &c. &c., and under APPEALS. [A. W. H.]

APOSTOLICAL CANONS. About 500 A.D., Dionysius Exiguus, a Roman monk of great learning, at the request of Stephen, Bishop of Salona, made a collection of Greek canons, translating them into Latin. At the head of this collection he placed 50 canons, with this title, "Incipiunt Regulae Ecclesiasticae sanctorum Apostolorum, prolatae per Clementem Ecclesiae Romanae Pontificem." At the same time, however, Dionysius says in the preface to his work, "In principio itaque canones, qui dicuntur Apostolorum, de Graeco transtulimus, quibus quia plurimi consensum non praebuere facilem, hoc ipsum vestram nolimus ignorare sanctitatem, quamvis postea quaedam constituta pontificum ex ipsis canonibus assumpta esse videantur."

These words obviously point to a difference of opinion prevailing in the Church, though it has been doubted by some whether the dissentients spoken of rejected the canons altogether, or merely denied that they were the work of the apostles. And with regard to the last clause, it is much disputed whether previous popes can be shown to have known and cited these canons.\* Hefele denies that "Pontifices" means Popes, and would understand it of bishops in their synodical constitutions.<sup>b</sup>

The subsequent course taken by the Church of Rome in relation to these canons is not altogether clear. In the last decade of the 5th century Pope Gelasius published a decree *De Libris non recipiendis*, and in the text of this decree as it now stands in the *Decretum Gratiani* there appears, amongst other rejected works, 'Liber canonum Apostolorum apocryphus.' But it is said that these words are not found in the most ancient MSS. of the decree, and Hincmar of Rheims, in speaking of it, expressly says that Gelasius is silent as to the Apostolical Canons. Moreover, Dionysius, who was by birth a Scythian, does not seem to have come to Rome until after the death of Gelasius, and consequently his collection cannot have appeared at the time of the decree.<sup>c</sup>

Hefele therefore thinks that the words in question were for the first time inserted by Pope Hormisdas (514–523), when he republished the decree 'De Libris non recipiendis' (*Conciliengeschichte*, i. 719).<sup>d</sup> If so, the point is not very material. It is clear that Dionysius, in setting forth a later collection during the popedom of Hormisdas (of which the preface alone is now extant) left out these canons. He says: "Canones qui dicuntur Apostolorum et Sardicensis concilii atque Africanae provinciae quos non admisit universitas, ego quoque in hoc opere praetermisi, &c."<sup>e</sup>

\* Bishop Pearson contends that Leo, Innocent, and Gelasius himself, refer to them (*Vindic. Ignat.*, part i. cap. iv.); but this has been as strongly denied. Bickell thinks that Dionysius may have had in view expressions of Siricius (*Ep. ad Div. Episc.*, anno 386) and Innocent (*Ep. ad Victic.*, anno 404), which, however, he conceives him to have misunderstood (*Gesch. des Kirchenrechts*, p. 74). Von Drey seems to think the canons were not known at Rome till the version of Dionysius; but Hefele observes that they might have been known in their Greek form. Dionysius in his preface says that he had been exhorted to the work of translation by his friend Laurentius, who was "confusione priscae translationis offensus." Does this point to an existing version of the canons, or is it to be understood of the other matters contained in his collection? The latter seems most in accordance with the received theory.

<sup>b</sup> See his *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. i. p. 767. But unless it can be limited to Eastern bishops, this view would equally admit that the canons so quoted or relied on must have been known in the Western Church.

<sup>c</sup> Dionysius says in his preface: "Nos qui eum (Gelasium) praesentis corporali non vidimus." This in itself would not be conclusive as to the decree, though the only alternative would be to admit that the canons were known at Rome before Dionysius's translation. Bishop Pearson seeks to throw doubt on the decree (*Vindic. Ignat.*, part i. cap. iv.); but much of his reasoning is not inconsistent with the theory of Hefele.

<sup>d</sup> So too, apparently, Bickell, vol. i. p. 74.

<sup>e</sup> Cited in Bickell (i. 75), who also mentions that they were omitted from the Spanish collection of canons in the 7th century, with these words: "Canones autem qui dicuntur Apostolorum, sed quia eodem nec sedes apostolica recipit, nec SS. patres illis consensum praebuerunt."



At all events it must be taken that the Church of Rome at the present day does not accept these canons as of apostolic authority. Though the citations made by Gratian under the head "*De auctoritate et numero Canonum Apostolorum*," are not very consistent with each other, yet the latest canonists speak more distinctly.

"*Canones illi non sunt opus genuinum apostolorum, nec ab omni naevo immunes*; merito tamen reputantur insigne monumentum disciplinae Ecclesiae per priora secula," says M. Icard in his *Prælectiones Juris Canonici* at St. Sulpice (published with the approbation of the authorities of the Church) in 1862, and he then cites the Gelasian decree declaring them apocryphal.

Nevertheless great attention has been paid to them. Extracts were admitted by Gratian into the *Decretum*, and, in the words of Phillips ('*Du Droit ecclésiastique dans ses Sources*,' Paris, 1852) "*ils ont pris rang dans la législation canonique*."

But we must return to the 6th century. About fifty years after the work of Dionysius, John of Antioch, otherwise called Johannes Scholasticus, patriarch of Constantinople, set forth a *σύνταγμα κανόνων*, which contained not 50 but 85 Canons of the Apostles. And in the year 692 these were expressly recognized in the decrees of the Quinisextine Council, not only as binding canons, but (it would seem) as of apostolic origin.<sup>1</sup> They are therefore in force in the Greek Church.

How it came to pass that Dionysius translated only 50 does not appear. Some writers have supposed that he rejected what was not to be reconciled with the Roman practice.<sup>2</sup> But, as Hefele observes, this could hardly be his motive, inasmuch as he retains a canon as to the nullity of heretical baptism, which is at variance with the view of the Western Church. Hence it has been suggested that the MS. used by Dionysius was of a different class from that of John of Antioch (for they vary in some expressions, and have also a difference in the numbering of the canons), and that it may have had only the 50 translated by the former. And an inference has also been drawn that the 35 latter canons are of later date.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, according to some, they are obviously of a different type, and were possibly added to the collection at the same time

pro eo quod ab hæreticis sub nomine Apostolorum compositi dignoscuntur, quamvis in eisdem quaedam inveniantur utilia, auctoritate tamen canonica et apostolica eorum gesta constat esse remota et inter apocrypha deputata."

<sup>1</sup> Ἐδοξε καὶ τοῦτο τῇ ἁγίᾳ ταύτῃ συνόδῳ κάλλιστά τε καὶ σπουδαιότατα, ὥστε μένειν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν βεβαίους καὶ ἀσφαλεῖς πρὸς ψυχῶν θεραπείαν καὶ ἰατρειάν παθῶν τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἁγίων καὶ μακαρίων πατέρων δεχθέντας καὶ κυρωθέντας, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ παραδοθέντας ἡμῖν ὀνόματι τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐνδόξων ἀποστόλων ὁδογήσαντα πάντα κανόνας. Can. II., cited in Ullsen, Pref. p. ix.

Beveridge argues that the word ὀνόματι shews that, while their validity as canons of the Church was admitted, their apostolical origin was not decided. Contra Hefele, *Conciliengesch.* I. 768.

The additional 35 canons in the collection of Scholasticus have not been in any way recognized by the Church of Rome.

<sup>2</sup> As, for instance, De Marca; and see Ayliffe's *Parergon*, introd., p. iv.

<sup>3</sup> See on this subject, Hefele, l. 768. Scholasticus says there were previous collections containing 85.

that the canons were appended to the Constitutions.<sup>1</sup>

It is time to come to the Canons themselves. Both in the collection of John of Antioch and in that of Dionysius they are alleged to have been drawn up by Clement from the directions of the Apostles. In several places the Apostles speak in the first person,<sup>2</sup> and in the 85th canon Clement uses the first person singular of himself.

Their subjects are briefly as follow:—<sup>1</sup>

1 & 2 (I. & II.). Bishop to be ordained by two or three bishops; presbyters and deacons, and the rest of the clerical body by one.

3 & 4 (III.) relate to what is proper to be offered at the altar; mentioning new corn, grapes, and oil, and incense at the time of the holy oblation.

5 (IV.). First-fruits of other things are to be sent to the clergy at their home, not brought to the altar.

6 (V.). Bishop or presbyter or deacon not to put away his wife under pretence of piety.

7 (VI.). Clergy not to take secular cares on them.

8 (VII.). Nor to keep Easter before the vernal equinox, according to the Jewish system.

9 (VIII.). Nor to fail to communicate without some good reason.

10 (IX.). Laity not to be present at the reading of the Scriptures without remaining for prayer and the Communion.

11 (X.). None to join in prayer, even in a house, with an excommunicate person.

12 (XI.). Clergy not to join in prayer with a deposed man as if he were still a cleric.

13 (XII. & XIII.). Clergy or lay persons, being under excommunication or not admitted to Communion, going to another city not to be received without letters.

14 (XIV.). Bishop not to leave his own diocese and invade another, even on request, except for good reasons, as in case he can confer spiritual benefit; nor even then except by the judgment of many other bishops, and at pressing request.

15 (XV.). If clergy leave their own diocese, and take up their abode in another without consent of their own bishop, they are not to perform clerical functions there.

16 (XVI.). Bishop of such diocese not to treat them as clergy.

17 (XVII.). One twice married after baptism, or who has taken a concubine, not to be a cleric.

18 (XVIII.). One who has married a widow or divorced woman, or a courtesan or a slave, or an actress, not to be admitted into the clerical body.

<sup>1</sup> So Bickell, l. 86 and 235. For the Constitutions, see the next article.

<sup>2</sup> Beveridge however contends, from the variations and omissions in MSS. and versions, that the introduction of the first person is a mere interpolation of late date, in order to promote the fiction of apostolic origin (*Ind. Can.* in Cotel., vol. II. p. 73, Appendix). See instances in Canons XXIX., L., LXXXII., LXXXV. The various readings may be seen in Ullsen's edition, and in Lagarde's *Reliq. Jur. Eccles. Antiquiss.*

<sup>3</sup> The numbering varies. Thus Canon III. of the Greek text is divided into two by Dionysius. The Arabic numerals represent the order in Dionysius; the Roman that in the Greek of Johannes Scholasticus. Cotelierius, again, gives a different numbering, making the canons only 76 in all.



19 (XIX.). Nor one who has married two sisters or his niece.

20 (XX.). Clergy not to become sureties.

21 (XXI.). One who has been made a eunuch by violence, or in a persecution, or was so born, may be a bishop.

22 (XXII.). But if made so by his own act, cannot be cleric.

23 (XXIII.). A cleric making himself so, to be deposed.

24 (XXIV.). A layman making himself a eunuch to be shut out from Communion for three years.

25 & 26 (XXV.). Clerics guilty of incontinence, perjury, or theft, to be deposed, but not excommunicated (citing Nah. 1, 9 *οὐκ ἐκδικήσεις δὲς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*).

27 (XXVI.). None to marry after entering the clerical body, except readers and singers.

28 (XXVII.). Clergy not to strike offenders.

29 (XXVIII.). Clergy deposed not to presume to act, on pain of being wholly cut off from the Church.

30 (XXIX.). Bishop, &c. obtaining ordination by money to be deposed, and, together with him who ordained him, cut off from communion, as was Simon Magus by me, Peter.

31 (XXX.). Bishop obtaining a church by means of secular rulers to be deposed, &c.

32 (XXXI.). Presbyters not to set up a separate congregation and altar in contempt of his bishop, when the bishop is just and godly.

33 (XXXII.). Presbyter or deacon under sentence of his own bishop not to be received elsewhere.

34 (XXXIII.). Clergy from a distance not to be received without letters of commendation, nor unless they be preachers of godliness are they to have anything beyond the supply of their wants.

35 (XXXIV.). The bishops of every nation are to know who is chief among them, and to consider him their head, and do nothing without his judgment, except the affairs of their own dioceses, nor must he do anything without their judgment.

36 (XXXV.). Bishop not to ordain out of his diocese.

37 (XXXVI.). Clergy not to neglect to enter on the charge to which they are appointed, nor the people to refuse to receive them.

38 (XXXVII.). Synod of bishops to be held twice a year to settle controversies.

39 (XXXVIII.). Bishop to have care of all ecclesiastical affairs, but not to appropriate anything for his own family, except to grant them relief if in poverty.

40 (XXXIX. & XL.). Clergy to do nothing without bishop. Bishop to keep his own affairs separate from those of the Church, and to provide for his family out of his own property.

41 (XLI.). Bishop to have power over all ecclesiastical affairs, and to distribute through the presbyters and deacons, and to have a share himself if required.

42 (XLII.). Cleric not to play dice or take to drinking.

43 (XLIII.). Same as to subdeacon, reader, singer, or layman.

44 (XLIV.). Clergy not to take usury.

45 (XLV.). Clergy not to pray with heretics, still less to allow them to act as clergy.

46 (XLVI.). Clergy not to recognize heretical baptism or sacrifice.

47 (XLVII.). Clergy not to rebaptize one truly baptized, nor to omit to baptize one polluted by the ungodly,<sup>m</sup> otherwise he contemns the cross and death of the Lord, and does not distinguish true priests from false.

48 (XLVIII.). Layman who has put away his wife not to take another, nor to take a divorced woman.

49 (XLIX.). Baptism to be in name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, not of three eternal, or three sons, or three paracletes.

50 (L.). Baptism to be performed by three immersions, making one initiation—not one single immersion into the Lord's death.

LI. Clergy not to hold marriage or the use of meat and wine things evil in themselves, or to abstain on any other than ascetic grounds.

LII. Bishop or presbyter to receive, not to reject penitents.

LIII. Clergy not to refuse to partake of meat and wine on feast days [as if evil, or on other than ascetic grounds].

LIV. Clerics not to eat in taverns except on a journey.

LV. Clerics not to insult bishop.

LVI. Nor presbyter or deacon.

LVII. Nor to mock the maimed, deaf, dumb, blind, or lame, nor must a layman do so.

LVIII. Bishops and presbyters not to neglect their clergy or people.

LIX. Nor to refuse succour to the needy clergy.

LX. Nor to publish in the church as sacred works forged by the ungodly in false names.

LXI. Those convicted of incontinence or other forbidden practices not to be admitted into the clerical body.

LXII. Clerics from fear of Jew or Gentile or heretic denying Christ to be excommunicated, or if only denying that they are clerics, to be deposed. On repentance, to be admitted as laymen.

LXIII. Cleric eating blood, or things torn by beasts, or dying of themselves, to be deposed, on account of the prohibition in the law. Laymen doing so to be excommunicated.

LXIV. Cleric or layman entering synagogue of Jews or heretics to pray, to be deposed and excommunicated.

LXV. Cleric in a struggle striking a single blow that proves mortal to be deposed for his precipitancy. Laymen to be excommunicated.

LXVI. Neither cleric nor layman to fast on Sunday or on any Saturday but one.<sup>n</sup>

LXVII. Any one doing violence to an betrothed virgin to be excommunicated. He may not take another, but must keep her, though poor.

LXVIII. Clergy not to be ordained a second time, unless when ordained by heretics, for those baptized or ordained by heretics have not really been brought into the number of the faithful or of the clergy.

LXIX. Bishop, presbyter, deacon, reader, or singer, not fasting in the holy forty days, or on the fourth and sixth days, to be deposed, unless

<sup>m</sup> I. e. baptized by heretics. Heretical baptism is styled not an initiation, but a pollution. See *Apost. Const.* vi. 15.

<sup>n</sup> Name'y. that before Easter day. *Apost. Const.* v. 18 and 20.

suffering from bodily weakness. Laymen to be excommunicated.

LXX. None to keep fast or feast with the Jews, or receive their feast-gifts, as unleavened bread and so forth.

LXXI. No Christian to give oil for a heathen temple or Jewish synagogue, or to light lamps at their feast times.

LXXII. Nor to purloin wax or oil from the Church.

LXXIII. Nor to convert to his own use any consecrated gold or silver vessel or linen.

LXXIV. Bishop accused by credible men, to be summoned by the bishops; and if he appear and confess the charge, or be proved guilty, to have appropriate sentence; but if he do not obey the summons, then to be summoned a second and third time by two bishops personally; and if he still be contumacious, then the Synod is to make the fit decree against him, that he may not appear to gain anything by evading justice.

LXXV. No heretic, nor less than two witnesses, even of the faithful, to be received against a bishop (Deut. 19, 15).

LXXVI. Bishop not to ordain relatives bishops out of favour or affection.

LXXVII. One having an eye injured or lame may still be a bishop, if worthy.

LXXVIII. But not one deaf, dumb, or blind, as being practical hindrances.

LXXIX. One that has a devil not to be a cleric, nor even to pray with the faithful, but when cleansed he may, if worthy.

LXXX. A convert from the heathen or from a vicious life not forthwith to be made a bishop; for it is not right that while yet untried he should be a teacher of others, unless this come about in some way by the grace of God.\*

LXXXI. We declare that a bishop or presbyter is not to stoop to public [secular] offices, but to give himself to the wants of the Church (Matt. 6, 24).

LXXXII. We do not allow slaves to be chosen into the clerical body without consent of their masters, to the injury of those who possess them, for this would subvert households. But if a slave seem worthy of ordination, as did our Onesimus, and the masters consent and set him free, let him be ordained.

LXXXIII. Clergy not to serve in the army, and seek to hold both Roman command and priestly duties (Matt. 22, 21).

LXXXIV. Those who unjustly insult a king or ruler to be punished.

LXXXV. For you, both clergy and laity, let there be, as books to be revered and held holy, is the Old Testament—five of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy—of Jesus the son of Nun, one; of Judges, one; Ruth, one; of Kings, four; of Paraleipomena the book of days, two; of Esdras, two; of Esther, one; of Maccabees, three; of Job, one; of the Psalter, one; of Solomon, three—Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs; of the Prophets, thirteen; of Isaiah, one; of Jeremiah, one; of Ezekiel, one; of Daniel, one. Over and above is to be mentioned to you that your young men study the Wisdom of the learned Sirach. But of ours, that is of the New Testament, let there be four gospels, Matthew's,

Mark's, Luke's, John's; fourteen epistles of Paul; two epistles of Peter; three of John; one of James; one of Jude; two epistles of Clement; and the regulations addressed to you bishops through me, Clement, in eight books,<sup>p</sup> which it is not right to publish before all, on account of the mysteries in them; and the Acts of us, the Apostles.

The above is merely the substance of the canons in an abridged form. It will not of course supersede the necessity of referring to the original in order to form an exact judgment. For the sake of brevity the penalties have been in most cases omitted. They are usually deposition for the clergy, excommunication for laymen.

Turrianus attempted to maintain that these canons really are what they profess to be, the genuine work of the apostles. Daillé, on the other hand, contended that they were a production of the middle or end of the 5th century. Against him Bishop Beveridge entered the field; and in two treatises of great learning, acuteness, and vigour,<sup>q</sup> sought to show that though not the work of the apostles themselves, they were yet of great antiquity, being in substance the decrees of primitive Synods convened in different places and at different times during the latter part of the 2nd, or at latest the earlier part of the 3rd century. And he further thinks that during the 3rd century they were brought together and formed into a collection or Codex Canonum, which was recognized, and cited as of authority in the Church.<sup>r</sup>

Bishop Pearson also holds the canons in a collected form to have been in existence prior to the Council of Nice (*Vindic. Ignat.* part i. cap. iv. in Cotel., vol. ii., append. p. 295).<sup>s</sup>

It will be well to endeavour to give some samples of the evidence which Beveridge adduces to show that the canons are quoted at all events from the first part of the 4th century downwards.

George of Cappadocia buys the favour of the Praefect of Egypt, and is thrust into the bishopric of Alexandria. Athanasius thereupon says, τοῦτο τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς κανόνας παραλύσει (ad ubique orthod. c. 1, p. 945). The reference, it is alleged, is to Apost. Can. 30 (xxix.) and 31 (xxx.)

<sup>p</sup> Vix. the *Apost. Constitutions*. See next article

<sup>q</sup> 'Judicium de Canonibus Apostolicis,' to be found in Cotel. *Patres Apost.* vol. i. p. 432, edit. 1724; and 'Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Primitivae Illustratus, Ibid. vol. ii. Appendix, p. 1.

<sup>r</sup> 'Judic.' in Cotel. vol. i. pp. 436-441; and see *Cod. Can.* in Cotel. vol. ii. Appendix. pp. 8-10, et alibi. He appears to think that in many cases they may represent apostolical traditions. They were called "apostolical" from this feeling, and also because framed by apostolical men. He allows, however, that they were probably collected by divers persons, some of whom put together more, some fewer. Hence Dionysius found only 50 in the Codex from which he translated, while Scolasticus found 85. Hincmar of Rheims is cited by Beveridge as on his side; but it would seem that he looked on the Apostolical Canons as collections of apostolical traditions made by pious persons, rather than as decrees of synods. He speaks of them as "antequam episcopi concilia libere independent celebrare, a devotis quibusque collectae." See *Cod. Can.* in Cotel. vol. ii. App. p. 12.

<sup>s</sup> The question of the collection, however, stands on very different grounds from that of the antiquity of particular canons, and the two points should be kept separate in investigating the subject.

\* I. e. unless he be designated as such in some special way by the hand of God. Beveridge refers to the case of Ambrose.

Basil, in his letters to Amphilochius (which have themselves obtained the authority of Canons in the Greek Church) says a deposed deacon is not to be excommunicated, διότι ἀρχαῖος ἐστὶ κανὼν τοὺς ἀπὸ βαθμοῦ πεπτωκότας, τούτῳ μόνῳ τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς κολάσεως ὑποβάλλεσθαι. Reference alleged to be to Apost. Can. 25.<sup>1</sup>

Again he says, τοὺς διγάμους παντελῶς δὲ κανὼν τῆς ὑπηρεσίας ἀπέκλεισε. Comp. Can. 17.

Once more he says, the Church must δουλεύειν ἀκριβείᾳ κανόνων, and reject heretical baptism. See Apost. Can. 46.

The Council of Nice, Can. 1, while treating self-inflicted mutilation as a bar to orders, says:—ὅσπερ δὲ τοῦτο πρόδηλον, ὅτι περὶ τῶν ἐπιτηδευόντων τὸ πρᾶγμα καὶ τολμῶντων ἑαυτοὺς ἐκτέμνειν εἰρητὰς οὕτως εἰ τινες ὑπὸ βαρβάρων ἢ δεσποτῶν εὐνουχίσθησαν, εὐρίσκονται δὲ ἄλλως ἄξιοι. τοὺς τοιούτους εἰς κλῆρον προσίεται δὲ κανὼν. Reference alleged to Can. Apost. 21 and 22.

Again Can. 2 says, that things had lately been done παρὰ τὸν κανόνα τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικόν, to correct which it enacts that no neophyte is to be made a presbyter. The reference is alleged to be to Apost. Can. lxxx.

Can. 5 says:—κρατεῖται ἡ γνώμη κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τὸν διαγορεύοντα τοὺς ὑφ' ἐτέρων ἀποβληθέντας, ὑφ' ἐτέρων μὴ προσίεσθαι. Comp. Can. Apost. 13 (xii. and xiii.) and 33 (xxii.)

Again, Can. 9, concerning the ordination of known sinners, treats it as παρὰ κανόνα, and says, τούτους δὲ κανὼν οὐ προσίεται. See Can. Apost. lxi.

Can. 10, concerning such as are ordained in ignorance of their having lapsed, says:—τοῦτο οὐ προκρίνει τῷ κανόνι τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ γινωσκόντες γὰρ καθαιροῦνται. Bev. thinks the reference is to Can. Apost. lxii., and that the Council of Nice found it needful to extend the rule to those who had lapsed before ordination.

Can. 15 and 16 restrain the clergy from moving from city to city, a practice which it calls συνήθεια παρὰ τὸν κανόνα, and speaks of such persons as μήτε τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα εἰδότες. Comp. Can. Apost. 14 and 15.

The Synod of Gangra, held in the middle of the 4th century against the Eustathians, after passing several canons on matters more or less similar to those treated in some of the Apost. Canons, declares that its object has been to condemn those who bring in novelties,—παρὰ τὰς γραφὰς καὶ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς κανόνας.

The Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, speaks of a παλαῖος θεσμός, as well as the Nicene Canon, for bishops to ordain in the ἐπαρχία or ecclesiastical province to which they belong. Bev. finds in the mention of "provinces," a reference to the authority of Metropolitans, Can. Apost. 35 (xxxiv.).

Not long afterwards a synod at Carthage says:—ὁ ἀρχαῖος τύπος φυλαχθήσεται, ἵνα μὴ ἥττονες τριῶν τῶν ὀρισθέντων εἰς χειροτονίαν Ἐπισκόπων ἀρκέσωσιν. Comp. Can. Apost. i.

<sup>1</sup> Dailly, and his ally, "Observer" (who seems to have been M<sup>r</sup>. de la Roque) contend that the context shews that Basil cannot have meant to allude to the Apostolical Canons. Beveridge replies at length (Cod. Can. 38, 39). Bickell takes the same view as Dailly (Gesch. des Kirchenrechts, i. 83, note), but without noticing the arguments of Beveridge.

The Council of Ephesus, 431 A.D., sent three times to summon the accused bishop, Nestorius, to appear, saying, that it did so in obedience τῷ κανόνι, and afterwards informed the Emperor of the course taken,—τῶν κανόνων παρακαλενομένων τῇ τρίτῃ κλήσει παρακαλεῖσθαι τὸν ἀπειθοῦντα.

And in like manner at Chalcedon, 451 A.D., upon the third summons sent to Dioscorus, the bishops who were the bearers of it say that the Council sent them to him:—τρίτην ἤδη κλήσιν ταυτὴν ποιουμένη κατὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν ἁγίων κανόνων. Compare Can. Apost. lxxiv.

At Ephesus a complaint was made against the Bishop of Antioch for trying to subject to himself the island of Cyprus:—"Contrary to the Apostolic canons and the decrees of the most holy Nicene Synod." Comp. Can. Apost. 36 (xxxv.)

We may now perhaps pause in our extracts from Councils and Synods, as we are approaching a period about which there is less dispute: but we must go back to the Nicene times in order to cite one or two individual testimonies. Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, writes that Arius, though excommunicated there, was received by other bishops, which he blames,—τῷ μήτε τὸν Ἀποστολικὸν κανόνα τοῦτο συγχωρεῖν (apud Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. i. c. iv.). See Can. Apost. 13.

About the same time Eusebius, declining to be translated from Caesarea to Antioch, Constantine the Great writes to praise him for observing τὰς τε ἐντολὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὸν Ἀποστολικὸν κανόνα, καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας (Euseb. Vita Const. iii. 61). The reference is alleged to be to Can. Apost. 14, while ἐκκλησίας is said to allude to the 15th Canon of Nice.

Again, during the reign of Constantine, Pope Julius, writing of the deposition of Athanasius and the intrusion of Gregory into his see, declares it to have been done in violation of the Canons of the Apostles. See 2nd Apol. of Athanasius. The reference is asserted to be to Can. 36 (xxxv.) and lxxiv. (Gregory being an untried layman.)<sup>a</sup>

Once more, in a provincial synod at Constantinople, 394 A.D., it was determined that the deposition of a bishop must not be merely by two or three bishops,—ἀλλὰ πλείονος συνόδου ψήφῳ, καὶ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας, καθὼς καὶ οἱ Ἀποστολικοὶ κανόνες διορίσαντο. The allusion is said to be to Can. Apost. lxxiv.

Of late years not much has been done by English scholars in the way of original investigation into the subject, but German writers have given a good deal of attention to it during the present century, and have arrived at results widely different from those we have just been considering. Among these Von Drey and Bickell stand conspicuous. The former seems to consider that the first 50 canons were collected in the early part of the 5th century, partly out of decrees of post-Nicene Councils, partly out of the so-called apostolical constitutions; and that the other 35 were added subsequently, probably

<sup>a</sup> If this could be considered to be proved, it would settle the point that the Canons were known at Rome, and referred to by popes before Dionysius's version of them. And if the LXXIVth be really intended, it would show that more than 50 were then recognised.

at the beginning of the 6th century, when the whole 85 were appended to the constitutions.\*

Bickell while adopting a similar theory does not press it so far. He believes the collection to have been made out of like materials to those specified by Drey, but to be not later than the end of the 4th century; and holds that the apostolical canons were quoted at Chalcedon (instead of being in part derived from the decrees of that Council as Drey would maintain), and possibly also at Ephesus and Constantinople, 448 (*Gesch. des Kirchenrechts*, vol. i. p. 83; see also Hefele *Conciliengesch.*, vol. i. p. 771). Both Von Drey and Bickell agree in denying the position of Beveridge that the collection was made not later than the 3rd century, and was composed out of *bona fide* previous canons then existing. And they meet his citations by denying that *κανὼν*, *θεσμός* and such like words always imply what we call a canon, and by alleging that they are used in early times of any generally received rule in the Church. Thus *κανὼν ἀποστολικὸς* might either refer to some direction of the Apostles contained in the New Testament, or to some ecclesiastical practice supposed to have been originated by them, and to have their authority.

Thus Clem. Rom. speaks of *τὸν ὀρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα* (*Ep.* i. 41), and it is not to be supposed that he can here allude to any synodical decree. Comp. Iren. *Ad. Hær.* i. 9; Polycrates, apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 24; Clem. Al. *Strom.* i. 350, vi. 676, vii. 753, 756, 764 (see also the instances in De Lagarde *Rel. Jur. Eccl. Ant.* pref. p. vi.). Accordingly Bickell would thus interpret (as Daille had done before him) the use of the words *κανὼν* and *κανονικὸς νόμος*, in canon 15 of Neocaesarea, and in canons 13, 15, 18, of Nice. So also Cornelius *Ad Fabianum*

\* The following table gives what he supposes to be the original of the various Canons:—

I., II., VI., VII., XVII., XVIII., XX., XXVI., XXXIII., XLVI., XLVII., XLIX., LI., LII., LIII., LX., LXIV., are all taken from the Apostolical Constitutions; the first six books of which he considers as of latter half of 3rd century.

LXXIX. is from the 8th book, which is later, but before the year 325.

XXI.-XXIV., and LXXX., are taken from the Nicene Decrees.

VIII.-XVI., and XXVIII., and XXXI.-XLI., from those of Antioch.

XLV., LXX., LXXI., from those of Laodicea.

LXXV. from those of Constantinople, A.D. 381.

XXVII. from those of Constantinople, A.D. 394.

XXIX., LXVII., LXXIV., LXXXI., LXXXIII., from those of Chalcedon.

LIX. from Neocaesarea.

XXV. from a canonical letter of Basil.

LXIX. and LXX., out of the supposed Epistle of Ignatius, *Ad Philadelph.*

About a third of the Canons Drey treats as of unknown origin. The subject matter of many of them he considers may be more ancient, but not in the form of canons.

As to the distinction said to be apparent between the first 50 Canons and the residue, see Bickell, i. 86 and 236.

For an examination of these instances from a contrary point of view, see Beveridge (*Cod. Can. lib. i. cap. xi.*). But the reader should notice that in Nic. Can. 18, he incorrectly translates *ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι κανὼν οὐτὶ ἐ συνήθεια* *supra* by "nec canonem nec consuetudinem esse," and neglects the words *κατὰ κανόνα καὶ κατὰ ράβδον* at the end of the Canon. He understands the Canon of Neocaesarea, that there must be seven deacons, *κατὰ τὸν κανόνα*, to allude to Acts vi. (the written law of Scrip-

(Euseb. vi. 43) *κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας κανόνα*, and Firmilian *Ad Cyprian.* (ep. 75) and Conc. Arlat. canon 13, "ecclesiastica regula," and comp. Euseb. vi. 24. Bickell also thus interprets the letter of Alexander to Meletius, and that of Constantine, which as we have seen (*ante*, p. 114) Beveridge takes as allusions to the apostolical canons.

In short Von Drey and Bickell maintain that the instances brought forward by Beveridge are not really proofs that the set of canons called apostolical are there quoted or referred to, but rather that allusion is made to broad and generally acknowledged principles of ecclesiastical action and practice, whether written or unwritten (see Bickell, i. p. 2, and p. 81, 82, and the notes).<sup>2</sup> But they go further and proceed to adduce on their side what they consider to be a positive and decisive argument. Many canons of the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, correspond not only in subject but to a very remarkable degree in actual phraseology with the apostolical canons. Yet they never quote them, at least *eo nomine*.

The following table gives the parallel cases:—

Antioch I. compared with Can. Apost. VII.

II.	..	..	..	{ VIII., IX., X.,
III.	..	..	..	XI., XII., XIII.
IV.	..	..	..	XV., XVI.
V.	..	..	..	XXVIII.
VI.	..	..	..	XXXI.
VII.	..	..	..	XXXII.
VIII.	..	..	..	XXXIII.
IX.	..	..	..	XXXIV.
XIII.	..	..	..	XXXV.
XVII., } XVIII. }	..	..	..	XXXVI.
XX.	..	..	..	XXXVII.
XXI.	..	..	..	XIV.
XXII.	..	..	..	XXXV.
XXIII.	..	..	..	LXXVI.
XXIV.	..	..	..	XL.
XXV.	..	..	..	XLI.

On this state of facts Von Drey and Bickell maintain that the apostolical canons are obviously borrowed from those of Antioch, while Beveridge argues that the converse is the case. The argument turns too much on a close comparison of phrases, and of the respective omissions, additions, and modifications, to admit of being presented in an abridged form. It will be found on one side to some extent in Bickell, vol. i. p. 79, *et seq.*, and p. 230, *et seq.* (who gives

ture). Some might possibly contend that the words of the Epistle of Alexander (*supra*, p. 114) refer to 2nd Epist. John 10. He also deals with a Canon of Ancyra (Can. 21), which mentions that *ὁ πρότερος ὅρος* refused communion, except on the death-bed, to unchaste women guilty of abortion. This Beveridge argues does not mean a "Canon" at all, but rather a decision of Church discipline. Hefele, on the other hand, thinks it alludes to a Canon of Elvira, refusing the sacrament to such even at death (*Conciliengesch.* i. 208).

<sup>2</sup> To a certain extent, Beveridge discusses this theory when put forward by "Observator" (see *Cod. Can. lib. i. c. 11, p. 44*), and appears to contend that *κανὼν* is not used for unwritten law, at all events by Councils in their decrees. There certainly seems some apparent distinction drawn in Nic. Can. 18, *οὐτὶ ἐ κανὼν οὐτὶ ἐ συνήθεια* *supra*.

<sup>3</sup> It will be observed that all the Apostolical Canons except one, for which parallels are here found in the Antioch decrees, fall within the first 50: and the parallel to the LXXVth Canon is very far-fetched.



the references to the corresponding parts of Von Drey's work); and on the other, in Beveridge's *Codex Canonum*, lib. i. cap. iv. and cap. xi., and elsewhere in that treatise.<sup>b</sup>

As a general rule the apostolical canons are shorter, the Antioch canons fuller and more express: a circumstance which leads Bickell to see in the former a compendium or abridgment of the latter, but which, according to Beveridge, proves the former to be the brief originals, of which the latter are the subsequent expansion.

Beveridge observes with some force that though the apostolical canons are not quoted by name, the canons of Antioch repeatedly profess to be in accordance with previous ecclesiastical rules, whereas the apostolical canons never mention any rules previously existing.<sup>c</sup> Still the same question must arise here as in relation to the canons of Nice, viz., whether the allusion really is to pre-existing canons of councils, or whether the terms used are to be otherwise explained. And as regards the silence of the apostolical canons as to anything older than themselves, it must be recollected that any other course would have been self-contradictory. They could not pretend to be apostolic and yet rely on older authorities. Hence even had such references been found in the materials of which they were composed, these must have been struck out when they were put together in their present shape.

The synod of Antioch lying under the reproach of Arianism, it may seem improbable that any decrees should have been borrowed from it. To meet this objection Bickell urges that though the Antioch clergy were Arian, the Bishop Meletius was not un-orthodox, and was much respected by the Catholics. And he throws out the theory that the apostolical canons, which shew traces of Syrian phraseology, may be a sort of corpus canonum made at that period in Syria, and drawn up in part from the Antioch decrees, in part from the apostolical constitutions (which shew like marks of Syrian origin), and in part from other sources.<sup>d</sup> This work, it is conjectured, Meletius brought with him when he came to the Council of Constantinople (where he died) in 381 A.D., and introduced it to the favourable notice of the clergy: a hypothesis which is thought to account for the apostolical canons being cited (as Bickell thinks for the first time) at the Provincial Synod of Constantinople, A.D. 394.

The opinion of Hefele may be worth stating. He thinks that though there is a good deal to be said for the theory that many of the apostolical canons were borrowed from those of Antioch,

<sup>b</sup> The suggestion is there made that the Council studiously re-enacted certain orthodox canons, in order to gain a good reputation, while they thrust in here and there a canon of their own so framed as to tell against Athanasius and the Catholics. See *Cod. Can.* lib. i. cap. iv. *ad fin.*

<sup>c</sup> However, it is to be observed that the 37-39 Canons of Laodicea, which closely resemble the LXX. and LXXI. Apostolical Canons, do not in any way refer to them, though on Beveridge's theory the Apost. Canons must have been in the hands of the Fathers of Laodicea.

<sup>d</sup> In Can. XXXVII. the Syro-Macedonian name of a month, *Hyperberetæus*, occurs in connexion with the time for the autumnal synod. Similar names of months occur in *Ap. Const.* v. 17, 20, and at viii. 10. Evadius, Bishop of Antioch, is prayed for as "our bishop."

the converse is quite possible, and the point by no means settled. In regard to the Council of Nice, it would appear, he thinks, that it refers to older canons on the like subjects with those which it was enacting. And it is by no means impossible that the allusion may be to those which are now found among the apostolic canons, and which might have existed in the Church before they were incorporated in that collection. This view he thinks is supported by a letter from certain Egyptian bishops to Meletius at the commencement of the 4th century,<sup>e</sup> in which they complain of his having ordained beyond the limits of his diocese, which they allege is contrary to "mos divinus" and to "regula ecclesiastica;" and remind him that it is the "lex patrum et propatrum. . . in alienis paroeciis non licere alicui episcoporum ordinationes celebrare." The inference, Hefele thinks, is almost irresistible that this refers to what is now the 36th (xxxv.) Apostolical Canon. And at all events he appears to hold with Bickell that the apostolical canons are referred to at Ephesus, Constantinople (A.D. 448), and Chalcedon. But such a view falls short of that of Beveridge.

Coming to the internal evidence, we find great stress to have been laid by Daillé, Von Drey, Bickell, and others on the contents of the canons, as distinctly marking their late date. Thus the 8th (vii.) (as to Easter) is in harmony with the present interpolated text of the apostolical constitutions, but is at variance with what Epiphanius read there, and with the Syriac didascalia (see *infra*, pp. 122, 123). It relates to the settlement of a particular phase of the Easter controversy which did not, according to Hefele, spring up until the 3rd century (*Conciliengesch.* i. 303 and 776).<sup>f</sup> Moreover, if known and recognized previous to the Council of Nice, it seems extraordinary that this canon should not have been mentioned in Constantine's famous letter to the Nicene Fathers on the Easter Controversy (*Euseb. Vita Const.* iii. 18-20).

Canon 27 (xxvi.) hardly savours of a very early time. On this canon Beveridge (*Annot. in Can. Apost., sub Canone xxvi.*) cites the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), as saying that in many provinces it was permitted to readers and singers to marry; and understands it of those provinces in which the apostolical canons had been put in force, they having been, he says, originally passed in different localities by provincial synods. (See also his *Jud. de Can. Apost.* § xii. in *Cotel.* vol. i. p. 436.) This seems to derogate somewhat from the general reception which he elsewhere appears disposed to claim for them. So limited an operation even in the 5th century is scarcely what was to be expected if the whole collection had been made, and promulgated a century and a half before.

The 31st (xxx.), the lxxxi., and lxxxiii., all appear to speak of a time when the empire was Christian (see Hefele, vol. i. p. 783, 789; Bickell, i. 80.).<sup>g</sup>

<sup>e</sup> Given in Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* vol. iii. pp. 381, 382.

<sup>f</sup> If Hefele's view on this subject be accepted, Beveridge must be held to have confused the special point here ruled with other questions in dispute in the Easter controversy (*Cod. Can.* lib. 2, c. iii.).

<sup>g</sup> Von Drey, however, points out that it is difficult to suppose a council under the empire would set itself so openly against the emperor's interference. If so, some



The 35th (xxxiv.), recognizing a kind of metropolitan authority, has also been much insisted on by Von Drey and Bickell, as well as by Daille, in proof of an origin not earlier than the 4th century (see contra, *Rev. Cod. Can.* lib. 2, cap. v.).<sup>b</sup>

The 46th suggests the remark that if it were in existence at the time of Cyprian, it would surely have been cited in the controversy as to heretical baptism. It agrees with the doctrine of the apostolical constitutions vi. 15, and according to some has probably been taken thence. Beveridge indeed observes that Cyprian (*Epist.* to Jubajanus) does rely on the decree of a synod held under the presidency of Agrippinus (see *Jud. de Can. Ap.* § xi. and *Cod. Can.* lib. 3, cap. xii.). This decree he seems to think may be the original of canon 46. If so, however, it would seem to shew the local and partial character of the apostolical canons, for we know that the Roman Church held at this very time a contrary view (Comp. the admissions of Bev. in *Jud. de Can.* § xii.).

Again, other orders besides bishop, priest, and deacon appear in the clerical body. We have subdeacons, readers, and singers (canon 43).<sup>1</sup> Though the second of these is found in Tertullian, the first and last are not to be traced further back than the middle of the third century.

Not to mention other instances, it may in conclusion be observed that much contest has taken place over the list of canonical books in the last canon, and as to the reference therein to the constitutions. Beveridge thinks that the variation in that list from the canon of Scripture as eventually settled, is a proof that it was drawn up at an early date and before the final settlement was made. But at the same time he (somewhat inconsistently) is inclined to take refuge in the theory that this last canon has been interpolated. Here again it would be vain to attempt an abridgement of the argument (see *Cod. Canon.* lib. 2, c. ix. and *Jud. de Can. Apost.* § xvi. et seq.)

Before concluding, the opinions of one or two other writers must be mentioned. Krabbe thinks that at the end of the 4th or early in the 5th century, a writer of Arian or Macedonian tendencies drew up both the 8th book of the constitutions and the collection of canons, the former being composed out of precepts then in circulation under the Apostles' names, with many additions of his own, the latter out of canons made in different places during the 2nd and 3rd centuries, with

support might be hence gained for the theory that these canons (in the present form, at all events) did not really emanate from any council.

<sup>b</sup> Beveridge observes that the Apostolical Canon merely speaks of τὸν πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπον, whereas the corresponding Canon of Antioch has τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει πρεσβύτερον ἐπίσκοπον; the latter being in conformity with the name metropolitan. This name did not arise till the 4th century; and he therefore thinks the Apostolical Canon is proved to be the older of the two, and to be before that era. Moreover the Canon of Antioch professes its enactment to be κατὰ τὸν ἀρχαιότερον κρατίσαντα ἐκ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν κανόνα. It may be worth observing that there is no trace of a primacy among bishops in the Apostolical Constitutions, even in their present state.

<sup>1</sup> Sometimes we find only a general expression, as in Can. 9 (viii.), which runs εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος ἢ ἐκ τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ; the latter words comprehending the other orders, and being apparently strictly equivalent to the phrase ἡ ὅλως τοῦ καταλόγου τῶν κληρικῶν in Can. 15.

the interpolation of the 7th and 85th canons forged by himself (see Ültzen, p. xvi. pref.).

Bunsen attaches much importance to the apostolical canons. He regards them as belonging to a class of ordinances which were "the local coutumes of the apostolical Church," i. e. if not of the Johannean age, at all events of that immediately succeeding. Yet such "never formed any real code of law, much less were they the decrees of synods or councils. Their collections nowhere had the force of law. Every ancient and great church presented modifications of the outlines and traditions here put together; but the constitutions and practices of all churches were built upon this groundwork" (*Christ. and Mankind*, vol. ii. 421). Our apostolical canons served this purpose in the Greek Church. The fiction which attributes them to the Apostles is probably ante-Nicene (vol. vii. p. 373); but they are now in an interpolated state.

Internal evidence shews, he thinks, that the original collection consisted of three chapters:—

I. On ordination.

II. On the oblation and communion.

III. On acts which deprive of official rights or offices.

These comprise, with some exceptions, rather more than a third of the whole. To these, he says, were appended, but at an early date—

IV. On the rights and duties of the bishop; and subsequently when the collection thus extended had been formed—

V. Other grounds of deprivation.

Canons 6 (v.), 27 (xxvi.), he considers from internal evidence to be interpolations. Relying on the fact that the Coptic version (to which he attaches much weight, calling it "The Apostolical Constitutions of Alexandria") omits canons xlvii., xlviii., xlix., l., he treats these also as of later date. Canon 35 (xxxiv.) he appears to consider as a genuine early form of what subsequently became the system of metropolitan authority.

Coming then to what he styles "The Second Collection, which is not recognized by the Roman Church," i. e. to the canons not translated by Dionysius, he says they "bear a more decided character of a law book for the internal discipline of the clergy, with penal enactments."

Canon lxxxi. is a repetition and confirmation of one in the first collection, viz., xx. compared with 31 (xxx.). This and canons lxxxiii., lxxxiv., are post-Nicene. The canon of Scripture also is spurious, as contradicting in many points the authentic traditions and assumptions of the early Church. It is wanting in the oldest MS., the Codex Barberinus (*Christianity and Mankind*, vol. ii. p. 227).

Ültzen, though modestly declining to express a positive judgment, evidently leans to the view of Bickell that the Antiochene decrees were the foundation of many of the canons, and regrets that Bunsen should have brought up again the theory of Beveridge, which, he considers, "recentiores omnes hujus rei judices refutaverant" (Pref. p. xvi. note. and p. xxi.).

There are Oriental versions of the apostolical canons. As Bunsen has observed, the Coptic and Aethiopic (the former being a very late but faithful translation from an old Sahidic version, see Tattam's Edition, 1848) omit certain of the canons relating to heretical baptism. Except in

this and in Can. lxxiv. they do not differ in any important degree.<sup>1</sup> Some account of these versions, and also of the Syriac, may be seen in Bickell, vol. i. append. iv. He considers even the last-named to be later than our Greek text, and that little assistance is to be derived from them (see p. 215); others, however, as Bunsen, rate them highly. The subject deserves further inquiry.

To attempt to decide, or even to sum up so large a controversy, and one on which scholars have differed so widely, would savour of presumption. It must suffice to indicate a few points on which the decision seems principally to turn. The first question is, Can we come to Beveridge's conclusion that a *corpus canonum* corresponding to our present collection, and possessing a generally recognised authority, really existed in the 3rd century? If so, much weight would deservedly belong to it.

But if an impartial view of Beveridge's arguments should be thought to lead merely to the conclusion, that a number of canons substantially agreeing with certain of those now in our collection, are quoted in the 4th century, and presumably existed some considerable time previously, we find ourselves in a different position.

In this case the contents of our present collection may possibly be nothing more than decrees of synods held at different and unknown times,<sup>2</sup> and in different and uncertain places, not necessarily agreeing with each other, and not necessarily acknowledged by the Church at large, at all events till a later period.<sup>3</sup>

Again, if our present collection as a whole be not shown to be of the 3rd century, the question at once arises when and how it was made, and whether any modification or interpolation took place in the component materials when they were so collected together.<sup>4</sup>

If it be to be looked upon as a digest of pre-existing canons brought together from various sources, it is necessary to consider how far the fact that any particular canon is authenticated

by being cited at Nice or elsewhere, in any degree authenticates any other canon not so cited. For unless some bond of connexion can be shown, two canons standing in juxtaposition, may be of quite different age and origin.

These considerations have been principally framed with reference to the arguments of Beveridge. Of course if the views of Von Drey be adopted, any importance to be attached to the canons is materially diminished. Up to a certain point Beveridge certainly argues not only with ingenuity but force, and his reasoning does not seem to have received its fair share of attention from Von Drey and Bickell.<sup>5</sup> Still, after allowing all just weight to what he advances, a careful consideration of the points just suggested, may perhaps tend to show that it is not difficult to see why controversialists of modern times have not ventured to lay much stress on the apostolical canons.

But there is another reason for this. No Western church can consistently proclaim their authority as they now stand. Protestant churches will hardly agree, for instance, to the rule that one who was ordained summarily, may not afterwards marry, nor will they recognise the *Mancubus* as a canonical book; while the canons which require a trine immersion in baptism, and the repetition of baptism when performed by heretics, will not be accepted by either Protestant or Roman Catholic.<sup>6</sup>

It may be proper to add that the canons here discussed are not the only series extant which claim apostolical authority.

Thus, for instance, besides the *Αποστόλοι τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων ἐπὶ χειροτονίᾳ*, *ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησίων* and *Αἱ διατάξεις αἱ ἐκ ἐκκλησίων καὶ συνόδων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων* (both of which will be treated of in connexion with the Apost. Constitutions), we have certain pretended canons of an apostolic council at Antioch (the title being *τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν Πατέρων ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῶν ἀποστόλων συνόδου*, *τοῦ ἐστὶν ἐκ τῶν συνόδων αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν μετὰ τὸν θεὸν ἀποστόλων οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἀσσυρίου ἐκκλησίας*). They are in Bickell, i. 138, and Lagarde, *Reliq. Juris Eccles.* p. 18.

We also find another set of apostolic canons (*ἅπας ἀποστολὴ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων*) also published by Bickell, i. 133, and Lagarde, p. 36 (and of which the latter critic says that it is "*secundum theologicis actis consideratum*"); and yet again a curious series of alleged apostolic ordinances (many of which resemble parts of the apostolical constitutions), in three ancient Syriac MSS., one translated into Greek by Lagarde (*Rel. Jur. Eccles.* p. 89), and two into English, with notes, by Cureton, in 'Ancient Syriac Documents,

<sup>1</sup> In Can. LXXXV. the Oxyria omits Esther from the O. T. and puts Judith and Tobit in place of Manasse, and after mentioning the 18 Prophets, it goes on: "Thou shalt let your young persons learn. And out of the Wisdom of Solomon and Esther, the three Books of Macchabeus, and the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, there is much instruction." In N. T. it adds the Apocryphes, between John and the Epistles of Clement, and says nothing whatever about the eight books of regulations. "The Acts" are merely mentioned by that name, and follow the Gospels in the list.

<sup>2</sup> Some may, no doubt, be of an early date (thus Von Drey admits the probable antiquity of Can. i. Can. 10 (in.), Can. 11 (x.), and others. See notes to the Canons in *Hefele's Conciliengeschichte*, vol. i. Append.; and comp. *Stolmitz*, vol. i. pp. 88, 81).

<sup>3</sup> Beveridge speaks of the Apostolical Canons as the work "not of one but of many synods, and thus held in divers places" (*Conf. Can. lib. i. cap. ii.*). He thinks that the name of the tenth *Hypothecarum* in Can. XXXVII. shows that Canon to be of Eastern origin; while he argues that the rule as to Esther in Can. VII. proves that Canon to belong to the Western Church, inasmuch as the rule in question does not agree with the *Origenian version* (*Anal. de Can. a. 13; and a. 37.*)

<sup>4</sup> As to additions of interpolations, see *Rev. J. de Can. ad Joann.* and *Conf. Can. in Cotel.* vol. ii. Append. pp. 10, 73, 114. Nor can it be forgotten that, in the only shape in which we know of their having been collected, they are introduced by the untraced pretext of being the words of the Apostles directed to Clement.

<sup>5</sup> Yet it is certainly remarkable that, when we first hear of these Canons, the question seems to be whether they are apostolic or apocryphal. The view that they are an authentic collection of pre-apostolic synodical decrees does not seem to have been suggested itself.

<sup>6</sup> Refined distinctions have indeed been drawn to qualify the apparent force of some of these Canons (see *Rev. Cotel. Can. in Cotel.* vol. ii. Append. p. 100, and p. 139), but the difficulty attending them has probably had no share in preventing their full recognition. Hefele speaks of the Canon on Heretical Baptism as contrary to the Roman rule. Can. LXXI. is also contrary to the discipline of Rome; but not being to the effect *it is held apocryphal*.

relating to the earliest establishment of Christianity in Edessa,\* &c., with preface by W. Wright, Lond. 1864. It appears that in Cod. Add. 14,173, fol. 37, in Brit. Mus. this document is quoted as "Canons of the Apostles."

It is not perhaps a wholly unreasonable hope that further researches into the ecclesiastical MSS. of Syria may be the means of throwing more light on the perplexing questions which surround alike the apostolic canons and the apostolic constitutions, both of them, in all probability, closely connected in their origin with that Church and country.<sup>1</sup>

*Authorities.*—*Constitutiones Magdeburg.* li. c. 7, p. 544, &c. Fr. Turrianus, *Pro Canon. Apost. et Epp. Decret. Pontif. Apost. Adversus Magd. Controv. Defensio* (Flor. 1573, Lutetiae 1573), lib. i. P. de Marca, *Conc. Secord.* iii. 2. J. Dailens, *De Pseudographia Apost.* lib. iii. Pearson's *Vindict. Agnat.* (in Cotelierus, *Patr. Apost.*, vol. ii. app. p. 251), part i. cap. 4. Matt. Larroquanne in *App. Obv. ad Paramonian Ignatii Vindict.* (Biblioth. 1674). Beveraggi *Judicium de Can. Apost.* (in Cotel., *Patr. Apost.*, edit. 1734, vol. i. p. 432). Beveraggi *Adnotationes ad Can. Apost.* (ibid. p. 455). *Codes Canonum Ecclesiarum Universalis Vindictus a Gal. Beveragio* (ibid. vol. ii. app. p. 1, and Oxford 1846.) Brunonis *Judicium de Auctore Canonum et Constitutionum Apostolicorum* (Cotel. vol. ii. app. p. 177). *Proleg. in Ignatium Ius. Usserii* (ibid. vol. ii. app. p. 199), see cap. vi. Ragenbrecht, *Dic. de Can. Ap. et Cod. Eccl. Hap.*, Ratib. 1828. Krabbe, *De Cod. Can. qui Apost. dicuntur*, Ekt. 1829. Von Drey, *Neue Untersuchung über die Entstehung und Kammen der Apost.*, Tübingen 1832. Birkell, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, Gießen 1843, vol. i. Heftle, *Concordien-Geschichte*, Freiburg 1855, vol. i. append. Bunsen, *Christianity and Mammon*, Lond. u 1854. Oltsen, *Constitutiones Apost.*, Suerini 1853, preface § 2. De Lagarde, *Reliquies Juris Ecclesiastici Antiquissimas*, 1854. [B. &.]

**APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.** The apostolical constitutions consist of eight books. Their general scope is the discussion and regulation (not in the way of concise rules, but in diffuse and hortatory language) of ecclesiastical affairs. In some places they enter upon the private behaviour proper for Christians; in other parts, in connexion with the services of the Church, they furnish liturgical forms of considerable length.<sup>2</sup> A large share of the whole is taken up with the subjects of the sacraments, and of the powers and duties of the clergy.

At the end of the eighth book, as now commonly edited, are to be found the apostolical canons. These we have already treated of in the previous article.

The constitutions, extant in MSS. in various libraries,<sup>3</sup> appear during the middle ages to have been practically unknown. When in 1546,

Carolus Capellus, a Venetian, printed an edition of them in Latin translated from a MS. found in Crete, Bishop Jewell spoke of it as a work "in these countries never heard of nor seen before." (*Park. Soc., Jew.*, l. 111.) in 1563 Bevinus published a complete Latin version, and in the same year Turrianus edited the Greek text. It is not expedient here to pursue at any length the question of subsequent editions, but it may be as well to mention the standard one of Cotelierus in the *Patres Apostolici* and the useful and portable modern one of Oltsen (Suerin, 1853). There is also one by Lagarde, Lipsia, 1862.

The constitutions profess on the face of them to be the words of the Apostles themselves written down by the hand of Clement of Rome.

Book 1 prescribes in great detail the manners and habits of the faithful laity.

Book 2 is concerned chiefly with the duties of the episcopal office, and with assemblies for divine worship.

Book 3 relates partly to widows, partly to the clergy, and to the administration of baptism.

Book 4 treats of sustentation of the poor, of domestic life, and of virgins.

Book 5 has mainly to do with the subjects of martyrs and martyrdom, and with the rules for fasts and feasts.

Book 6 speaks of excommunication and heretics, and enters upon the question of the Jewish law, and of the apostolic discipline substituted for it, and refers incidentally to certain customs and traditions both Jewish and Gentile.

Book 7 describes the two paths, the one of life, the other of spiritual death, and follows out this idea into several points of daily Christian life. Then follow rules for the teaching and baptism of catechumens, and liturgical precedents of prayer and praise, together with a list of bishops said to have been appointed by the Apostles themselves.

Book 8 discusses the diversity of spiritual gifts, and gives the forms of public prayer and administration of the communion, the election and ordinations of bishops, and other orders in the Church, and adds various ecclesiastical regulations.

This enumeration of the contents of the books is by no means exhaustive—the style being diffuse, and many other matters being incidentally touched upon—but is merely intended to give the reader some general notion of the nature of the work.

From the time when they were brought again to light down to the present moment, great differences of opinion have existed as to the date and authorship of the constitutions.

Turrianus and Bevinus held them to be a genuine apostolical work, and were followed in this opinion by some subsequent theologians, and notably by the learned and eccentric Whiston, who maintained that (with the exception of a few gross interpolations) they were a record of what our Saviour himself delivered to his Apostles in the forty days after his resurrection, and that they were committed to writing and were sent to the churches by two apostolic councils held at Jerusalem, A.D. 64 and A.D. 67, and by a third held soon after the destruction of the city.

On the other hand Baronius, Bellarmine and Petavius declined to attach weight to the Con-

\* Birkell, however, writes us that the fruits of such researches must be used with caution, on account of the artificial way in which various pieces are put together in these MSS. (vol. i. p. 317).

<sup>1</sup> These being especially in the question of liturgies, and will not therefore be considered at length here.

<sup>2</sup> An account of the MSS. is given in Usser's edition, and by Lagarde in Bunsen's *Christ. and Mam.*, vol. vi. p. 28.

stitutions, while Daillé and Blondel fiercely attacked their genuineness and authority.

Whiston's main argument was that the early Fathers constantly speak of διδασκαλία ἀποστολική, διατάξεις, διαταγαί, διατάγματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, κανὼν τῆς λειτουργίας, κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας, and so forth, which is true but he has not proved that these expressions are necessarily used of a definite book or books, and far less, that they relate to what we now have as the so-called Apostolical Constitutions.

It will be well to look at some of the chief of these passages from the Fathers.

We may begin with the words of Irenaeus in the fragment first printed by Pfaff in 1715. οἱ ταῖς δευτέραις τῶν ἀποστόλων διατάξεσι παρηκολουθηκότες ἴσασι τὸν κύριον νέαν προσφορὰν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ καθεστηκέναι κατὰ τὸ Μαλαχίου κ. τ. λ.

Professor Lightfoot is disposed to see here a reference to the apostolical constitutions, but does not recognise the Pfaffian fragments as genuine.\* (Lightfoot *On Epist. to Philippians*, London, 1868, pp. 201, 202.) But if the genuineness be admitted, the reference is surely in the highest degree vague and uncertain. There is no evidence that the ordinances spoken of (whatever they were) were to be found in any one particular book—still less is there anything to identify what is spoken of with the apostolical constitutions either as we now have them, or under any earlier and simpler form. Moreover, it appears singular that if the Constitutions were really what the writer was relying on, he should not quote some passage from them. Instead of this, he goes on to cite the Revelation, the Epistle to the Romans, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, almost as if these contained the διατάξεις in question. What is meant by the word δευτεραί it seems very difficult to say with certainty.

Origen speaking of fasting (in his 10th Homily on Leviticus) says, "Sed est et alia adhuc religiosa [jejunandi ratio], cujus laus quorundam apostolorum literis praedicatur. Invenimus enim in quodam libello ab apostolis dictum, Beatus est qui etiam jejunit prae eo ut alat pauperem. Hujus jejunium valde acceptum est apud Deum et revera digne satis: imitatur enim illum qui animam suam posuit pro fratribus suis."

The terms in which Origen introduces this citation do not seem very appropriate to such a work as the Constitutions, nor in point of fact do the words (which seem meant as an exact quotation) occur in it. There is indeed (Book v. 1) a general exhortation to fast in order to give the food to the saints, but the passage has a primary reference (at all events) to saints imprisoned on account of the faith. There is, therefore, a considerable divergence between the words in Origen and those in the Constitutions; and we are hardly justified in seeing any reference to the latter in the former.<sup>d</sup>

\* Hilgenfeld appears to take a like view, both as to the Apostolical Constitutions being intended, and as to the passage not being genuine. (*Nov. Test. extra Canon. recept.* Fascic. iv. pp. 83, 84.) Bunsen thinks the Fragment genuine, and that it refers to some early "Ordinances," not necessarily the same as we now have: *Christ. and Man.*, vol. ii. p. 398, et seq.

<sup>d</sup> Prima facie, too, "literae quorundam apostolorum" is not an apt designation of a work professing to represent the joint decrees of all.

A later treatise entitled 'De Aleatoribus,' of unknown date and authorship, erroneously ascribed to Cyprian, refers to a passage "in doctrinis apostolorum," relating to Church discipline upon offenders. Here again no effort has succeeded in tracing the words of the citation either in the constitutions or in any known work. There is, indeed, a passage of a similar effect (Book ii. c. 39), but the actual language is not the same; and a similarity of general tenor is not much to be relied upon, inasmuch as the subject in hand is a very common one.

We come now to Eusebius. In his list of books, after naming those generally allowed, and those which are ἀντιλεγόμενοι, he goes on,—“We must rank as spurious (νόθοι) the account of the ‘Acts of Paul,’ the book called ‘The Shepherd,’ and the ‘Revelation of Peter,’ and besides these, the epistle circulated under the name of ‘Barnabas,’ and what are called the ‘Teachings of the Apostles’ (τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ λεγόμεναι διδασκαί), and moreover, as I said, the ‘Apocalypse of John,’ if such an opinion seem correct, which some as I said reject, while others reckon it among the books generally received. We may add that some have reckoned in this division the Gospel according to the Hebrews, to which those Hebrews who have received [Jesus as] the Christ are especially attached. All these then will belong to the class of controverted books.” (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 25.)

The place here given to the διδασκαί (even supposing them to be the constitutions) is inconsistent with their being held a genuine work of the Apostles. It speaks of them, however, as forming a well-known book, and from the context of the passage, they seem to be recognised as orthodox; but there is nothing to identify them directly with our present collection.

Athanasius, among books not canonical, but directed to be read by proselytes for instruction in godliness, enumerates the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobias, and what he styles διδασχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων. The same remarks obviously apply to this Father as to Eusebius (*Op. S. Athan.* i. 963, Ed. Bened.).

The language of neither of them indicates that the work in question was looked upon as an authoritative collection of Church laws. Lagarde denies that either of them is to be considered as quoting any book of our constitutions, laying much stress on the distinction between διδασκαί and διατάξεις or διαταγαί ἀποστόλων. (Bunsen. *Christ. and Man.*, vol. vi. p. 41.) Bunsen, however, himself is inclined to see here a real reference to a primitive form of the constitutions. (*Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 405.)

We now come to Epiphanius, who, writing at the close of the 4th century, has numerous explicit references to the διάταξις of the Apostles, meaning thereby apparently some book of a similar kind to that which we now have. His view of its character and authority is to be found in the following passage:—

“For this purpose the Audiani themselves [a body of heretics] allege the Constitution of the Apostles, a work disputed indeed with the

\* In this work Lagarde writes under the name of Boetticher, which he has since changed for family reasons to Lagarde.

majority [of Christians] yet not worthy of rejection.<sup>1</sup> For all canonical order is contained therein, and no point of the faith is falsified, nor yet of the confession, nor yet of the administrative system and rule and faith of the Church." (*Haer.* 70, No. 10; comp. also *Ibid.* No. 11, 12; 75, No. 6; 80, No. 7.)

But when we examine his citations, we find that none of them agree exactly with our present text, while some of them vary from it so widely, that they can be connected with it only by the supposition that they were meant to be made ad sensum not ad literam. Even this resource fails in a famous passage, immediately following that just cited, where Epiphanius quotes the constitutions as directing Easter to be observed according to the Jewish reckoning,<sup>2</sup> whereas in our present copies they expressly enjoin the other system. (See Book v. 17.)

In a work known as the 'opus imperfectum in Matthaeum,' once ascribed to Chrysostom, but now considered to have been the production of an unknown writer in the 5th century, there is a distinct reference to "the 8th book of the apostolic canons." And words to the effect of those quoted are found in the second chapter. Another citation, however, in the same writer cannot be verified at all.

It is not necessary to pursue the list further. From this time forwards references are found which can be verified with more or less exactness, and in the year 692 the council of Constantinople, known as Quinisextum, or the Trullan council, had the work under their consideration, but came to a formal decision, refusing to acknowledge it as authoritative on account of the extent to which it had been interpolated by the heterodox.

It appears then that we must conclude that there is no sufficient evidence that the Church generally received as of undoubted authority any collection of constitutions professing to have come from the Apostles themselves, or at least to be a trustworthy primitive record of their decisions. Even Epiphanius bases his approbation of the work of which he speaks on subjective grounds. He refers to it, because he thinks it orthodox, but admits that it was not received as a binding authority. Yet had such a work existed, it should seem that from its practical character it must have been widely known, perpetually cited, and generally acted upon.

Indeed that the so-called apostolic constitutions, as they now stand, are not the production of the Apostles or of apostolical men, will be clear to most readers from their scheme and contents. "Apostles," says the author of an article on the subject in the 'Christian Remembrancer' in 1854, "are brought together who never could have been together in this life: St. James, the greater (after he was beheaded), is made to sit in council with St. Paul (Lib. vi. c. 14), though elsewhere he is spoken of as dead (Lib. v. c. 7). Thus assembled, they condemn heresies and heretics by name who did not arise till after

their death (Lib. vi. c. 8); they appoint the observance of the days of their death (Lib. viii. c. 33), nay, once they are even made to say 'These are the names of the bishops whom we ordained in our lifetime' (Lib. viii. c. 47)."

Most persons will also be of opinion that there is a tone about the constitutions themselves which is by no means in harmony with what we know of apostolic times. Thus for instance, the honour given to the episcopate is excessive and hyperbolical.

οὗτος [i. e. ὁ ἐπίσκοπος] ὑμῶν βασιλεὺς καὶ δυνάστης· οὗτος ὑμῶν ἐπιγέλος Θεὸς μετὰ Θεόν, ὃς ὀφείλει τῆς παρ' ὑμῶν τιμῆς ἀπολαβεῖν (citing Ps. lxxii. 6 and Exod. xxii.-xxviii. in LXX.). 'Ο γὰρ ἐπίσκοπος προκαθεζέσθω ὑμῶν ὡς Θεοῦ ἀξία τετιμημένος, ἥ κρατεῖ τοῦ κλήρου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ παντός ἄρχει (Book ii. 26; comp. also Book ii. 33).

And in Book vi. 2 we read:—

εἰ γὰρ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπεχειρόμενος κολάσεως ἄξιός, κἂν υἱὸς ᾖ, κἂν φίλος· πόσῃ μᾶλλον ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπανιστάμενος; 'Οσφ γὰρ ἱερωσύνη βασιλείας ἀμείνων, περὶ ψυχῆς ἔχουσα τὸν ἀγῶνα, τοσοῦτ' καὶ βαρυτέραν ἔχει τὴν τιμωρίαν ὁ ταύτῃ τολμήσας ἀποτομματοῦν, ἥπερ ὁ τῇ βασιλείᾳ.<sup>3</sup>

A system, too, of orders and classes in the Church stands out prominently, especially in the 8th book, of which there is no trace in the earliest days (see Bickell, vol. i. p. 62). Thus we have subdeacons, readers, &c., with minute directions for their appointment. Ceremonies also are multiplied. The use of oil and myrrh in baptism is enjoined (Book vii. 22), and the marriage of the clergy after ordination is forbidden (vi. 17).

We must therefore feel at once that we have passed into a different atmosphere from that of Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, and that the connection of Clement's name with the work must be a fiction, no less than the assertion that he wrote its contents at the mouth of the apostles. Even those who think that they trace something like the origin of such a system in the letters of Ignatius must allow that it is here represented in a state of development which must have required a considerable period of time to bring about.

The questions, however, still remain:—

To what date are we to assign the work in the form in which it now exists?

Can we show that it was in any degree formed out of pre-existing materials?

Bishop Pearson<sup>4</sup> and Archbishop Usher regard the variations between the citations of Epiphanius, and what we read in our present copies of the constitutions, as conclusive evidence that there have been alterations and interpolations on a large scale since the time of that Father, and the latter of these writers thinks that the same falsifier has been at work here, who expanded the shorter epistles of Ignatius into the so-called longer epistles.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Usher, in *Cotel. Patr. Apost.* vol. ii. p. 220, edit. 1724.

<sup>2</sup> *Vind. Ignat.* Part i. c. 4 prope fin. And see the opinion of Beveridge, *Cod. Can.* lib. 2, cap. ix.

<sup>3</sup> *Cotel. Patr. Ap.* vol. ii. Append. p. 228. Bickell has collected some instances of correspondence in phraseology between the Ignatian Epistles and the Constitutions as they stand, which the reader may refer to in order to examine the probability of the latter theory (*Gesch. des*

<sup>1</sup> Τῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων διάταξιν, οὕσαν μὲν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐν ἀμφιλέκτῃ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀδόκιμον.

<sup>2</sup> Ὅριζονσι γὰρ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ διατάξει οἱ ἀπόστολοι ὅτι. Ὑμεῖς μὴ ψηφίζετε, ἀλλὰ ποιεῖτε ὅταν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ὑμῶν οἱ ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς μετ' αὐτῶν ἅμα ποιεῖτε. And he adds: Παρὰ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις δὲ τὸ ῥητὸν δι' ὁμόνοιαν ἐπιφέρεται, ὡς ἐπιμαρτυροῦσι λέγοντες ὅτι. Κἂν τε πλανηθῶσι, μηδὲ ἰὼν μελέτω.



According to Pearson, we should probably attribute the work in its existing form to about the middle of the 5th century, while Usher refuses to place it higher than the 6th century. If, on the other hand, we could suppose that Epiphanius quoted loosely, and that the book which he had may, with occasional exceptions, have resembled in substance what we now have,<sup>k</sup> we should be able to put its antiquity somewhat higher. But whatever conclusion may be come to on this point, there is no satisfactory evidence to warrant its being assigned to any period sufficiently early to make it, as it stands, an authority as to apostolic usage.

But the question still remains. Can we trace its composition, and in any degree identify the materials out of which it has been put together?

That the work was a pure and simple forgery is improbable. Such was not the course which matters took in early days; nor would the measure of acceptance which it obtained be easily accounted for on this theory.

Moreover it contains passages which seem manifestly to belong to an early age. Thus in case of quarrels the Christian is recommended to seek reconciliation even at a loss to himself, *καὶ μὴ ἐρχέσθαι ἐπὶ κριτήριον ἐθνικόν* (book ii. c. 45)—words which at all events savour of a time before the empire was Christian. So again, the secular judges are said to be *ἐθνικοὶ καὶ οὐ γινώσκοντες θεότητα*. So also martyrdom and persecution on account of Christianity are spoken of as by no means exclusively belonging to the past (see Lib. 5, init. et alibi).

And to mention but one more point, the charge of Arianism, which was at one time freely brought against the constitutions, and used to prove that they had been corrupted, if not forged, by heretics,<sup>l</sup> has in later days been sometimes made the ground of an opposite inference. It is thought by some modern writers merely to show that the phrases excepted against date from a time before the controversy arose, and when therefore men spoke with less of dogmatic exactness.<sup>m</sup>

Perhaps it is possible to go even a step further, at all events, by way of not unreasonable conjecture. We have seen that Whiston relied on a number of places in which the early Fathers speak of *διδασκαί*, *διδασκαλαί*, *διατάξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων*, and some years before Whiston wrote, Bishop Pearson (in his *Vindiciae Ignatianae*) had suggested the idea that, so far as such expressions really referred to any specific works at all, they were to be understood of smaller, more ancient, and more fragmentary treatises, of a kind not rare in the Primitive Church, professing to contain the words of the apostles or of apostolical men on matters of doctrine and Church order. Some of these were the production of heretics, some were of an orthodox character. Those which related to doctrine were called *didascaliae*,

those which gave rules of ritual or discipline, *διατάξεις* or *Constitutiones*. These works, written at different times and in different parts of the Church, furnished (as Pearson supposes) the materials to the compiler, who, with many alterations and interpolations formed out of them our present constitutions (*Vindic. Ignat.*, Part i. c. 4).

Other critics have spoken in terms which seem rather to point to a gradual accretion, added to from time to time to express the Church system as developed, and modified at the periods when such additions were respectively made. Thus Lagarde says, "*Communis virorum doctorum fere omnium nunc invaluit opinio, eas [Constitutiones] saeculo tertio clam succrevisse et quum sex aliquando libris absolutae fuissent, septimo et octavo auctas esse postea*" (*Reliq. Juris Eccles. Antiq.* 1856).

That the work as we have it is a composite one is indeed manifest enough "from the general want of internal unity, method, or connexion; the difference of style in the various portions, and sometimes statements almost contradictory; the same topics being treated over and over again in different places; besides a formal conclusion of the end of the sixth book, and other indications of their being distinct works joined together" (*Christ. Remembr.* ubi supra).

In the Paris Library is a Syriac MS. called the *Didascalia* or Catholic doctrine of the 12 Apostles and holy disciples of our Saviour. It contains in a shorter form much of the substance of the first six books of the constitutions, but with very great omissions, and with some variations and transpositions.

Its contents were printed in Syriac by De Lagarde (without his name) in 1854; and the same critic, in the 6th vol. of Bunsen's *Christianity and Mankind*, has published, 1st, our present text, with what he states to be the variations of the Syriac; and 2nd, a shorter Greek text or '*Didascalia Purior*,' founded on the Syriac.<sup>n</sup>

Bickell, who, however, when he wrote had only seen extracts, thought this Syriac MS. a mere abridgement of the larger work, and therefore posterior in date to it, and adding little to our knowledge.

But Bunsen (*Christianity and Mankind*, vol. i. p. x.), Lagarde (*Rel. Jur. Eccl. Ant.* pref., p. iv.), and the author of the article in the *Christian Remembrancer* 1854, all agree that we have here an older and more primitive, if not the original work. Hilgenfeld says, "*Equidem et ipse Syriacam Didascaliam ad hujus operis primitivam formam propius accedere existimo, sed eandem nunquam mutata continere valde dubito.*"<sup>o</sup> He concludes, on the whole, "*tertio demum saeculo didascalia apostolica in eam fere formam redacta esse videtur, quam Eusebius et Athanasius noverrant, quam recensionem a nostris constitutionibus apostolicis valde diversam fuisse antiquissima decent testimonia, praecipue Epiphani.* Ea autem

*Kirchenrechts*, vol. 1. p. 58, note). Pearson takes a somewhat different view, *Vind. Ignat.* ubi supra.

<sup>k</sup> Comp. Bickell, i. pp. 57, 58, note. Epiphanius, however, never quotes from the 7th or 8th books, which on any theory are doubtless of later date.

<sup>l</sup> See for instance Le Clerc, in *Cotel. Patr. Apost.* vol. ii. App. p. 492, et seq.; and Bruno, *ibid.* p. 177, et seq. Indeed Photius and the Trullan Council had insinuated the same accusation (*Biblioth. Can.* 112, 113).

<sup>m</sup> See Bickell, p. 58, note, p. 61, and p. 69, note. Comp. Bull, *Def. Fid. Nic.* lib. 2, c. 3, § 6

<sup>n</sup> It does not seem, however, that this literally represents the Syriac. For one of the passages given by Hilgenfeld (see *infra*), which undoubtedly exists in the Syriac, is not to be found in the '*Didascalia Purior*.' It is much to be regretted that neither Lagarde nor any other Oriental scholar has published a literal translation of the Syriac text.

<sup>o</sup> His own view is that the Apostolical Constitutions sprang from an Ebionite source, allied to that which produced the Clementine Recognitions

etiam a Syriaca didascalia quamvis cognata saepius discedunt." He thinks that the Syriac appears not to be very consistent on the subject of the calculation of Easter. It seems, however (from the translations which he gives), that it contains a passage agreeing in substance with what Epiphanius quotes as to keeping Easter by the Jewish method (ante p. 121): "Ihr sollt aber beginnen dann, wenn eure Brüder aus dem Volk [Israel] das Pascha halten, weil, als unser Herr und Lehrer mit uns das Pascha ass, er nach dieser Stunde von Judas verrathen wurde. Und um dieselbe Zeit haben wir angefangen, bedrückt zu werden, weil er von uns genommen war. Nach der Zahl des Mondes, wie wir zählen nach der Zahl der gläubigen Hebräer, am zehnten im Monat, am Montag haben sich die Priester und Aeltesten des Volks versammelt" u. s. w., and subsequently — "Wie also der vierzehnte des Pascha fällt, so sollt ihr ihn halten. Denn nicht stimmt der Monat, und auch nicht der Tag in jedem Jahre mit dieser Zeit, sondern er ist verschieden."\*

This is worthy of serious attention, as an argument for the antiquity of this Syriac work.

It would seem that it must at all events be admitted that the original work from which the Syriac was taken consisted of six books only. The 7th and 8th books, as they now stand, formed no part of it.

The same is the case with an Aethiopic version translated by Mr. Platt. This also, though said to be very loose and of little value as a guide to the original text, is a witness to the fact that there were but six books when it was made. The like is true of the Arabic versions, of which some account was first given by Grabe, and of which two MSS. are in the Bodleian.†

Not only do these facts tend to isolate the first six books from the 7th and 8th; but the formal conclusion which occurs at the end of the 6th even in our present Greek, and the style of the contents itself, furnish internal evidence in the same direction.

It has therefore been contended that the kernel out of which, to a great extent, the first six books sprang was a shorter book called *διδασκαλία τῶν ἀποστόλων*, of which the Syriac version furnishes a fair idea, if not a really pure text.

And as none of Epiphanius's citations are made from the two last books, it is suggested that we may have here something like a key to the work as it was in his time, the 7th and 8th books having been added since.‡

Coming to the 7th book, we must notice that its first thirteen chapters or thereabouts exhibit a great similarity, both in matter and expression, to the first part of an ancient tract printed by Bickell from a Vienna MS., and entitled *Αἱ διατάξεις αἱ διὰ Κλημέντος καὶ κανόνες ἐκ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς*

*καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων*.<sup>§</sup> This tract professes to contain short and weighty utterances by the apostles (who are introduced as speaking successively) on Christian morals, and on the ministers of the Church.<sup>¶</sup> An Aethiopic version (for it is extant in Coptic, Aethiopic, and Arabic) calls it "canons of the apostles which they have made for the ordering of the Christian Church."<sup>||</sup> It is the piece which Bickell and others after him have called "Apostolische Kirchenordnung." It is assigned by him to the beginning of the 3rd century.<sup>\*\*</sup> The same date is given in the article on the subject in Herzog's *Encyclopädie*, where it is treated as a document independent of the constitutions. Bunsen, removing the dramatic form and presenting only the substance of the piece, considers it to be in fact a collection of rules of the Alexandrian Church. This view, however, is warmly disputed by the writer in the *Christian Remembrancer* (1854, p. 293), who contends that its whole garb, style, and language show that it was not an authoritative work, but was the production of a pious writer, who arrayed in a somewhat fictitious dress what he sought to inculcate. It is more remarkable for piety than knowledge; for though the number of twelve apostles is made out, it is by introducing Cephas as a distinct person from Peter, and by making him and Nathanael occupy the places of James the Less and of Matthias. St. Paul does not appear at all—a fact, perhaps, not without its bearing on conjectures as to its origin.

It should be observed that the language of the first part of this tract, and of the 7th Book of the Constitutions, coincides to a great extent with the latter part of the Epistle of Barnabas, leaving it doubtful whether it was taken thence or whether the transcribers of that epistle subsequently incorporated therewith a portion of this treatise. Borrowing and interpolation must, it would seem, have taken place on one hand or on the other, and, as in other cases, it is difficult to decide the question of originality.

Upon this state of facts the writer in the *Christ. Rem.* argues that this tract furnished materials for the first part of the 7th Book of the Constitutions. He also thinks that it is itself the work referred to by Eusebius and Athanasius under the name of *διδασχὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων*. We have seen already that the title in the Greek varies from that in the Aethiopic, and it is urged that (considering the subject) there seems no reason why it may not also be suitably designated 'Teaching of the Apostles.' Now in an old stichometry appended to Nicephorus' chronography,<sup>§</sup> but perhaps of earlier date than that work, the number of lines contained in certain works is given, and from this it would appear that the 'Doctrina Apostolorum' was

\* See Hilgenfeld, *Novum Test. extra Can. recept.* Fasciculus iv. p. 79, et seq. (Lipsiae, 1866.)

† There are in the Arabic five chapters not in the Greek.

‡ The fact that there is no Oriental version of the eight Greek books as a whole, has been relied on to shew that they had not been united together in one work up to the year 451, when the Egyptian, Aethiopic, and Syriac churches were severed from the communion of the Greeks and Latins (*Christ. Remembr.*, 1854, p. 278). The same authority is inclined to date the Didascaly in the latter part of the 3rd century.

§ Bickell, vol. i. App. I. It will also be found in Lagarde's *Rel. Juris Eccl. Ant.*, p. 74.

¶ It is the former of these points alone in which the likeness appears between this work and the 7th Book of the Constitutions.

|| See Bickell ubi supra; and i. p. 88.

\*\* It mentions only "Readers" in addition to the three orders of the ministry; and as Tertullian does the same (*De Praescr. Haer.*, c. 41), this is thought a ground for attributing it to his epoch (Bickell, vol. i. p. 92). See also Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra Can. rec.*, Fasciculus iv pp. 93, 94.

§ A production of the 9th century.

shorter than the Book of Clement, and that a book called the 'Teaching of Clement,' was as long as the Gospel of Luke. Hence, if the 'Doctrina' of this list be the same as that of Eusebius, it must have been a book very much shorter than our present constitution, and one not far differing in length from the tract of which we have been speaking; while the 'Teaching of Clement' (a larger work) may be a designation of the earlier form of our present first six books—in short, of the Didascalia. Rufinus, in a list otherwise very similar to those of Eusebius and Athanasius, omits the 'Teaching of the Apostles,' and inserts instead 'The two ways, or the Judgment of Peter.' Assuming that the 'Doctrina' is the tract we have been discussing, reasons are urged for supposing that it reappears here under a different title. We have already seen that the Greek and Aethiopic give it two different names, and its contents might perhaps render the designation in Rufinus not less appropriate. For St. John, who speaks first, is introduced as beginning his address with the words, "There are two ways, one of life and one of death;" and St. Peter intervenes repeatedly in the course of it, and at the close sums up the whole by an earnest exhortation to the brethren to keep the foregoing injunctions. Such is the hypothesis of the learned writer in the *Christ. Rev.*

Hilgenfeld, it may be mentioned, has independently arrived at a conclusion in part accordant with the above. He argues strongly that the treatise published by Bickell is that spoken of by Rufinus under the name of 'Duo viæ vel Judicium Petri,' but does not apparently identify it with the 'Doctrina Apostolorum' of Athanasius. He thinks the book was known in some form to Clement Alexandrianus, and agrees that great part of it passed into the 7th Book of the Constitutions (see Hilgenfeld's *Neumen Test. contra Canonem Hieronymum*, Lipsiae 1866; Fasciculus iv. p. 83).

We now come to the 8th Book. Extant in several Greek MSS. (one being at Oxford) are large portions of the matter of the earlier part of this book, not however connected together throughout, but appearing in two distinct and apparently separate pieces. The first of them is entitled 'Teaching of the Holy Apostles concerning gifts' (*χρησμός*), the second 'Regulations' (*διδασκαλία*) of the same Holy Apostles concerning ordination [given] through Hippolytus' (*ἐπὶ χριστοστέφῳ ἁγ. ἱεροστέφῳ*). The two together, as just observed, comprise a very large proportion of the 8th Book, but are not without some omissions and several variations from it. In that book as we have it, the two portions represented respectively by these separate treatises stand connected by a short chapter, containing nothing of importance, and seeming to serve only as a link.

Hence it has been suggested that we have in the treatise in question an older and purer form of the 8th Book, or rather the materials used in its composition. The 'Regulations' are also in existence in Coptic (indeed there are two Coptic forms differing from each other and from the Greek by additions and omissions and probably in age), in Syriac, Arabic, and Aethiopic, the text being in many cases a good deal modified.\*

Bunsen treated these as a collection of Alexandrian Church rules, and viewed the portions common to them and to the 8th Book of the Constitutions as in a great degree derived from a lost work of Hippolytus *ἐπὶ χριστοστέφῳ* (*Christ. and Man.*, vol. ii., p. 412).

On the other hand Bickell argues that the tracts in question are nothing more than extracts from the constitutions, more or less abridged and modified. He relies, for example, on the fact that in one of these treatises no less than in the text of our 8th Book, St. Paul (who is introduced as a speaker) is made to command Christian masters to be kind to their servants, "as we have also obtained in what has preceded, and have taught in our epistles." This he considers to be a clear reference to what has been before said in the constitutions on the same subject (Book vii. c. 13).

Lagarde expresses a similar view, and draws

mentioned *infra*, p. 126. See also *Christ. Revue*, p. 268, as to another Syriac MS. and comp. p. 283.

\* The inscription on the statue of Hippolytus at Rome mentions among his works *ἐπὶ χριστοστέφῳ διδασκαλίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ*. It is not clear whether the *ἐπὶ χριστοστέφῳ* was one treatise and *ἐκκλησίᾳ* another, or whether the whole is the title of one work. See Bickell, p. 68, note. As regards the *ἐπὶ χριστοστέφῳ*, Bunsen considers it to have been the subject of much interpolation, and regards its title in this respect to have been like that of the Constitutions themselves, the compilation of which he describes in words worth quoting in relation to the general subject: "Here we see the very origin of these Constitutions. Towards the end of the ante-Nicene period they made the old staple collections of canons and regulations into a book, by introducing different sets of 'constitutions,' by a literary composition either of their own making, or by transcribing or extracting a corresponding treatise of some ancient father. Thus the man who compiled our 7th book has, as everybody now knows, extracted two chapters of the ancient epistle which bears the name of Barnabas. The compiler of the 8th book, or a predecessor in this sort of compilation, has apparently done the same with the work of Hippolytus on the *Charismata*" (*Christianity and Antiquity*, vol. ii. c. 16). Elsewhere, in the same work, he expresses an opinion that the old collections of canons here spoken of were themselves made at a much earlier time—perhaps in the 2nd century—and express the practice of various great churches; and that the consciousness of apostolicity in that primitive age justified, or at least excused, the fiction by which they were attributed to Apostles,—a fiction which descended to us, and was only meant to express an undoubted fact, viz., the apostolicity of the injunctions as to their substance (vol. ii. c. 200). Assuming still a step higher, he believes that the materials employed in these old collections were of all but apostolic times. The oldest horizon to which we look back as reflected in them is perhaps the age immediately posterior to Clement of Rome, who himself represents the end of the Johannine age, or first century (see vol. ii. p. 407). To Bunsen's mind, full of faith in the power and tact of subjective criticism, this seems more than to the taste of theologians of the English school. He believed in the possibility of applying the critical magnet to draw forth the true fragments of steel from the mass in which to our eyes they seem so trustfully buried. He thus speaks of the subjective process by which he makes the first step upwards: "As soon as we get rid of all that belongs to the bad taste of the 3rd, some other interpolation, and all uncanonical moralising sentences, and generally everything manifestly re-written with literary pretension; and lastly, as soon as we expunge some interpolations of the 4th and 5th centuries, which are easily detectable, we find ourselves immediately in the midst of the 1st of the Church of the 2nd and 3rd centuries" (vol. ii. p. 408).

\* The Syriac and Coptic forms part of the collection

attention to the circumstance that in one part of the Munich MS. of the *περὶ χειροτονιῶν*, there is a note which expressly speaks of what follows as taken out of the apostolical constitutions.<sup>b</sup>

In conclusion, it may be remarked that all such researches as those we have been considering as to one piece being the basis or original of another, are beset with much difficulty, because certain statements or maxims often recur in several tracts which (in their present state at all events) are distinct from each other, though sometimes bearing similar names. Lagarde points out (*Rel. Jur. Eccl. Ant.*, preface p. xvii., and Bunsen's *Christianity and Mankind*, vol. vi. p. 38, 39) that there once was a Syriac collection in eight books equally professing to be the work of Clement, yet far from being identical with our present Greek constitutions, though here and there embracing similar pieces. Passages which Lagarde deems to be extracts from the 2nd and 3rd Books have been edited by him in Syriac from fragments found in the same Paris MS. (Sangerm. 38) which contains the Syriac *Didascalia*<sup>c</sup> (see his *Rel. Jur. Eccl. Ant. Syrian*. 1856). He has also translated them into Greek (see his *Rel. Jur. Eccl. Ant. Græce*, p. 80, and Pref. p. xvii.).<sup>d</sup> Then again, there is an Egyptian collection,<sup>e</sup> also in eight books, the relation of which to the abovementioned Syrian Octateuch is discussed by Lagarde (*Rel. Jur. Eccl. Ant.* preface, and Bunsen's *Christ. and Mankind*, vol. vi. p. 39).

We have thus endeavoured to present a sketch of some of the leading theories which have been put forward as to the apostolical constitutions. Did space permit it would not be difficult to add others. Krabbe appears to have thought that Eusebius, Athanasius, and Epiphanius knew the first seven books, and that they were composed in the East not long after the time of Cyprian (the seventh being a kind of appendix to the others), and probably by one author, whose object was to model the Church on a Levitical pattern, and who perhaps described not so much what existed as what he desired to see. At a later period (end of 4th or beginning of 5th century) the 8th Book was added, embracing divers precepts which were commonly supposed to be apostolical, together with much from the writer him-

self, probably an Arian or Macedonian. This second writer probably is responsible for many interpolations in the previous books.<sup>f</sup>

Von Drey again, who spent much labour on the subject, advocated the view that the treatises of four distinct writers are combined in our present work. The first six books, he thought, were written after the middle of the 3rd century, to teach practical religion, and were adapted for catechumens. The seventh is probably of the date of A.D. 300, and treats of the mysteries for the use of the faithful alone. The 8th Book is a kind of pontifical of some Eastern Church, being full of liturgies for the use of the clergy. It dates perhaps from the 3rd century, but has been altered and adapted to the state of things in the middle of the 4th. Athanasius, who speaks of the *διδασχὴ καλουμένη τῶν ἀποστόλων* as fit for recent converts desirous of instruction, is to be taken as referring to the six first books.<sup>g</sup> But before the time of Epiphanius the eight books were joined as one work.

Interesting as such inquiries are, they cannot at present be considered as having removed the question of the origin and date of the apostolical constitutions out of the class of unsolved problems.<sup>h</sup> The majority of scholars will perhaps decline to say with confidence more than that the precise age and composition of the work is unknown, but that it is probably of Eastern authorship,<sup>i</sup> and comprises within itself fragments of very different dates, which we have no certain means for discriminating from one another, and which have undergone great modifications when incorporated with the rest. The consequence is that, as it stands, the work cannot be deemed to reflect a state of things in the Church much, if at all, prior to the Nicene age.<sup>k</sup>

Nor can it be said ever to have possessed, so far as we know, any distinct ecclesiastical authority. We are in the dark as to its authorship, and there is no such proof of its general and public reception at any period as would seem needful to establish its validity as an authoritative document. There are indeed signs of a common nucleus of which various churches seem to have availed themselves, but in adopting it into their respective systems they modified it in relation to their respective needs, with a freedom hardly consistent with the idea that it was entitled to very great veneration.

*Authorities.*—F. Turrianus, *Proem. in Libr.*

<sup>b</sup> Lagarde, *Rel. Juris Eccl. Ant.*, Preface, p. viii.; and see also, *ibidem*, a theory as to the name of Hippolytus, as connected with the treatise.

<sup>c</sup> This must not be confounded with the Syriac *Didascalia* previously mentioned, from which it is quite distinct.

<sup>d</sup> Matter closely agreeing with these fragments, though not in quite the same order, and connected with much that is additional, is also found in a MS. of the 12th cent. in the Cambridge Univ. Library. This MS. (brought by Buchanan from Southern India) contained eight books of Clementine Constitutions placed at the end of a Syriac Bible; but it is now in a dilapidated state. It may be that the Paris fragments are extracts from it, or, on the other hand, this MS. (as the later of the two in date) may possibly contain a subsequent development. It may be hoped that further attention will be paid to it by Oriental scholars. Its existence seems to have been unknown to Lagarde.

<sup>e</sup> Of this Egyptian collection, the first two books are printed in a Greek version by Lagarde in Bunsen's *Christ. and Mankind*, vi. 451; and see Bunsen's analysis of the collection, *ibid.* vii. 372. Another Coptic MS. was translated by Dr. Tattam in 1848. There is a notice of it in the *Christ. Remembr.* for 1854, p. 282.

<sup>f</sup> When, however, a very late date is attempted to be assigned, it should be remembered *contra* that, as observed by Bickell, metropolitan authority does not appear; and if we hear of asceticism (in book viii.), there is no mention of monasticism.

<sup>g</sup> While, on the other hand, the 85th of the Apostolical Canons perhaps refers to the 7th and 8th when it speaks of the Apostolical Constitutions as *διατάξαι ὡς οὐ κατὰ δημοσίαν ἐπὶ πάντων διὰ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς μυστικά*.

<sup>h</sup> See the words of Lagarde in Bunsen, *Christ. and Mank.*, vol. vi. p. 40.

<sup>i</sup> See Bickell, vol. i. p. 63, who assigns several grounds for this conclusion. It is worth notice that throughout the Constitutions the Church of Rome never occupies any position of priority or pre-eminence.

<sup>k</sup> The age of the Syriac *Didascalia* is of course another question. It demands fuller consideration, which it can hardly receive from scholars in general until it has been literally translated. According to the '*Didascalia Purior*' in Bunsen, it is not free from very hyperbolical language in relation to the clergy.

*Clémentine Rom. de Const. Apost.*, 8a. édit. 1579. Ioh. Dallaeus, *De Pseudopigraphis Apost.*, lib. III. Harderv. 1653. Jan. Ursin, *De Const. Apost.* (in *Catal. Patr. Ap.*, vol. II. app. p. 190, 8a. édit. 1734). Parsons, *Flavic. Synod.* (in *Catal. Patr. Ap.*, vol. II. app. p. 251). Part I. chap. 4. Brunonis, *Judicium* (ibid. p. 177). Cotelerii, *Judic. de Const. Apost.* (Catal. vol. I. p. 195). J. E. Grabe, *Synod. Patr.* Ozen. 1711. J. E. Grabe, *Essay upon two Arabic MSS.* Lond. 1711. W. Whiston, *Printing Christianity Revised.* Lond. 1711. Krabbe, *Über den Ursprung und den Inhalt der Ap. Const.* Hamb. 1829. Von Drey, *Neue Untersuchungen über die Const.*, 8a. Tübingen 1832. Bothe, *Anfänge der Christl. Kirche.* Bickell, *Geschichte der Kirchenverträge*, vol. I. Gießen 1843. Utzer, *Const. Apost.* Boerlini 1853. Bunsen's *Christianity and Mission*, London 1854. *Christian Remembrances for 1854.* De Lagarde, *Reliquiae Juris Ecclesiastici Antiquissimae*, 1856. Idem, *Syracus* 1856. Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem receptum.* Lipsiae 1866; Fascic. IV. *The Ethiopic Didache*; or, the Ethiopic version of the Apostolical Constitutions, received in the Church of Abyssinia. With an English translation. Edited and translated by Thomas Poll Platt, F.A.S. London, printed for the Oriental Translation Fund, 1854. *The Apost. Constitutions*; or, the Canons of the Apostles in Coptic, with an English Translation by Henry Tattam, LL.D. &c.; printed for the Oriental Translation Fund, 1846. [D. B.]

**APOSTOLICUS**, a title once common to all bishops (the earliest instance produced by Du Cange is from Venantius Fortunatus, 6th century, addressing Gregory of Tours, *Frang. to V. S. Martini* and elsewhere; but none of his quotations use the word absolutely and by itself, but rather as an epithet); or, from about the 8th century restricted to the Pope, and used of him in course of time as a technical name of office. It is so used, e.g., by Rupertus Tuitiensis, 12th century (*De Divin. Offic.* l. 27); but had been formally assigned to the Pope still earlier, in the Council of Rheims A.D. 1048,—"quod solus Romanus sedis Pontifex universalis Ecclesiae primus esset, et Apostolicus,"—and an Archbishop of Compostella was excommunicated at the same council for assuming to himself "culmen Apostolici nominis" (so that, in the middle ages, *Apostolicus*, or, in Norman French, *l'Apostole* or *l'Apostole*, which = *Apostolicus*, not *Apostolus*, became the current name for the Pope of the time being). Claudius Taurinensis, in the 9th century, recognises the name as already then appropriated to the Pope, by ridiculing his being called "not *Apostolus*, but *Apostolus*," as though the latter term meant *Apostoli custos* for which Claudius's Irish opponent Dungal takes him to task. (Du Cange; *Raynaud. Codic. Beroii*.) [A. W. H.]

**APOSTOLIUM** ('Αποστολίον), a church dedicated in the name of one or more of the Apostles. Thus Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* ix. 10, p. 376) speaks of the Basilica of St. Peter at Rome as τὸ ἱερόν ἀποστολικόν; and the same writer, speaking of the church which Rufinus built at the Oak (a suburb of Chalcedon) in honour of St. Peter and Paul, says that he called it 'Αποστολικόν from them (*Hist. Eccl.* viii. 17, p. 347). [MAURITIUS, PROPHETUS.] [C.]

**APOTAXAMENI** (ἀποτάξαμενοι)—renunciates, renouncers, a name by which the monks of the ancient Church were sometimes designated, so denoting their renunciation of the world and a secular life, e.g. in Palladius *Hist. Laonic.*, c. 15, and Chasman, who entitles one of his books, *De Institutis Renunciatis*. (Bingham, book vii. c. 2.) [D. B.]

**APPEAL** (*Appellatio* in reference to the court appealed to, *Prosecutio* in reference to the opponent; ἔφεσις in classical Greek, verb in N. T. ἐπαλεῖσθαι), a complaint preferred before a superior court or judge in order to obtain due remedy for a judgment of a court or judge of an inferior rank, whereby the complainant alleges that he has suffered or will suffer wrong. We are concerned here with ecclesiastical appeals only. And they will be most conveniently discussed if—distinguishing between 1, appeals from an ecclesiastical tribunal to another also ecclesiastical, and 2, appeals from an ecclesiastical to a lay tribunal, or *secundum*, and further, as regards persons, between (a) bishops and clergy, to whom in some relations must be added monks and nuns, and (B) laity—we treat successively, as regards subject matter, of I. *Spiritual Discipline* properly so called, II. *Civil Causes*, and III. *Criminal ones*. It will be convenient also to include under the term *Appeal*, both appeals properly so called, where the superior tribunal itself retries the case; and that which is not properly either revision or rehearing, where the jurisdiction of the superior tribunal is confined to the ordering, upon complaint and enquiry, of a new trial by the original, or by an enlarged or otherwise altered, body of judges; and that again which is properly a mere revision, where the case is revised by a higher tribunal but without suspending sentence meanwhile; and, lastly, the transference also of a cause from one kind of tribunal to another not co-ordinate with it, as e.g. from lay to spiritual or *secundum*, which, if the first court have completed its sentence, practically constitutes the second into a court of appeal to its predecessor. It is necessary also to bear in mind the difference between a friendly interference, such as brotherly love requires on the part of all bishops if any fall into heresy or sin, but which implies no formal authority of the adviser over the advised; and an arbitration, where the arbitrator, who may be any one, derives his authority from the mutual and free consent of (properly) both parties, but (as will be seen) in certain cases sometimes from the sole action of one; and an appeal, where some definite superior tribunal may be set in motion by either party, but has in that case exclusive as well as compulsory jurisdiction; and the yet further step, where (like the *intercommisio* of the *Tribuni Plebis*) the superior court or magistrate has the power of calling up the case for revision, and of suspending sentence meanwhile, *secundum*. An appeal, however, of whatever kind, implies the legality in the abstract, and assumes the fact, of the jurisdiction of the court appealed from as a primary court. And it becomes needful, therefore, here to assume, although it is no business of this article either to detail or to prove, the extent and limits of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the first instance; in order clearly



to set forth the various checks in the way of appeal placed in such case upon that original jurisdiction. On the other hand, the limitation of the subject to the period antecedent to Charlemagne, excludes from consideration the whole of the elaborate fabric built up by the Canon Law of later times, mainly upon the basis of the False Decretals. And we have nothing to do, accordingly, with that grand innovation, whereby, in the West, the entire system of purely ecclesiastical appeals (and, indeed, of justice) was in effect perverted and frustrated, viz., the right gradually allowed of appealing immediately from any ecclesiastical tribunal, high or low, upon any subject great or small, to the Pope at once; nor yet with the elaborate disputes upon the nature and limits of *maiores causas* (the phrase, however, dating from Innocent I.); nor with the encroachments of the highest or of other ecclesiastical tribunals upon those of the State; nor with the celebrated *Appel comme d'Abus* in medieval and later France; nor with such questions as the legitimate effect of the clause *appellationes remota* or *postposita* in a Papal brief; nor with the appeal from the Pope to a General Council, present or future; or from the Pope ill-informed, to the Pope well-informed; nor again, on another side of the subject, with distinctions between appeals judicial or extra-judicial, or from sentences definitive or interlocutory; nor with the system, at least as subsequently elaborated, of *Apostoli* (certainly not derived from *post appellationem*) or letters dismissory, whether reverential, refutatory, repository, testimonial, or conventional, whereby the under court formally transferred the cause to the upper one; nor with the *fatalia appellationum*, scil., the fixed times within which an appeal must be laid, carried to the upper court by means of *Apostoli*, prosecuted, and concluded; nor, in a word, with any other of the elaborate details of the later Canon Law upon the subject. Our attention must be confined to the system so far as it was worked out under the Roman Empire, and renewed or modified under that of Charlemagne.

I. 1. Spiritual jurisdiction in matters of discipline over clergy and laity alike, rested in the beginning both by Scriptural sanction and by primitive practice with the bishop, acting, however, rather with paternal authority and in the spirit of mutual love, through moral influence on the one side met by willing obedience on the other, than according to the hard outlines of a fixed Church law laid down in canons; although such canons gradually grew into existence and into fulness, and the ultimatum of excommunication must have existed all along as the punishment of obstinate or repeated transgression. The Apostolic canons, however (xxxvii. and lxxiv.), recognize as the then Church law, and the Nicene Council (A.D. 325) formally establishes, the authority of the synod of each province as a court of (revision rather than) appeal from a single bishop: enacting, that "excommunicate clerks and laymen shall abide by the sentence of their bishop," but that, "to prevent injustice, synods of the bishops of a province (*ἐπαρχία*) shall be held twice a year, in order that questions arising on such subjects may be enquired into by the community of the bishops; a sentence of excommunication, if confirmed by them, to hold good

until a like synod should reverse it" (*Conc. Nic.* can. 5): such right of appeal being apparently the common law of the Church, and the Council interfering only to secure it by requiring synods to be held with sufficient frequency. And this right, as respects presbyters and all below presbyters, was recognised and confirmed by *Conc. Carth.*, A.D. 390 can. 8, and A.D. 398 can. 29, 66, *Conc. Miler.* A.D. 416 c. 22, for Africa; by *Conc. Vassens.* A.D. 442 can. 5, and *Conc. Venet.* A.D. 465 can. 9 ("Episcoporum audientiam, non secularium potestatum," in this last instance), for Gaul and Armorica; by *Conc. Hispal.* A.D. 590 cc. 5, 9, for Spain; and by *Conc. Antioch.* cc. 6, 11, A.D. 341, directed both against the Pope and against appeals to the Emperor (adopted into the canons of the Church Catholic), and by the Council of Constantinople in 381, cc. 2, 3, 6, for the East. The last-named Council also in effect limited the right of appeal from above as well as below, by forbidding all bishops *ταῖς ἐπεροποιῶν ἐκκλησίαις ἐπιέναι*, and by establishing each province in an independent jurisdiction (*Conc. Constantinop.* c. 2).

a. Confining ourselves first to the case of clergy, the right of the bishop to judge his brethren or his clerks, was further limited, in that part of the Church where Church law was earliest and most formally developed, viz., Africa, by the requirement of twelve bishops to judge a bishop, of six to judge a presbyter, of three to judge a deacon (*Conc. Carth.* A.D. 348 can. 11, A.D. 390 can. 10, A.D. 397 can. 8). And a dispute between two bishops was still later referred by the (African) Council of Mileum A.D. 416 (can. 21), to bishops appointed by the metropolitan. In the East, and generally, bishops (and presbyters) would seem to have been left by the Nicene canon merely to the natural resort of an appeal from one synod to another and a larger one, viz. to the metropolitan and bishops of the next province; which is the express rule laid down in *Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, cc. 11, 12, 14, 15, and in *Conc. Constantinop.* A.D. 381, can. 6. So also canon 13 of the collection of Martin of Braga. But between the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Councils and that of Chalcedon in 451, a further modification took place in accordance with the settlement of the several Patriarchates, whereby the appeal was made to lie from the bishop to the metropolitan with his synod, and then from him to the Patriarch; with the further claim gradually emerging on the part of the Bishop of Rome to a right of supreme judicial authority over the entire Church. (But whether the sentence was to remain in force pending the appeal seems to have been a doubtful question, variously settled at different times and places; see Balsamon in *Can. Afric.* 32.) The first step was that, in the West, of the Council of Sardica, A.D. 347, intended to be oecumenical but in result only Western, and not accepted as authoritative either by the Eastern or even by the African Churches: which attempted to make the system work more fairly, and perhaps to escape reference to an Arian Emperor, by giving presbyter or deacon an appeal to the metropolitan and the comprovincial bishops (can. 14 Lat.), and by enacting with respect to bishops, in the way of revision rather than appeal, that, whereas ordinarily they should be judged by the bishops of their own province, if a bishop thought himself aggrieved, either the

bishops who tried him or those of the neighbouring province should consult the Bishop of Rome, and if he judged it right, then the comprovincial or the neighbouring bishops should by his appointment retry the case, with the addition (if the complainant requested it, and the Bishop of Rome complied with his request) of presbyters representing the Bishop of Rome, who were to take their place in that capacity among the judges (can. 4, 5, 7): no successor to be appointed to the deposed bishop pending such new trial. The choice of the Bishop of Rome as referee (to decide, however, not the case itself, but whether there ought to be a new trial) has some appearance of having been personal to Julius the then Pope (as was the subsequent grant of Gratian to Pope Damasus), to whom the right is granted by name in the Greek version of the canons (so Richerius and De Marca); but certainly it was determined to the see of Rome, not through previous precedent, or as by inherent right, but as in honour of the one Apostolical see of the West,—“in honour of the memory of St. Peter.” It was in fact giving to the Pope the right previously possessed exclusively by the Emperor, save that the latter would refer causes to a Council. Prior to 347, the case of Fortunatus and Felicissimus A.D. 252 (striving to obtain the support of Pope Cornelius against their own primate St. Cyprian, and eliciting from the latter an express assertion of the sufficiency and finality of the sentence passed upon them by their own comprovincial African bishops, St. Cypr. *Epist.* 59, Fell)—and that of Marcian, Bishop of Arles A.D. 254 (whom the bishops of Gaul are exhorted to depose for Novatianism, St. Cyprian interfering on the sole ground of brotherly episcopal duty to urge them to the step, and asking Pope Stephen to interfere also, but solely on the like ground, Id. *Epist.* 68),—and those of Basileides and of Martial, Bishops respectively of Leon with Astorga and of Merida, also A.D. 254 (deposed by the Spanish bishops as having lapsed, and of whom Basileides, having deceived Pope Stephen into re-admitting him to communion, and into “canvassing” for his restoration, was rejected nevertheless by the Spanish, seconded by the African bishops, Id. *Epist.* 67)—sufficiently shew that while the Nicene canons only confirmed and regulated the previously established and natural principle of the final authority of the provincial synod, that of Sardica introduced a new provision, although one rather opening the way for further extensive changes than actually enacting them. In 341, also, the Council of Antioch, representing the East, repudiated the same Pope Julius’s interference on behalf of St. Athanasius (Sozom. iii. 8; Socrat. ii. 15) and passed a canon against the return of a deposed bishop to his see unless by decree of a synod larger than that which had deposed him (can. 12); as well as against appeals of deposed bishops to emperors, unsanctioned by the comprovincial bishops: canons adopted into the code of the whole Church. In the West, however, the Sardican canon became the starting point of a distinctly marked advance in the claims of the Bishop of Rome, although not without opposition on the part of the Church, nor, on the other hand, without political support from the Emperors. In 367 a Council of Tyana restored Eustathius of Sebastea to his see, among other grounds, on the strength

of a letter of Pope Liberius; but the proceeding was condemned in strong terms by St. Basil the Great (*Epist.* 263 § 3). In 378, the Emperor Gratian added State sanction—at least during the Popedom of Damasus, and in reference to the schism of the antipope Ursicinus—to the judicial authority of the Bishop of Rome, but in conjunction with six or seven other bishops if the accused were a bishop himself, and with an alternative of fifteen comprovincial bishops in the case of a metropolitan, the attendance of the accused bishop at Rome to be compelled by the civil power (*Conc. Rom., Epist. ad Gratian. et Valentin. Imp.* A.D. 378, in Mansi, iii. 624, and the Rescript appended to it of the same Emperors *ad Aquilinum Vicarium*). In 381, however, the epistle of the Italian bishops (including St. Ambrose) to Theodosius, claims no more respecting Eastern bishops in the case of Maximus (deposed by the Council of Constantinople), than that the voice “of Rome, of Italy, and of all the West,” ought to have been regarded in the matter. But in some year between 381 and 398 (see Tillemont, *Mém. Eccl.*), although Theodoret (v. 23) seems to place it under Innocent I. in 402, Flavian, accepted by the East, but rejected by Egypt and by Rome and the West, as Bishop of Antioch, was summoned by the Emperor to go to Rome to be judged there by the Bishop of Rome, but refused to submit; and was finally accepted by the Pope, to whom he sent a deputation of bishops, at the intercession of St. Chrysostom, but without any pretence of trial. In 404–406, Innocent’s interference to procure St. Chrysostom’s own restoration to his see, even to the extent of withdrawing communion from St. Chrysostom’s opponents, proved as great a failure as Pope Julius’s like attempt on behalf of St. Athanasius (Sozom. viii. 26–28. and the letters of St. Chrysostom and Pope Innocent in Mansi, iii. 1081–1118); although the mean proposed was not a trial by the Pope but a general Council. While St. Chrysostom himself at the same period affirms the old principle, that causes must not *ὑπερορίους ἔλκεσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἐν ταῖς ἐπαρχίαις τὰ τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν γυμνάζεσθαι* (in Mansi, i.). But even in the Western Church at the same period the Roman claim was admitted with difficulty, and only gradually and by continual struggles. Innocent I. indeed declared that, “si majores causae in medium fuerint devolutae, ad sedem Apostolicam, sicut synodus statuit” (meaning, of course, but exaggerating, the Sardican canons) “et vetus sive inveterata consuetudo exigit, post iudicium episcopale referantur” (*Epist. 2 ad Victric.*). But in actual fact, 1. in Africa, A.D. 417–425, the appeal to Pope Zosimus of the presbyter Apiarius, condemned by his own Bishop, Urbanus of Sicca, whom the Pope summoned to Rome to be judged, and on refusal sent legates to successive Carthaginian Councils to enforce his claims, was in the first instance provisionally compromised, by a temporary admission of the Papal authority (*Epist. Conc. Afric. ad Bonifac. Papam* A.D. 419, in Mansi, iv. 511), on the ground of the canons of Sardica, alleged by the Popes (Zosimus, Boniface, Celestine) to be Nicene; but on the production of the genuine canons of Nicaea from Constantinople and Alexandria, was absolutely rejected (*Epist. Conc. Afric. ad Caelestinum* A.D. 425, in Mansi, iv. 515): whilst the canon (22) of Mileum, A.D. 416, which is repeated by Carth-

aginian Councils down to A.D. 525 (Mansi, viii. 644), assigns presbyters and all below them to appeal, "non ad transmarina judicia sed ad primates suarum provinciarum; ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam ad communionem suscipiatur;" and the *Cod. Can. Afric.* 18 Gr. 31 (A.D. 419), adds to this—"sicut et de Episcopis saepe constitutum est," the genuineness of which last clause is supported by Tillemont, De Marca, and Beveridge, although denied by Baronius. It seems certainly to have been inserted in the canon by some African council of this period. At the same time, while the gloss of Gratian on the word "transmarina"—"nisi forte ad Romanam sedem appellaverit"—is plainly of the kind that as exactly as possible contradicts its text; it is evident by St. Augustin's letter to Pope Celestine in 424 (*Epist.* 209), that applications from Africa in a friendly spirit to Rome in disputes respecting bishops, both to judge and to confirm others' judgments, and this not only during the provisional admission of the Papal claim (as in the case of the Bishop of Fussala), but before it, had been frequent. It is hard to believe, in the face of the precisely contemporary and unmistakeable language of the assembled African bishops at the close of the controversy respecting Apiarius, that such applications could have been in the nature of formal appeals; although the case of Pope Leo I. and Lupicinus, A.D. 446, shows the Papal claim to have been still kept up (St. Leo, *Epist.* xii. al. i. § 12). 2. In Illyria,—whereas, in 421, the Emperor Theodosius had decreed that doubtful cases should be determined by a council, "non absque scientia" of the Bishop of Constantinople (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. tit. 2. s. 45),—in 444, Pope Leo I., insisting upon the canons apparently of Sardica, and as part of the Papal measures for securing the whole of Illyria to the Roman Patriarchate, commanded appeals ("causae graviores vel appellationes") from Illyria to be brought to Rome (St. Leo, *Epist.* v. § 6). And 3. in Gaul, in 445, the same Pope, overthrowing the decree of Pope Zosimus in 418, which had constituted Arles the metropolitan see of the province, insisted on rehearing at Rome in a synod the causes of Bishop Projectus and of Celidonius Bishop either of Vesontio or of Vienne, whom Hilary of Arles had deposed, and carried the point, although with strong opposition from Hilary (St. Leo, *Epist.* x.). Pope Hilary, however, 461–462, *Epist.* xi., respecting the Metropolitan of Vienne and Arles, refers his authority as Bishop of Rome to the "decreta principum." And undoubtedly a decree of the Emperor Valentinian III., in the year 445, definitely assigned to the Pope, not simply an appellate jurisdiction, but the right of evoking causes to Rome *suo motu*, by enacting that "omnibus pro lege sit quidquid sanxit vel sanxerit Apostolicae sedis auctoritas, ita ut quisquis Episcoporum ad iudicium Romani antistitis evocatus venire neglexerit, per moderatorem ejusdem provinciae adesse cogatur" (*Cod. Theod. Novell. tit. xxiv., Suppl.* p. 12). An ultimate appellate jurisdiction was also given at the same period, but by Church authority, viz., by the general council of Chalcedon in 451, to the Bishop of Constantinople: the order of appeal being there fixed from bishop to metropolitan and synod, and from the latter to the particular Patriarch or to the Bishop of Constantinople (*Conc. Chalc.* c. 9).

CHRIST. ANT.

The Eastern rule appears to have henceforward remained the same; except that Justinian A.D. 533, confirming the canon of Chalcedon in other respects, dropped all special mention of the Bishop of Constantinople, but enacted in general that an appeal should lie from bishop to metropolitan, and from metropolitan alone to metropolitan with synod, but that from the synod each Patriarch should be the final court of appeal in his own Patriarchate, as final as was in civil cases the *Praefectus Praetorio* (Justin. *Cod.* vii. tit. 62. s. 19); although no cause was to come to him at once unless in the form of a request that he would delegate it to the bishop, who was the proper primary tribunal (Id. i. tit. 4. s. 29; 7. tit. 62. s. 19; *Novell.* cxxiii. 22). A law of Leo and Constantius in 838 (Leunclav. *Jus Gr. Rom.* II. 99) likewise declares the patriarch to be the ἀρχή of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, whose decision, therefore, is final, unless indeed he chooses to review it himself. And so also, apparently, the 8th General Council of Constantinople A.D. 870 (Act 10, cc. 17, 26). It is to be added, however, that in the case of any one under the degree of bishop, and in cases not ecclesiastical, the bishop was the primary judge, but from him the case might be taken to the civil judge, the Emperor deciding if they differed; but in the case of a bishop, the right of appeal to the patriarch enacted by Justinian is final (Justin., *Novell.* lxxxiii. 12, cxxiii. 21, 22).

In the West, the changes in the matter relate to two points, to the fruitless attempts of the Popes to obtain appellate jurisdiction over the East, and to their more successful efforts to secure their Western claim of the like kind under the altered laws and policy of the new Barbarian rulers of Europe; efforts which may be said to have finally secured success under the Carolingians, in the popedom of Nicholas I. about 858. and as confirmed by the false Decretals, first used by Nicholas in 864 (Gieseler). For the former, in 449, Flavian no doubt appealed from Dioscorus and the Ephesine *Latrocinium* nominally to the Pope, but Leo's own letter to Theodosius in consequence (St. Leo, *Epist.* 43 al. 34, and 44 al. 40; *Liberat. Brev.* 12, in Mansi, ix. 379), shows that the tribunal of appeal contemplated by even the Pope himself, was a general council (see Quesnel and Van Espen). In 484, however, Felix II. in a synod at Rome, as the issue of a long dispute, during which, among other steps, he had summoned Acacius of Constantinople to be tried at Rome upon the strength of the canons of Sardica, misnamed Nicene, made an open schism with the East, which lasted 40 years, by excommunicating and deposing Acacius (Mansi, vii. 1054); a sentence which, it need not be said, was disregarded. In 587, Pelagius II. seems to have confirmed the sentence of acquittal passed by a tribunal at Constantinople, summoned by the Emperor, in the case of Bishop Gregory of Antioch, while protesting against the title of universal bishop applied by the same authority to the Bishop of Constantinople (St. Greg. M., *Epist.* v. 18; Evagrius, vi. 7); a protest renewed, as every one knows, by Gregory himself. But this implied no formal superiority over Eastern bishops. And the claim unhesitatingly advanced by Gregory—"De Constantinopolitana ecclesia quis eam dubitet Apostolicae sedi esse subjectam" (St. Greg. M., *Epist.* ix. 12)—was assuredly not admitted by

K



the Church of Constantinople itself. Further on, the Council in *Trullo* in 691, repeated not only the 3rd canon of Constantinople in 381, but the 28th of Chalcedon in 451, which latter equals Constantinople to Rome (*Conc. Quinisext. can. 36*); and also the 17th of the same Council of Chalcedon (*ib. 38*), which involves the 9th of the same council, viz., that which (as above said), so regulates the course of appeals as to put the patriarch of a province with an alternative of the Bishop of Constantinople as the ultimate tribunal. The dispute which a century after issued in the great schism, cut short the narrower, by absorbing it in the broader, controversy. For the West, however, matters proceeded more successfully. Gelasius (492-496), while allowing the subordination of the Pope to a general council approved by the Church, asserts positively (*Epist. 13*), that the see of St. Peter "de omni ecclesia jus habeat judicandi, neque cuiquam de ejus liceat judicare judicio," and that "ad illam de qualibet mundi parte canones appellari voluerint, ab illa autem nemo sit appellare permissus." In 503, although the Arian Theodoric appointed a commission of bishops, under the presidency of a single bishop (of Altino), to judge of the disputed election of Symmachus to the Popedom, and although Symmachus in the first instance admitted their jurisdiction, and both parties appealed to the judgment of Theodoric himself; yet 1. a Roman synod (*Synodus Palmaris*) both sanctioned Symmachus's election without presuming to make enquiry, and declared the interference of laity in Church elections or property to be against the canons (*Mansi, viii. 201, sq.; Anastas. Lib. Pontif. in v. Symmachus*); and 2. Ennodius of Ticinum, in 511, formally asserted in an elaborate document the absoluteness of the Papal power, and especially that the Pope is himself the final court of appeal, whom none other may judge (*Mansi, viii. 282-284*). And at the end of the century Gregory the Great assumes as indisputable that every bishop accused is subject to the judgment of the see of Rome (*Epist. ix. 59*). During the following period, however,—while the suffering African Church, retaining her privilege untouched, but as a privilege, under Gregory the Great, yet practically gave up her ancient opposition a few years later (*Epist. Episc. Afric. ad Papam Theodorum, in Act. Conc. Lateran. A.D. 649, Mansi, x. 919*),—the European Churches were practically under the government of the kings, although the theoretical claims of the Popes remained undiminished. The Irish Churches, indeed, were still independent of the Pope, the end of the seventh century being the close of the Celtic schism, except in Wales. In Saxon England, the proceedings of both kings and synods in the appeals of Wilfrid (678-705), when the Pope reversed the judgments of English synods on Wilfrid's complaint, showed on the one hand a feeling of reverence for the Pope (e.g. the Council of Nidd, A.D. 705 [*Eddius 58*] did not repudiate the Pope's decree, but the testimony of Papal letters, which might be forged, as against the *vivâ voce* evidence of Archbishop Theodore); but on the other, disregarded such decree in practice, by enforcing that precise severance of Wilfrid's diocese against which he had appealed. And the Council of Cloveshoo, A.D. 747, pointedly limits appeals to the provincial council, and no further (*can. 25*). In Spain, although Gregory

the Great interfered by a legate authoritatively in favour of deposed bishops, viz., Stephanus and Januarius, on the ground, first, of Justinian's law as being their Patriarch, and if that was refused, then by the right of the see of Rome as head of the Church (*Epist. xiii. 45*), yet in 701 or 704, King Witiza, in a Council of Toledo, expressly forbade appeals to any foreign bishop (*Conc. Tolet. xviii.*). And a little earlier, admission into Church communion was declared dependent on the will of the Prince (*Conc. Tolet. A.D. 681 c. 3, and 683, c. 9*). The Kings in effect were in Spain supreme judges of bishops (*Cenni, De. Antiq. Eccl. Hisp. ii. 153, quoted by Gieseler*). In Gaul, the cases of Salonius, Bishop of Embrun, and Sagittarius, Bishop of Gap, deposed in 577 by a synod of Lyons, restored by Pope John III. on appeal, but by permission and power of King Guntram, and then again finally deposed in 579 by a Council of Châlons (*Greg. Turon., Hist. Franc. v. 21-28*), leave the Papal claim in a similar state of half recognition to that in which it stood in England. And in the ensuing century the Royal authority here also practically superseded the Papal. In 615, the administration of ecclesiastical discipline is made subservient to the king's intercession (*Conc. Paris. c. 3, as confirmed by Chlotarius II.*). And many instances of depositions of bishops occur without appeal to the Pope, beginning with that of Saffaric of Paris, deposed by a second synod there, to which he had appealed from a former one, under King Chilperic, A.D. 555. Gregory the Great, indeed, renewed the ingenious expedient of appointing the Bishop of Arles his vicar to decide such causes in Gaul, in conjunction with twelve bishops; and yet even so, most of such causes were decided without even the presence of the Papal vicar (*De Marca, vii. 19*). The *Capitula* of Hadrian I., sent to Ingilram of Metz in 785, introduced the first great innovation upon preceding rules, by enacting (*c. 3*) that no bishop should be condemned unless in a synod called "Apostolica auctoritate;" and again, that, if a deposed bishop, whose primary tribunal was the comprovincial synod, appealed from it to Rome, "id observandum esset quod (Papa) ipse censuerit" (*c. 20, 23, and Epitome Capit. A.D. 773*). But they contained also the African prohibition of appeals *ad transmarina judicia* (see *Gieseler*). And while the *Capitulary* of Aix in 789, repeated more expressly by the Council of Aix in 816 (*cc. 73, 74*), repeats the Nicene and Antiochene (341) canons without the addition of those of Sardica, the *Capitularies* as collected by Benedict Levita contain also the Sardican canons. For bishops, then, Charlemagne allowed the appeal to Rome for a new trial, the comprovincial synod being still held to be the proper tribunal for such cases: and an appeal being also allowed to more numerous episcopal judges if dissatisfaction were felt with those originally appointed by the metropolitan, and, again, from them to a synod (*Capit. vii. 413*), or again, from a suspected judge to another (*ib. vii. 240, and Add. iii. 25, iv. 18, sq.*):—see *Capit. v. 401, 410, vi. 300, vii. 102, 103, 314, 315, 412, Add. iii. 105*:—but left the ordinary and direct right of a proper appeal to the Pope, and the condition of his prior consent to the trial of an accused bishop, sufficiently unsettled to lead to the great disputes of the following period, of

which the case of Hincmar and Bishop Rothad is the primary case. The Carolingian Princes, indeed, deposed bishops in synods, just as they elected them, without any reference to the Pope. But the Papal power gradually increased. And while Gregory IV., in 835, and Leo IV., about 850, expressly claim a proper appellate jurisdiction, Pope Nicholas I., 858-867, on the strength of the False Decretals, may be said to have finally established the claim in its fulness. Even in 791, however, the synod of Friuli asserted for the Patriarch of Aquileia the right, that even no presbyter, deacon, or archimandrite be deposed, in his Patriarchate, without consulting him (can. 27): the same right which Hadrian claimed universally for the Bishop of Rome. As regards all below bishops, the Council of Frankfort in 794, can. 6, re-enacts the order of appeal from bishop to metropolitan, i.e., to the provincial synod, but no further; and, in addition, orders the civil magistrate (Comes) to act as assessor, and to refer to the Emperor all cases too hard for the metropolitan. And *Capit.* iii. 1, A.D. 812, includes bishops also among those who are to bring their disputes to the Emperor for settlement.

In sum, appeal from a bishop or bishops to his neighbouring brethren, under their metropolitan, i.e., from one or few bishops to many, was the Church's common law; the appeal terminating there, until the law of Valentinian in 445 for the Bishop of Rome, the canon of Chalcedon in 451 for the Bishop of Constantinople and patriarchs generally, and the law of Justinian in 533 for all patriarchs without distinction, allowed further appeal from bishops to their patriarchs: the Bishop of Rome, however, alleging also for his right the narrow and insufficient basis of the canons of Sardica, and custom, and in time also the broader and sentimental ground of the privilege of St. Peter. The False Decretals first established in the West, in its full meaning, the absolute both appellate and immediate jurisdiction of the Popes as of Divine right, in the 9th century, during the Papacy of Nicholas I. It remains to add, that the Cyprian, the Armenian, the Georgian, the Bulgarian, and the Ravennate, claims, to be autocephalous, were simply remnants of the older condition of things before the existence of patriarchates, differing from each other only in the fact that the Cyprian right was actually tried and confirmed by a general council.

B. The above canons for the most part leave laymen to their original right of appeal to a provincial synod, according to the canon of Nice. And this was plainly their right, generally speaking, throughout; and is confirmed (as above said) by the Council of Frankfort in 794. In Africa, however, where the right of appeal was more jealously guarded than elsewhere, it was enacted at one time (*Conc. Carth.* A.D. 397 can. 8, and A.D. 398 can. 22, 23) that the bishop of the place "agnoscat et finiat" the causes of all below presbyters, although in no case "absque presentia clericorum suorum." Hincmar, in the 9th century, limits the same class of appeals to the provincial synod, protesting only against any further right of appeal in such cases to the Pope.

L. 2. The interference of lay tribunals in causes spiritual, after the Emperors became Christian, belongs properly to other articles. Questions of

faith and such as were purely ecclesiastical, as it is sufficient here to state upon the unqualified testimony of Gothofred (*Comment. in Cod. Theod.* 16. tit. 2. s. 23, quoted by Bingham), were left ordinarily to bishops and synods, by laws reaching from Constantius to Justinian (e.g. *Novell.* lxxxiii., cxlii. 21). And the law of Honorius in 399 (*Cod. Theod.* 16. tit. 11. s. 1), among others, which expressly denies any proper right of Church courts to civil jurisdiction, affirms also that causes of religion as properly belong to them. When, however, either questions of faith or private causes became of political importance, a qualified and occasional practice of appeal to the Emperors from spiritual tribunals naturally grew up. Our business is with the latter, i.e. with judicial cases. And here it may be said in brief, that the Emperors throughout claimed and exercised a right of ordering a new trial by spiritual judges; the choice of whom so far rested with themselves, that they took them if it seemed good from another province than that of the parties accused or accusing. So Constantine dealt with Caecilianus in the Donatist controversy, appointing first Melchiades of Rome and three Gallic bishops to judge the case at Rome, and then, upon the dissatisfaction of the Donatists, commanding a synod to rehear it at Arles (without the Pope at all) in 314. The precise question, however, was one of discipline more than of belief. And Constantine disclaimed all right of appeal from the episcopal tribunal to himself. So also Bassianus of Ephesus, and Eusebius of Dorylaeum, asked letters from the Emperor Marcian, that the Council of Chalcedon in 451 might judge their appeals. And at a somewhat earlier period Theodosius in a like case transferred causes from one province to another (*De Marca, De Conc. Sac. et Imp.* iv. 3). So also Theodoric appointed bishops to decide the case of Pope Symmachus c. A.D. 500, although, after commencing the case, they ultimately refused to judge the Bishop of Rome, save by a merely formal judgment. And the Council of Mileum in 416, while condemning to deprivation any appellant to a civil tribunal, excepts the case of those who ask from the Emperor "*episcopale iudicium.*" On both sides, however, this middle course was occasionally transgressed. Bishops sometimes asked the Emperors themselves to decide their appeals: e.g., even St. Athanasius, while in his *Apol.* ii. expressly repudiating the Emperor's power to decide such a cause, yet, after the Council of Tyre had deposed him, requested the Emperor nevertheless, not only to assemble a "lawful" council of bishops to rehear the case, but as an alternative, *ἢ καὶ αὐτὸν δέξασθαι τὴν ἀπολογία* (Socrat. i. 33). And the Council of Antioch accordingly, in 341, took occasion (as above said) to prohibit all applications to the Emperor except such as were backed by letters of metropolitan and provincial bishops, and to insist upon the restriction of fresh trials to "a larger synod:" canons repeated down to the days of Charlemagne, and adopted by the Church at large, although repudiated as Arian by St. Chrysostom and by Pope Innocent I., when quoted against the former. And about A.D. 380, Sulpicius Severus, again, affirms that he himself and his fellow bishops had done wrong in allowing Priscillian to appeal to the Emperor, and



lays it down that he ought to have appealed to other bishops. Yet both Pope Symmachus and his opponent Laurentius requested the Arian Lombard Theodoric to decide between them. On the other side, when mentioning a very late case, where the Emperor transferred a cause of a spiritual kind from the Patriarch Luke of Constantinople, A.D. 1156-1169, to a civil court, Balsamon (in *can. 15 Syn. Carthag.*), while affirming this to be against the canons, yet admits that a lay co-judge might rightly be asked of the Emperor. And Justinian (*Novell. cxxiii. 21*) reserves indeed a right upon appeal of assigning judges, from whom an appeal lay "*secundum legum ordinem*," i.e. ultimately to the *Praefectus Praetorio* and *Quaestor Palatii* (*Cod. 7. tit. 62. s. 32*); but ecclesiastical causes are expressly excepted from such appeal. On the other hand, Arcadius and Honorius expressly prohibit appeals from councils to themselves; unless, indeed, this refers only to civil and criminal causes. The Carolingian Emperors (as we have seen above) reserved an appeal to themselves in difficult cases from the metropolitan, in causes of presbyters and all below them; besides appointing the civil magistrate as assessor to the metropolitan in the first instance. And in the case of Leo III. A.D. 800, when Charlemagne convened a synod at Rome to investigate accusations against that Pope, the bishops appointed declined to act, on the ground that it was the Pope's right to judge them, and not theirs to judge the Pope (Anastas., in *V. Leon. III.*).

II. We pass next to civil causes: and the jurisdiction of bishops in these, whether lay or clerical, is of course, as a coercive jurisdiction, purely a creation of municipal law. As founded upon 1 *Cor. vi. 4*, it could not have been until the time of Constantine more than a voluntarily conceded power of arbitration, whereby both plaintiff and defendant, being Christians, agreed to be bound (see Estius, *ad loc.*). But upon principles of Christian love and of avoiding scandal, the decision of such cases became the common and often the inconveniently troublesome business of bishops: e.g., of Paphnutius (see Rufinus), Gregory Thaumaturgus (St. Greg. Nyss. in *Vita*), St. Basil the Great (St. Greg. Naz. *Orat. 20*), St. Ambrose (*Epist. 34*), St. Augustine (Possid. in *Vita*), St. Martin of Tours (Sulp. Sev. *Dial. ii.*): and is recognized as their work by St. Chrysostom (*De Sac. iii. 18*). The *Apost. Constit. ii. 45-47* regulate the process. St. Cyprian (*Adv. Judaeos iii. 44*), speaking of resort to the bishop and not to the secular court as the duty of Christians, may serve as a specimen of the feeling upon which the practice rested. And while Socrates (vii. 37) speaks of Bishop Sylvanus of Troas as declining it either for himself or his clergy, it is recognized even by the Council of Tarragona in 516 (c. 4) as extending to presbyters and deacons also. The practice was changed from a precarious to a recognized and legal institution by Constantine. Either party to a suit was allowed by him, not in form to appeal from magistrate to bishop, but to do so in effect; in that he gave to either the power to choose the bishop's court in preference to the magistrate's, the bishop's sentence to stand as good in law as if it were the Emperor's (Euseb., *De V. Constantini*, iv. 27; Sozom. i. 9); and if

the law at the end of the Theodosian code is (as Selden, and, among later writers, Haenel and Walter [see Robertson's *Becket*, p. 80] think, but Gothofred denies) his, then took the still further step of empowering either, without the other's consent, and whether the cause were actually pending or even already decided by the civil court, to claim a rehearing in the court of the bishop (*Extrav. de Elect. Judic. Episc. Cod. Theod. vi. 303*).

a. This power was enlarged in the case of the clergy into a compulsory jurisdiction, the Church forbidding clergy to take civil cases in which they were concerned before any other tribunal than the bishop's (*Conc. Carth. A.D. 397 c. 9*, *Conc. Milevit. A.D. 416 c. 19*, *Conc. Chalced. A.D. 451 c. 2*, *Conc. Venetic. A.D. 465 c. 9*, *Conc. Cabillon. i. A.D. 470 c. 11*, *Conc. Matiscon. A.D. 582 c. 8*), while the Emperors permitted and ratified episcopal jurisdiction between clergy in civil cases, and where both parties agreed to the tribunal (Valentin. III., *Novell. de Episc. Judicio*, xii. Gothofr.). And Justinian in 539 gave civil jurisdiction outright to the bishops over the clergy, the monks, and the nuns, subject to an appeal to the Emperor in case the civil judge decided differently to the bishop (*Novell. lxxix., lxxxiii., cxxiii. c. 21*). The law also of Constantius, in A.D. 355, refers all complaints against bishops without distinction, and therefore civil as well as criminal, to an episcopal tribunal (*Cod. Theod. 16. tit. 2. s. 12*); which Justinian specifies into a regular chain of appeal to metropolitan and patriarch, unless in one exceptional case, where either the *Praefectus Praetorio per Orientem*, or "judges appointed by the Emperor," are to decide (*Novell. cxxiii. cc. 22, 24*). If a layman, however, were a party to the suit, it rested with him to choose the tribunal.

β. With respect to laymen, indeed, generally, the law of Constantine, if it ever did go to the length of allowing a transfer of the cause at the will of either party, and at any stage of the suit, was soon limited. Arcadius and Honorius A.D. 408 require the consent of both parties (*Cod. Justin. 1. tit. 4. s. 7, 8*). And both they, and Valentinian III. A.D. 452, expressly allow a layman to go if he chooses to the civil court, and in all cases and persons require the "*vinculum compromissi*," and the "*voluntas iurgantium*," as a prior condition to any episcopal (coercive) jurisdiction at all; expressly laying down also that bishops and presbyters "*forum non habere nec de aliis causis praeter religionem posse cognoscere*" (*Cod. Theod. 16. tit. 11. s. 1*; and Valentin. III., as before cited). Justinian, however, appears to have gone further. 1. He granted to the clergy of Constantinople a right to have all their pecuniary causes, even if a layman were concerned, tried in the first instance by the bishop; and only if the nature of the case hindered him from deciding it, then, but not otherwise, before the civil court (*Novell. lxxxiii.*); and 2. he appointed the bishop generally co-judge with the civil magistrate, and with an appeal from the latter to the former (*Novell. lxxxvi.*). And both in *Conc. Carthag. A.D. 399 c. 1* (*Cod. Can. Afric. 5*), and in Justin. *Novell. cxxiii. § 7*, *Cod. 1. tit. 3. s. 7*, and *Cod. Theod. 11. tit. 39. s. 8*, provision is made to protect a bishop or clergyman, who had thus acted as judge, from being subsequently molested by a discontented party to the

suit, who should summon him to give account of his judgment before a secular tribunal.

The law of Constantine in its widest form, and as applying to laity as well as clergy, is alleged to have been revived by Charlemagne (*Capit. vi. 281*), expressly as a renewal of the (extreme) Theodosian enactment, but very serious doubts are thrown on the genuineness of the re-enactment: viz., that "Quicumque litem habeat, sive possessor sive petitor fuerit, vel in initio litis vel decursis temporum curriculum, sive cum negotium peroratur sive cum jam coeperit promi sententia, si iudicium elegerit sacrosanctae legis Antistitis, illico sine aliqua dubitatione, etiam si alia pars refragatur, ad Episcoporum iudicium cum sermone litigantium dirigatur: . . . omnes itaque causae, quae vel praetorio jure vel civili tractantur, Episcoporum sententiis terminatae, perpetuo stabilitatis jure firmentur: nec liceat ulterius retractari negotium, quod Episcoporum sententia deciderit:"—thus interposing an absolute right of appeal in civil causes for either party, whether lay or clerical, at every stage of the civil suit, from the civil judge to the bishop, and forbidding appeal from the latter (see also *Capit. vii. 306*, and Gratian, *Decret. P. II., c. xl. qu. 1 cc. 35-37*; and Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ii. 146, 11th ed.). At the same time it is obvious, by *Conc. Francof. A.D. 794 c. 6*, above referred to, that an appeal to the Emperor himself was allowed, even from the metropolitan, in all civil cases. The joint jurisdiction of bishops and aldermen in Saxon England belongs to a different subject.

III. In criminal cases, this article is not concerned to define the limits and nature of the exemptions or privileges of clergy, beyond the brief statement that, 1. Clergy, and in particular bishops, were exempted from civil tribunals by the Emperors in criminal cases, provided that first the *delicta* were *letia*, and next the consent of the plaintiff if a layman were obtained; and 2. Episcopal intercession for criminals, all along looked upon as a duty and regarded with favour, received a civil sanction at the hands of Justinian; while Heraclius A.D. 628 formally committed jurisdiction over the criminal offences of clergy to the bishops, to be judged "*κατὰ τοὺς θελοὺς κανόνας*" (Leunclav. *Jus Graeco-Rom. i. 73*). In relation to appeals, we have only to mention, that Justinian, in criminal cases of clerks, appoints the bishop and civil judges to act together, with an appeal to the Emperor (*Novell. cxxiii. c. 21*); the civil judge to try the case, but within two months, and the bishop then (if the accused is condemned) to deprive (*Novell. lxxxiii.*); and that in the law of Heraclius, just mentioned, occurs the well-known phrase—that if the case were beyond canonical punishment, then the bishop should be directed, "*τὸν τοιοῦτον τοῖς πολιτικοῖς ἔρχουσι παραδιδόσθαι, τὰς τοῖς ἡμετέροις διορισμέναις νόμοις τιμωρίας ὑποσχεσόμενον.*" And in such cases, therefore, the cause was thenceforth transferred from the spiritual to the lay tribunal. So also Justinian (*Novell. lxxxiii.*) requires the convicted criminal clerk to be first deposed by the bishop, and then, but not before, *ὑπὸ τὰς τῶν νόμων γίνεσθαι κρίμας*. Under the Carolingian empire, the *Apocrisarius* or *Archicapellanus* acted as the Emperor's deputy in the final decision of clerical

causes of all kinds, the Emperor being the ultimate judge in these as in secular ones (*Conc. Francof. A.D. 749 c. 6*; and see for *Cappellani* under the Franks, Walafr. Strab., *De Reb. Eccl. c. 31*).

(Besides the works of De Marca, Richerius, Quesnel, Thomassin, Van Espen, and Church Historians, such as Fleury, Neander, Gieseler; and Beveridge, Bingham, &c. among ourselves, the works of Allies and of Hussey, on the Papal Supremacy, and Greenwood's *Cathedra Petri*, Lond., 1856, sq., may be referred to; also, Hebenstreit, *Hist. Jurisd. Eccl. ex legg. utriusque Cod. illustrata*, (Lips. 1773), Schilling, *De Origine Jurisd. Eccles. in Causis Civilibus* (Lips. 1825), and Jungk, *De Originibus et Progressu Episcop. Judicii in Causis Civilibus Laicorum usque ad Justinianum*, Berlin 1832-8, referred to by Gieseler.) [A. W. H.]

APPROBATION OF BOOKS. [CENSORSHIP OF BOOKS.]

APRONIANUS, martyr at Rome, commemorated Feb. 2 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

APSE, the niche or recess which terminates a church at the end near which the high altar is placed. This feature existed in the basilicas or halls of justice constructed by the Romans, the tribunal for the presiding magistrate having been placed in the centre of the arc forming the apse.

In the earlier centuries the apse was almost invariably semicircular, in some churches and particularly in those which would appear to date from the third or early part of the fourth century the apse is internal, so that the building has a rectangular termination. Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme, at Rome, has this plan, though it is doubtful whether this was the plan adopted when it first became a church; but in Italy it is very rarely found; in Africa and in Asia it seems to have prevailed, particularly in the earlier period: the basilica of Reparatus at Orleansville, in Algeria, believed to date from A.D. 252; the churches at Deyr Abu-Faneh near Hermopolis Magna, at Hermouthis (Erment) in Egypt, at Ibrihm in Nubia, at Pergamus, and Ephesus, are all thus planned. [CHURCH.]

In the basilica of St. Reparatus there is a second apse, also internal, at the other end of the building; this is believed to have been added about the year 403.

In the churches built in the fifth century in the East three apses are often found, the aisles as well as the central nave being so terminated; in the following century this plan, the so-called parallel triapsal, was introduced into Italy and churches at Ravenna, as St. Apollinare in Classe, built A.D. 538-549, (though with a peculiar modification), and the Duomo at Parenzo (A.D. 542), exhibit it. In the eighth and ninth centuries it appears at Rome, as in St. Maria in Cosmedin (A.D. 772-795), and a few other churches.

The transverse-triapsal plan, that in which there are three apses, one projecting from the end, and one from each side of the building, is rarely found in churches of the usual basilican plan, or in any anterior to the sixth century. It occurs (with some modification) in St. Sophia's, Constantinople, and in other churches for which that building served in some degree as a model, and in the eleventh and twelfth centuries is com-

mon in Germany. It is, however, found at Rome in oratories, even in the fifth century, as in that of St. John the Baptist opening from the baptistery of the Lateran, built by Pope Hilarus, cir. A.D. 461, and that of Sta. Croce, built by the same pope, but now destroyed.

About the year 800 churches in Germany were constructed with an apse at each end: the greater church at Reichenau, in the Lake of Constance, begun in 816, has a semicircular apse at one end and a square recess at the other; the plan prepared for the church of St. Gall in the beginning of the ninth century shows a semicircular apse at each end.

The altar was usually placed in the chord of the arc of the apse, the cathedra or chair for the bishop in the centre of the arc against the wall, while a stone bench, or a series of such, one above the other, afforded places for the clergy. At Torcello, near Venice, there are six such ranges. Apses so fitted appear to have been called "apsides gradatae." [CHURCH.] [A. N.]

APTONIUS, commemorated May 23 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

APULEIUS, disciple of Peter, martyr at Rome, commemorated Oct. 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae*); in Rheims MS. of the Gregorian *Sacramentary* (see Ménard's ed. p. 418).

AQUAMANILE (other forms, *Aquamanilium*, *Aquamanus*, Gr. *Χέρνιβον*), the bason used for the washing of the hands of the celebrant in the liturgy. The aquamanile with the urceus are the bason and ewer of the sacred ceremony.

In the *Statuta Antiqua* called the "Canons of the Fourth Council of Carthage" (*Canon V.*), it is laid down that a subdeacon should receive at his ordination from the hands of the archdeacon an aquamanile (corruptly written "aqua et mantile") as one of the emblems of his office. Compare Isidore, *De Eccl. Off.* ii. 10. And these directions are repeated verbatim in the office for the ordination of a subdeacon in the Gregorian *Sacramentary* (p. 221). In the Greek office, the subdeacon receives *χερνιβόξεστον καὶ μανδύλιον*, where the word *χερνιβόξεστον* perhaps includes both urceus and aquamanile (*Daniel's Codex Lit.* iv. 550).

In the *Ordo Romanus* I. (p. 5), the acolytes are directed to carry an aquamanus (among other things) after the Pope in the great procession of Easter-Day.

Aquamanilia of great splendour are frequently mentioned in ancient records. Desiderius of Auxerre is said to have given to his church "aquamanile pensans libras ii. et uncias x.; habet in medio rotam liliatam et in cauda caput hominis;" and Brunhilda, queen of the Franks, offered through the same Desiderius to the church of St. Germanus "aquamanilium pensans libras iii. et uncias ix.; habet in medio Neptunum cum tridente" (*Krazer, De Liturgiis*, p. 210). Compare URCEUS. [C.]

AQUILA. (1) Wife of Severianus, martyr, commemorated Jan. 23 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) Husband of Priscilla, July 8 (*Ib.*); July 14 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(3) Martyr in Arabia, Aug. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

AQUILEIA, COUNCIL OF (AQUILIENSE CONCILIUM). I., A.D. 381, provincial, although

the Easterns were invited, St. Ambrosius being the most important bishop present; summoned by the Emperor Gratian, to try the cases of Bishop Palladius and Secundianus, who were there condemned for Arianism (*Mansi*, iii. 599-632).

II. A.D. 553, Western or rather provincial, on behalf of the three chapters. It rejected the Oecumenical Council of Constantinople of A.D. 550, and thereby severed the Aquileian Church from the Church Catholic for over 100 years (*Baed., De VI. Aetat.*; *Mansi*, ix. 659). III. A.D. 698, a like Synod for a like purpose (*Baed., ib.*; *Paul. Diac.*, v. 14; *Sigebert in an.*; *Mansi*, xii. 115). [A. W. H.]

AQUILINA, martyr, commemorated June 13 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

AQUILINUS. (1) Martyr in Africa, Jan. 4 (*Mart. Hieron., Bedae*).

(2) Commemorated Feb. 4 (*M. Hieron.*).

(3) Of Isauria, commemorated May 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae*).

(4) Presbyter, May 27 (*M. Hieron.*).

(5) Saint, July 16 (*Ib.*); July 17 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

AQUISGRANENSE CONCILIUM. [Aix.]

ARABICUM CONCILIUM. — A council was held, A.D. 247, in Arabia against those who maintained that the soul died with the body. Origen went to it, and is said to have reclaimed them from their error (*Euseb.* vi. 37). [E. S. F.]

ARATOR, commemorated April 21 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

ARAUSICANUM CONCILIUM. [ORANGE.]

ARCA, ARCULA. 1. A chest intended to receive pecuniary offerings for the service of the church or for the poor (*Tertullian, Apologeticus*, c. 39). Of this kind was probably the "arca pecuniae," which Pope Stephen (an. 260) is said to have handed over, with the sacred vessels, to his archdeacon when he was imprisoned (*Liber Pontif.* c. 24); and such that which Paulinus Petricordius says (in *Vita S. Martini*, lib. iv. ap. Ducange) was committed to the charge of a deacon chosen for the purpose. The box from which priests received their portions is described as "arca sancta" by Marcellus (*Vita S. Felicis*, c. 3).

2. It is used of a box or casket in which the Eucharist was reserved: thus Cyprian (*De Lapsis*, c. 26, p. 486) speaks of an "arca in qua Domini sacramentum fuit," from which fire issued, to the great terror of a woman who attempted to open it with unholy hands. In this case, the casket appears to have been in the house, and perhaps contained the reserved Eucharist for the sick.

3. Among the prayers which precede the Ethiopic Canon (*Renaudot, Lit. Orient.* i. 501) is one "Super arcam sive discum majorem." The prayer itself suggests that this arca was used for precisely the same purpose as the paten, inasmuch as in both cases the petition is that in or upon it may be perfected (*perficiatur*) the Body of the Lord. Renaudot (p. 525) seems to think that it may have served the purpose of an ANTIMENSIUM (q. v.).

It does not appear, however, that its use was limited to the case of unconsecrated altars; and when we remember that the Copts applied the term *ἱλαστήριον* to the Christian altar (*Renaudot*),

1st, i. 182) it does not seem improbable that this area was an actual chest or ark, on the lid of which, the Mercy-Seat, consecration took place. It is worth noticing that chests are said to have been anciently used as altars in Rome [ALTAR]. Dr. Neale (*Eastern Church, Introd.* p. 184) says that the *tabout* or ark of the Ethiopic Church is used for the reservation of the Sacrament. Major Harris's informant (*Highlands of Ethiopia*, iii. 138) declared that it contains nothing except a parchment inscribed with the date of the dedication of the building. [C.]

ARCADIUS. (1) Martyr, commemorated Jan. 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).  
(2) Martyr in Africa, Nov. 12 (A.). [C.]

ARCANI DISCIPLINA [DISCIPLINA ARCANI].

ARCHANERIE, commemorated at Rome Aug. 10 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

ARCHBISHOP.—The earliest use of this title was probably the same as that with which we are familiar in the Modern Church, viz., as designating a metropolitan or chief bishop of a province. Afterwards, however, as the hierarchical system of the Church was further extended to correspond with the civil divisions of the Roman empire, it became appropriated to the higher dignity of patriarch. Thus, according to Bingham (ii. 17), Liberatus (*Breviar.*, c. 17) gives all the patriarchs this title of archbishops, and, he adds, so does the Council of Chalcedon frequently, speaking of the patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople under the name of archbishops also. About the time of Constantine the empire was divided into dioceses, each of which contained many provinces. This division, like the earlier one of provinces, was also adopted by the Church; and as the State had an exarch or vicar in the capital city of each civil diocese, so the Church, in process of time, came to have her exarchs or patriarchs in many, if not all, the capital cities of the empire. These patriarchs were originally called archbishops, which title had therefore a much more extensive signification than it has at present. The principal privileges of the archbishops of that period were—1. To ordain all the metropolitans of the diocese, their own ordination being received from a Diocesan Synod; 2. To convene Diocesan Synods and to preside in them; 3. To receive appeals from metropolitans and from Metropolitan Synods; 4. To censure metropolitans, and also their suffragans when metropolitans were remiss in censuring them. The Patriarch or Archbishop of Alexandria had from very early times some peculiar privileges within his diocese, but originally all patriarchs were co-ordinate, as well as mutually independent as regards actual power, though some had a precedence of honour, as those of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, to whom the canons gave precedence of all others.

For "Archbishop" in its later and present signification, see METROPOLITAN. [D. B.]

ARCHDEACON.—'Αρχιδιάκονος, 'Αρχιδιάκων, 'Αρχιδιάκων (Catal. Patriarch. Constant. 1944, ap. *Manuscript.* 1st. iii. 243, though perhaps somewhat late), *Archidiaconus*, *Archidiaconus*, *Levita septimus* (Joannes Secundus, *Vit. Greg. Mar.* i. c. 25).

1. *Origin of Name and Office.*—That there was

from the first a primacy among deacons, as there appears to have been among presbyters, and as there was afterwards among bishops, is more a matter of conjecture than of historical certainty. It is reasonable to suppose that some one deacon, either the senior in office or the most eminent in ability, took the lead of the rest, as St. Stephen appears to have taken the lead of the seven first deacons (whence the Menologium gives him the title 'Αρχιδιάκονος); but it is uncertain when this became a part of the regular ecclesiastical order. The name is sometimes given by later writers to prominent deacons of the first four centuries; for example, St. Lawrence, who had evidently some precedence over his brother deacons, is called archdeacon by St. Augustine (*Serm. de Dismissa*, cat. cap. 9; *Sacrosanctus Laurentius archidiaconus fuit*); and Cassilian of Carthage is called archdeacon by Optatus (i. l. p. 18, ed. Paris, 1879). But other writers describe the office by a paraphrase; for example, Theodoret (*H. E.* i. 26) uses the phrase δὲ πρῶτος τῶν διακόνων ὑποφύρας to describe the position—which was evidently equivalent to that of an archdeacon—of Athanasius at Alexandria; and there is the negative evidence that neither the name nor the office is mentioned in the Apostolical Constitutions (although some have supposed the phrase δὲ πρῶτος τῶν ἀρχιεπισκόπων διακόνων, in ii. 57, to refer to it), and that Cornelius (*ap. Euseb. H. E.* vi. 43) omits the archdeacon from his list of Church officers at Rome. The first contemporary use of the title is, in the Eastern Church, in the old version of the acts of the Council of Ephesus (*Labbe, Suppl. Concil.* p. 505); and, in the Western Church, in St. Jerome (*e.g. Ep. xc. ad Rusticum*). After that period it is in constant use.

In both East and West the title appears to have been restricted to the secular clergy; the first in rank of the deacons of a monastery seems to have had, in the East, the title of ὑποδιάκονος (but not universally, for Joannes Climacus, *Scol. Parad.* p. 58, also uses the title ἀρχιδιάκων of a monk); a deacon in a similar position in the West seems to have had, at least in early times, no special designation.

II. *Mode of Appointment.*—The mode of appointment varied with particular times and places. At first, and in some places permanently, the deacon who was senior in date of ordination appears to have held the office, without any special appointment, by right of his seniority. That this was the usual practice at Constantinople is clear from the answer of Anatolius to Leo the Great in the case of Andrew and Aetius. Leo, probably having the use of the Roman Church in his mind, assumes in his letter of remonstrance to Anatolius that the latter had appointed (constituisse) Andrew archdeacon. Anatolius replies that, on the ordination of Aetius as presbyter, Andrew had succeeded him as archdeacon in regular order (non protractus a nobis et gradu faciente Archidiaconi dignitate honoratus—S. Leon. Mag. Op. vol. i. p. 653, ed. Paris, 1875). But, on the other hand, Sozomen speaks of Serapion as having been appointed by Chrysostom (ὁ ἀρχιδιάκων ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκείνου—H. E. viii. 9), and Theodoret notices that Athanasius was at the head of the deacons, though young in years (ὁ πρῶτος τῶν διακόνων), which could hardly have been the case in so large a



church as that of Alexandria if the rule of seniority had been followed. St. Jerome has indeed been sometimes quoted to show that the practice at Alexandria was for the deacons to elect their archdeacon, but the hypothetical form of the sentence ("quomodo si . . . . diaconi eligant de se quem industrium noverint et Archidiaconum vocent") makes it difficult to use the passage as an assertion of an existing fact. In the West there appears to have been a similar diversity of practice. The phrases which are sometimes used (e.g. by Joannes Secundus, *Vit. S. Greg. Mar.* i. 25, "levitam septimum ad suum adiutorium constituit") seem to show, what might also be expected from the nature of the case, that when the archdeacon became not so much the first in rank of the minor officers of the Church as the bishop's secretary and delegate, the bishop had at least a voice in his appointment. But there is a canon of a Gallic council in A.D. 506 (*Conc. Agath. can. xxiii.*, Mansi, viii. 328) which strongly asserts the rule of seniority, and enacts that even in cases in which the senior deacon, *propter simpliciores naturam*, was unfit for the office, he was to have the title (*loci sui nomen teneat*), although the burden of the duty devolved upon another. In later times, however, it is clear that the right of appointment rested absolutely with the bishop.

III. *Number, and Duration of Office.*—It is clear, both from the statement of St. Jerome (*Ep. xc. ad Rusticum*, "singuli ecclesiarum episcopi, singuli archipresbyteri, singuli archidiaconi") and from the invariable use of the singular number in the canons of the councils which refer to the office, that for several centuries there was but one archdeacon in each diocese. When the number was increased is not altogether clear. The increase seems to have been a result partly of the increase in the number of rural parishes, partly of the difficulty of dividing dioceses which were coextensive with civil divisions. The fact of the Council of Merida (A.D. 666) having directly prohibited the appointment of more than one archdeacon in each diocese seems to indicate that such a practice had been contemplated, if not actually adopted (*Conc. Emerit. can. x.*, Mansi, xi. 81); but the first actual record of a plurality of archdeacons occurs a century later in the diocese of Strasburg. In 774, Bishop Heddo divided that diocese into three archdeaconries (*archidiaconatus rurales*), and from that time there appears to have been throughout the West—except in Italy, where the dioceses were small—a general practice of relieving bishops of the difficulties of the administration of overgrown dioceses by appointing archdeacons for separate divisions, and giving them a *delegatio* (ultimately a *delegatio perpetua*) as to the visitation of parishes. Thence grew up the distinction between the "Archidiaconus magnus" of the Cathedral Church and the "Archidiaconi rurales." The former was at the head of the cathedral clergy, whence in much later times he was known as the provost (*praepositus*) of the cathedral, ranking as such before the archpresbyter or dean. The latter had a corresponding status in their several districts; they were usually at the head of the chapter of a provincial town, and they had precedence, and perhaps jurisdiction, over the "Archipresbyteri rurales," who were at the head of subdivisions

of the archdeaconries, and corresponded to modern "rural deans." There was this further difference between the two classes, that the rural archdeacons were usually priests, whereas the cathedral archdeacon, even so late as the 12th century, was usually a deacon.

Originally, the office was limited to deacons; an archdeacon who received priest's orders ceased thereby to be an archdeacon. Proofs and examples of this are numerous. St. Jerome says (in *Ezech. c. xlviii.*) that an archdeacon "injuriā putat si presbyter ordinetur." Anatolius made his archdeacon Aetius a presbyter in order to get rid of him, of which proceeding Leo the Great, in a formal complaint to the Emperor Marcian on the subject, says "dejectionem innocentis per speciem profectionis implevit" (*S. Leon. Magn. Epist. 57, al. 84*); and Sidonius Apollinaris speaks of an archdeacon John who was so good an archdeacon that he was kept from the presbyterate in consequence ("diu dignitate non potuit augeri ne potestate posset absolvi"—*lib. iv. ep. 24*). It is not certain at what date presbyters were allowed to hold office as archdeacons; probably the earliest certain evidence on the point is that which is afforded by Hincmar of Rheims, who (A.D. 874) addresses his archdeacons as "archidiaconibus-presbyteris" (*Mansi, xv. 497*).

IV. *Functions.*—At first an archdeacon differed only from other deacons in respect of precedence. In the churches of the East he was probably never much more. Individual archdeacons attained to eminence, but not by virtue of their office. Their office gave them such privileges as the right of reading the Gospel in the cathedral (e.g. at Alexandria; *Sozomen, vii. 19*), and of receiving the sacred elements before the other deacons (*Joannes Citri, Resp. ad Cabasil. ap. Meursius, Gl. Graeco-Barb. s. v.*); but they appear to have had no administrative functions, and at Constantinople, so unimportant did the office become, from an ecclesiastical point of view, that at last the archdeacon became only an officer of the Imperial court (*Codinus, De Off. Constant. c. xvii. 38*).

It was different in the West. Partly from the fact that the deacons, and especially, therefore, the senior deacon, were the administrative officers of the Church; partly from the fact that the senior deacon had been from early times especially attached to the bishop, the office, which, even in the time of St. Leo, was called the "officiorum primatus" (*S. Leon. Magn. Ep. 106, al. 71*), assumed an importance which at one period was hardly inferior to that of the episcopate itself.

The functions of the office may conveniently be distributed under two heads, according as they grew out of the original functions of the diacönite, or out of the special relation of the archdeacon to the bishop.

(1) The archdeacon seems to have had charge of the funds of the Church; e.g. both St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, in speaking of St. Lawrence, speak of him as having the "opes ecclesiae" in his custody (*S. Aug. Serm. de Divers. cxi. c. 9*); and St. Leo describes the appointment of an archdeacon by the phrase "quem ecclesiasticis negotiis praeposuit" (*S. Leon. Magn. Ep. 85, al. 58*).

This involved the distribution of the funds to



the poor; St. Jerome speaks of the archdeacon as "mensarum et viduarum minister" (S. Hieron. in Ezech. cxlviii.), and the 4th Council of Carthage prohibits a bishop from attending to the "gubernationem viduarum et peregrinarum" himself, but orders him to do so "~~per archipresbyterum aut per archidiaconum~~" (IV. Conc. Carth. can. xvii.; Mansi, iii. 952).

Afterwards, if we are to trust the letter of Isidore of Seville to the Bishop of Cordova, he appears to have distributed to the clergy of the several orders the money which was offered for their support at the communion (Isid. Hisp. Ep. ad Luidifr., Op. ed. Paris, 1601, p. 615).

(2) The archdeacon had the "ordinatio ecclesiae," that is, the superintendence of the arrangements of the cathedral church and of divine service. He was "master of the ceremonies." As such he had (a) to keep note of the calendar, and to announce the fasts and festivals (Isid. Hisp. *ibid.*; cf. the phrase "concionatur in populos" of Jerome in Ezech. c. xlviii.). (b) He had to correct offences against ecclesiastical order during divine service; for example, at Carthage a woman who kissed the relics of an unrecognized martyr was reproved (*correpta*) by Caecilian (Optat. i. p. 18). Probably this was a duty of the archdeacon in the East as well as in the West; at least it is difficult to account for the origin of the unseemly scuffle between Meletius and his archdeacon at Antioch (Sozom. H. E. iv. 28) unless we suppose that the latter was exercising a supposed right. (c) He had to see that the arrangements of the Church for divine service were properly made, and that the ritual was properly observed. Isidore of Seville (*ibid.*) assigns to him in detail, "cura vestiendi altaris a levitis, cura incensi, et sacrificii necessaria sollicitudo, quis levitarum Apostolum et Evangelium legat, quis preces dicat." (d) The same authority, or quasi-authority, may be quoted for his having also charge of the fabric of the cathedral church: "pro reparandis diocesanis basilicis ipse suggerit sacerdoti" (*ibid.*).

(3) The archdeacon had to superintend and to exercise discipline over the deacons and other inferior clergy. This was common to both East and West; and as early as the Council of Chalcedon we find it stated that a deacon (Maras of Edessa) had been excommunicated by his archdeacon (*ἀκουωνήτος ἐστὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀρχidiaκόνῳ*: but the bishop, Ibas, who is speaking, goes on to say, *οὐδὲ ἐμοὶ ἐστὶν ἀκουωνήτος*, which seems to imply that the bishop and the archdeacon had co-ordinate jurisdiction over deacons: Mansi, vii. 232). A curious instance of the extent of their authority is afforded by a canon of the Council of Agde, in Gaul, which enacts that "Clerici qui omnem nutriunt ab archidiacono etiamsi noluerint inviti detondeantur" (Conc. Agath. can. xx.; Mansi, viii. 328). This ordinary jurisdiction of an archdeacon over the inferior clergy must be distinguished from the *delegated* jurisdiction which he possessed in later times. The canon of the Council of Toledo which is cited in the Decretals as giving him an ordinary jurisdiction over presbyters is confessedly spurious (Mansi, iii. 1008).

(4) This power of exercising discipline was combined with the duty of instructing the inferior clergy in the duties of their office. The

4th Council of Carthage enacts that the ostiarius before ordination is to be instructed by the archdeacon. Gregory of Tours identifies the archdeacon with the "praeceptor" (H. F. lib. vi. c. 36), and speaks of himself as living at the head of the community of deacons (Vit. Patr. c. 9). The house of this community appears to have been called the "diaconium" ("lector in diaconio Caeciliani"—Optat. lib. i. c. 21), and is probably referred to by Paulinus when he says that he lived "sub cura" of the deacon Castus (Paulin. Vit. Ambros. c. 42).

(5) As a corollary from these relations of an archdeacon to the inferior clergy, it was his office to enquire into their character before ordination, and sometimes to take part in the ceremony itself. Even in the East it is possible that he had some kind of control over ordinations, for Ibas is said to have been prevented by his archdeacon from ordaining an unworthy person as bishop (*καλυθεὶς παρὰ τοῦ τηνικαῦτα ἀρχidiaκόνου αὐτοῦ*—Conc. Chalc. act x., as quoted by Labbè, iv. 647, c., but Mansi substitutes *πρεσβυτέρου*—vii. 224). In the African Church the archdeacon was directed to take part in the ordination of the subdeacons, acolytus, and ostiarius (IV. Conc. Carthag.; Mansi, iii. 951). Throughout the West his testimony to character appears to have been required. At Rome this was the case even at the ordination of presbyters; but Jerome speaks of it as "unius urbis consuetudinem" (S. Hieron. Ep. ci. al. lxxxv. ad Evang.). In later times the archdeacon enquired into the literary as well as into the moral qualifications of candidates for ordination; but there is no distinct authority for supposing this to have been the case during the first nine centuries; the earliest is that of Hincmar of Rheims, in 874, who directed his archdeacon-presbyters to enquire diligently into both the "vita et scientia" of those whom they presented for ordination (Mansi, xv. 497). In one other point they appear in some places to have conformed to later practice, for Isidore of Pelusium (Ep. i. 29) reproves his archdeacon for making money from ordination fees (*ἀπὸ τιμῆς χειροτονιῶν*).

2. The second class of an archdeacon's functions were those which grew out of his close connection with the bishop. The closeness of this connection is shown as early as the 4th century by St. Jerome, who says of the "primus ministeriorum," i.e. the archdeacon, that he never leaves the bishop's side ("a pontificis latere non recedit"—Hieron. in Ezech. c. xlviii.). This expression has, without any corroborative evidence except the indefinite phrase of the Apostolical Constitutions (quoted above), been interpreted exclusively of his attendance upon the bishop at the altar. It is probable that this is included in the expression, but it is improbable that nothing else is meant by it. The mass of evidence goes to show that while the arch-presbyter was the bishop's assistant chiefly in spiritual matters, the archdeacon was his assistant chiefly in secular matters.

(1) He was attached to the bishop, probably in the capacity of a modern chaplain or secretary. He transacted the greater part of the business of the diocese; for example, St. Leo speaks of the office as involving "dispensationem totius causae et curae ecclesiasticae" (Ep. lxxxiv. al. lvii.). He conveyed the bishop's orders to the

clergy; for example, when John of Jerusalem prohibited Epiphanius from preaching, he did so "per archidiaconum" (S. Hieron. *Ep.* xxxviii. al. lxi.). He acted as the bishop's substitute at synods; for example, Photinus at the Council of Chalcedon (Mansi, vi. 567). Compare the canon of the Council of Trullo, in 692 (Mansi, xi. 943), which forbids a deacon from having precedence over a presbyter, except when acting as substitute for a bishop, and the canon of the Council of Merida, in 666 (Mansi, xi. 79), which expressly disapproves of the practice. Ordinary deacons were sometimes called the "bishop's eyes," whence Isidore of Pelusium, writing to his archdeacon, says that he ought to be "all eye" (*ὅλος ὀφθαλμὸς ὀφείλεις ὑπάρχειν*—Isid. Pel. *Ep.* i. 29).

(2) In somewhat later times he was delegated by the bishop to visit parishes, and to exercise jurisdiction over all orders of the clergy. There is no trace of this in the East. It grew up in the West with the growth of large dioceses, with the prevalence of the practice of appointing bishops for other than ecclesiastical merits, and with the rise of the principle of the immunity of ecclesiastical persons and things from the jurisdiction of the secular power. But it is difficult to determine the date at which such delegations became common. The earliest evidence upon which reliance can be placed is that of the Council of Auxerre in 578, which enacted that, in certain cases, a parish priest who was detained by infirmity should send "ad archidiaconum suum," implying a certain official relation between them. More definite testimony is afforded by the Council of Châlons in 650, which expressly recognises his right of visiting private chapels ("oratoria per villas potentum"—*I. Conc. Cabill.* can. 14; Mansi, x. 1192). A similar enactment was made at the second Council of Châlons, in 813, which, however, censures the exacting of fees for visitations ("ne census exigant"—*II. Conc. Cabill.* c. 15). In later times this "delegatio" became a "delegatio perpetua," not revocable at the pleasure of the bishop who had conferred it; but that such was not the case during the first nine centuries is clear from the letter of Hincmar to his archdeacons (quoted above), and also from the fact that Isidore of Seville, whose authority, or quasi-authority, was so frequently quoted to confirm the later pretensions of the archdeacons, only speaks of their visiting parishes "cum iussione episcopi."

The rise of the separate jurisdiction of the archdeacon is still more obscure. In the 6th century we find him named as the bishop's assessor in certain cases (*I. Conc. Matic.* can. 8, Mansi, ix. 933; *II. Conc. Matic.* can. 12; Mansi, ix. 954); but there is no trustworthy evidence in favour of the existence of an "archdeacon's court" within the period of which the present work takes cognizance.

(3) In the East, during the vacancy of a see, the archdeacon appears to have been its guardian or co-guardian. Chrysostom writes to Innocent of Rome, complaining that Theophilus of Alexandria had written to his archdeacon "as though the church were already widowed, and had no bishop" (*ὥσπερ ἤδη χηρούσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ οὐκ ἐχούσης ἐπίσκοπον*—Mansi, iii. 1085); and in the letter which the Council of Chalcedon wrote to the clergy of Alexandria to inform them of the

deposition of their bishop Dioscorus, the archdeacon and the oeconomus are specially named. In the West it is not clear that this was the case; but sometimes the archdeacon was regarded as having a right of succession. Eulogius (*ap. Phot. Bibl.* 182) says that it was a law at Rome for the archdeacon to succeed; but the instance which he gives, that of Cornelius making his archdeacon a presbyter, to cut off his right of succession, is very questionable, the date being earlier than the existence of the office. No doubt, many archdeacons were chosen to succeed, but the most striking instances which are sometimes quoted to confirm the statement of Eulogius, those of St. Leo and St. Gregory, were probably both exceptional.

(An amusing blunder identified the archdeacon, who was sometimes called not only "oculus episcopi," but "cor episcopi," with the chorepiscopus or suffragan bishop; the blunder, which has been not unfrequently repeated, seems to be traceable in the first instance to Joannes Abbas *de translatione reliquiarum S. Glodesindis*, quoted in H. Vales. *Adnot. ad Theodoret*, i. 26.) [E. H.]

ARCHELAUS, or ARCHILLAUS, commemorated Aug. 23 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

ARCHIMANDRITE (*ἀρχὼν τῆς μὲνδρας*, *praefectus coenobii*), lit. ruler of "the fold"—the spiritual fold that is—a favourite metaphor for designating monasteries in the East, and very soon applied. As early as A.D. 376 we find St. Epiphanius commencing his work against heresies in consequence of a letter addressed to him by Acacius and Paul, styling themselves "presbyters and archimandrites," that is, fathers of the monasteries in the parts of Carchedon and Beroea in Coele-Syria. Possibly St. Epiphanius omits to style them "archimandrites" in his reply, because the term was not yet in general use.\* But at the time of the Council of Ephesus the Emperors Theodosius and Valentinian received a petition from "a deacon and archimandrite," named Basil (Mansi, tom. iv. p. 1101). At the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 448, under Flavian, 23 archimandrites affixed their signatures to the condemnation of Eutyches, himself an archimandrite. Sometimes the same person was styled archimandrite and hegumen indifferently; but, in general, the archimandrite presided over several monasteries, and the hegumen over but one. The latter was therefore subject to the former, as a bishop to a metropolitan or archbishop. Again, there was an exarch, or visitor of monasteries, by some thought to have been inferior to the archimandrite, by some superior, and by some different only from him in name. But if it is a fact that archimandrites were admitted to their office by the patriarch alone, though he, of course may have sometimes admitted the others as well, it would seem to suggest that they occupied the highest rank in the monastic hierarchy, analogous to that of patriarch amongst bishops. According to Goar (*Euchol.* p. 240) archimandrites had the privilege of ordaining readers, which the ordinary hegumen had not; but he has omitted to point out where this privilege is conferred in the form of admission given by him further on (p. 492). King (p. 367), in his history of the Greek Church, re-

\* Both letters are prefixed to his work.

gards archimandrite as the equivalent for abbot, and hegumen for prior, in the Western monasteries; but he can only mean that the offices in each case were analogous. Rarely, but occasionally, bishops and archbishops themselves were designated archimandrites in the West and East. For fuller details, see Suicer, *Thesaur. Eccl. s. v.*; Du Fresne, *Gloss. Graec. s. v.*, *μᾶνδρα*; Habert's *Pontifical. Eccl. Graec. p. 570, et seq.* [E. S. F.]

**ARCHINIMUS**, confessor, commemorated March 29 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ARCHIPARAPHONISTA** (Ἀρχιπαράφωνιστής), a principal officer of the Roman "Schola Cantorum," [CANTOR] called also "Quartus Scholae." It belonged to his office to name the chanters who were to sing the several parts of the service in a Pontifical Mass (*Ordo Romanus*, I. c. 7; III. c. 7); to go before the pope, and place for him a prayer-desk before the altar (*O. R.* I. c. 8); and to bring to the sub-deacon the water for use in the celebration of mass (*O. R.* I. c. 14). [C.]

**ARCHIPPUS**, the fellow-labourer of St. Paul commemorated March 20 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); as "Apostle," Feb. 19 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**ARCHISUBDIACONUS**.—This is a word which occurs in the canons of the synod of Auxerre (*Synod. Autissiodor. can. 6*; Mansi, ix. 912), but apparently not elsewhere. If the reading be genuine, it would appear that in some dioceses the subdeacons as well as the deacons had their primate; but it is probable that the reading should be *subarchidiaconum*, which may have been another name for the officer known to the Greeks as *ὁ δευτερεύων*, and to some Western dioceses as *secundarius*. [E. H.]

**ARCHIPRESBYTER**. (ἀρχιπρεσβύτερος, Sozom. *H. E.* viii. 12; but the ordinary Greek term was *πρωτοπρεσβύτερος*, which is found applied to the same person in the corresponding passage of Socrates, *H. E.* vi. 9; cf. also Phot. *Bibl.* 59, in the account of the irregular synod against Chrysostom, and Mansi, vii. 252, from which it appears that the word was found in some versions of the acts of the Council of Chalcedon; in later times = *πρωτοπρεσβύτερος*, Codin. *De Off. Eccl. Const.* c. i.; *archipresbyter*, S. Hieron. *Ep. xcv. ad Rustic.*)

The origin of the office is not clear; after the permanent establishment of the distinction between the episcopate and presbyterate it appears that the senior presbyter had certain recognized rights in virtue of his seniority; but there is no evidence of his having had a distinct name until the close of the 4th century, when we find it, as quoted above, in Socrates.

For some time the name, when given at all, seems to have been given as a matter of course to the presbyter who was senior in date of ordination. But the assertion of Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* xliii. 39) that he refused *τὴν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων προτίμησιν*, which Basil offered him, and the phrase of Liberatus (*Brev. c. xiv.*) "qui [see *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.* art. DIOSCORUS OF ALEXANDRIA] et eum [*Dict. of Chr. Biogr.* art. PROTERICUS] archipresbyterum fecerat" seem to show that in some places in the East the bishop had the power of making a special appointment. In the West, however, this was regarded as a violation of the regular order, for St. Leo (*Ep. v. ad xvii.*) finds great fault with Dorus of Bene-

ventum for giving precedence (he does not use the word archipresbyter) to a newly ordained presbyter over his seniors.

At first there appears to have been only one archipresbyter in a diocese (cf. S. Hieron. *Ep. xcv. ad Rustic.*, "singuli ecclesiarum episcopi, singuli archipresbyteri, singuli archidiaconi"). He took rank next after the bishop, all of whose functions he performed during the vacancy of a see, and some of them, e.g. baptism, during the bishop's temporary absence. It has been held that he had also a right of succession, but this is hardly proved. With the increase in the population in the large dioceses of the West and the growing difficulty of subdividing them, on account of their identification with civil divisions, began the system of placing an archipresbyter (*arch. ruralis*) in each of the larger towns, who stood in the same relation to the clergy of the surrounding district as the archipresbyter of the cathedral to the rest of the clergy of the cathedral. The first mention of these rural archipresbyters is in Gregory of Tours (*Mirac.* i. 78, ii. 22). Their duties may be gathered from various canons of Gallican and Spanish councils. The Council of Tours, in 567, enacted that subpresbyters were to be liable to penance if they neglected to compel the presbyters and other clergy of their respective districts to live chastely (Mansi, ix. 797). The Council of Auxerre, in 578, inflicted a similar but heavier penalty on them if they neglected to inform the bishop or the *archdeacon* (the first instance of such a subordination of rank) of clerical delinquencies; and also enacted that "saeculares" who neglected to submit to the "institutionem et admonitionem archipresbyteri sui" were to be not only suspended from ecclesiastical privileges but also to be fined at the king's discretion (Mansi, ix. 797). From Can. 19 of the Council of Rheims, in 630, it would appear that certain feudal rights of seigniority had begun to attach to the archipresbyters, in consequence of which the office was being held by laymen (Mansi, x. 597). The Council of Châlons, in 650, enacted that lay judges were not to visit monasteries or parishes, except on the invitation in the one case of the abbot, in the other of the archipresbyter (Mansi, x. 1191).

The name *decanus*, which was given to the archipresbyter of the cathedral, and *decanus ruralis*, which was given to the archipresbyter of a country district, as also the struggle for precedence between the archipresbyters and the archdeacons, in which the latter were ultimately victorious, belong to a later period. [E. H.]

#### ARCHIVES. [REGISTERS.]

**ARCOSOLIUM**. This word is derived by Martigny (*Dict. des Antiq. Chréti.*) from "arcus, an arch, and "solium," which according to him is sometimes used in the sense of sarcophagus. Some inscriptions, and particularly one now in the cortile of the Palazzo Borghese (Marchi, *Mon. delle Arti Christ. primit.* p. 85), which runs thus, "Domus eternalis Aur. Celsi et Aur. Ilaritatidis compari mees [*leg. comparavimus*] fecimus nobis et nostris et amicis arcosolio cum parieticulo suo in pacem," make mention of it, and it has been supposed to denote those tombs hewn in the living rock of the catacombs at Rome (and elsewhere), in which there is an arched opening above the portion reserved for the deposition of

the body to be interred, the grave being dug from above downwards into the reserved portion below the arch.

There seems, however, some reason for doubting whether the attribution of the word is correct, and whether we ought not rather to understand by it the sepulchral chambers or cubicula in which the great majority of these tombs are found.

It is difficult to understand how one tomb of the kind could contain more than about five bodies, even if two were placed in the grave below, and three in loculi cut in the wall under the arch; while the inscription quoted above would seem to imply that a much larger number were to be placed in the arcosolium made by Aurelius Celsus; but it may be that these persons were all mentioned in order that the right of interment of relations or friends might not be disputed if claimed.

It is not clear how or where the parieticulum or partition could be placed. Martigny says that the arcosolia were divided into several compartments by these walls, but does not explain in what way. If the word mean merely the tomb, parieticulum would probably mean the wall included under the arch.

The word may really be derived from "arca," a sarcophagus, and "solium," which among other meanings has that of a piscina or reservoir in a bath, and in mediæval Latin of a chamber generally; it may thus denote a vault containing sarcophagi.

In the tombs of this kind the receptacle for the corpse was sometimes covered by a slab of marble, or sometimes a marble sarcophagus is inserted. In a few cases the sarcophagus projects forward into the chamber, and the sides of the arch are continued to the ground beyond the sarcophagus.

Such slabs or sarcophagi have been supposed to have served as altars during the period of persecution, as being the resting-places of saints or martyrs, and in some instances this may have been the case; but the far greater number of these tombs are no doubt of later date, and simply the monuments used by the wealthier class. The bishops and martyrs of the 3rd century were, as may be seen in the cemetery of Callixtus (on the Via Appia near Rome), placed, not in these "arcosolia" or "monumenta arcuata," but in simple "loculi," excavations in the wall just large enough to receive a body placed lengthwise (v. De Rossi, *Roma Sott. Crist.* t. ii. tav. i. ii. iii.). It seems hardly probable that, when such illustrious martyrs were interred in so humble a manner, more obscure sufferers should be more highly honoured; this consideration seems to afford ground for the supposition that, where a saint or martyr of the first three centuries has been placed in a decorated tomb, such a memorial is to be attributed not to the period of the original interment, but to the piety of a later time. In the 4th and 5th centuries the humble "loculus" was altered into the decorated "monumentum arcuatum," and the whole sepulchral chamber in many cases richly adorned with incrustations of marble, with stucco, and with paintings. An excellent example of this is afforded by the chamber in the cemetery of Callixtus, in which the remains of the Popes Eusebius (309-311) and Miltiades (or Melchiades, 311-314) were placed, a part of which is represented in the annexed woodcut.

## ARCOSOLIUM

In the walls of this chamber are three large "arcosolia," in front of one of which was a marble slab, with an inscription by Pope Damasus commemorating Pope Eusebius (v. De Rossi, t. ii. tav. iii. iv. and viii.). The whole chamber has been richly decorated with marble incrustations, paintings, and mosaics. These decorations it would seem reasonable to assign to Pope Damasus, who undoubtedly set up the inscription. Another inscription by Pope Damasus, found in the crypt of St. Sixtus in the same cemetery, testifies the desire then felt to lie in death near the remains of holy personages, and at the same time the awe and respect felt for them in these words—

"Hic fiteor volui Damasus meae condere membra  
Sed cineres timui sanctos vexare piorum."

This pious awe gradually diminished, and loculi are found excavated above, below, before, at the side of the sepulchres of confessors and martyrs. Hence the formulae "ad sanctos," "ad martyres," "supra sanctos," "retro sanctos," "ante sanctos," often found in inscriptions in the catacombs. A good instance of this practice may be seen over the tomb of Pope Eusebius, where a painting representing the Good Shepherd has been cut through in order to form a loculus.



Arcosolium in the Cemetery of Callixtus.

Loculi so excavated within the arch of the "arcosolia" are, however, too common to be always accounted for in this manner, and in many instances were no doubt intended for the children or near relatives of those who lay below.

In the year 1858, in the cemetery of St. Callixtus, an unviolated "arcosolium" was discovered: in this a marble sarcophagus was found, in which lay a body swathed in numerous bands of linen exactly in the manner shown in the early representations of the raising of Lazarus.

These "arcosolia" were often decorated with paintings, either on the front of the sarcophagus or on the wall above it. Examples may be found in Perret's work on the 'Catacombs,' vol. i. pl. lviii.-lxx. One of the most remarkable is—



stances is the tomb of St. Hermes in the catacombs near Rome called by his name.

The tombs of this class are more usually found in the "cubicula," or small chambers, than in the galleries of the catacombs: in the former, two, three, or more are often found. Martigny seeks to draw a distinction between those found in the "cubicula," which he thinks may often or generally be those of wealthy individuals made at their own cost, and those in the so-called chapels or larger excavations, which he thinks were constructed at the general charge of the Christian community. In one such chapel in the cemetery of St. Agnes near Rome there are eleven such tombs. Rostell (*Beschreibung von Rom*, by Bunsen and others, vol. i. p. 408) gives it as his opinion that such chapels, specially connected with the veneration of martyrs, do not usually date from an earlier period than the 4th or 5th century. The work of the Cav. de' Rossi on the catacombs (*Roma Crist. Sotterranea*) will no doubt when completed throw great light on all these questions, which cannot be satisfactorily solved except by that union of the most careful and minute investigation, and candid and impartial criticism, which that learned archaeologist will bring to bear upon them.

Examples of tombs of the same form may be found in structures above ground at a much later date: two such are in the walls of the entrance to the baptistery at Albenga, between Nice and Genoa, a building probably not later than the 7th century. One tomb is quite plain, the other decorated with plaited ornaments in the style prevalent circa 800. [A. N.]

**AREA.** I. A space within which monuments stood, which was protected by the Roman law from the acts of ownership to which other lands were liable. Such arene are frequent by the side of most of the great roads leading into Rome, and letters on the monument describe how many feet of frontage, and how many in depth, belong to it. The formula is, IN·FR·P. . . . IN·AG·P. . . . i.e., "In fronte pedes—": "In agro pedes—." The size of these arene varied much; some were 16 feet square, some 24 feet by 15; a square of about 125 feet each way seems to have been common; the example in Horace (*Sat.* i. 8, 12) gives us 1000 feet by 300; and some appear to have been even larger than this; one of Gruter's *Inscriptiones*, for instance, (i. 2, p. cccxcix. 1), runs, "Huic monumento cedunt agri puri jugera decem." So large a space was required, not for the mausoleum which was to be erected, but in some cases for the reception of many tombs, in others for the performance of *sacra*, which were often numerously attended (Northcote and Brownlow's *Roma Sotterranea*, pp. 47 f.).

On a monument or a boundary stone of the area was engraved a formula indicating that this plot was not to pass to the heirs of him who set it apart for sepulture. This was generally H·M·H·N·S. i.e., "Hoc monumentum haeredes non acquiritur" (Orelli's *Inscriptiones*, No. 4379). The corresponding Greek form was, "τοῖς κληρονόμοις μου οὐκ ἐπακολουθήσει τοῦτο τὸ μνημεῖον" (Pösch's *Corpus Inscriptionum*, No. 3270).

In the Roman catacombs care has evidently been taken lest the subterranean excavations should transgress the limits of the *area* on the surface (Northcote, u.s. 48).

This reverence of the Roman law for burial-places enabled the early Christians, except in times of persecution or popular tumult, to preserve their sepulchres inviolate. The areas about the tombs of martyrs were especially so preserved, where meetings for worship were held, and churches frequently built. Tertullian (*Ad Scapul.* 3) tells us that when Hilarianus, a persecutor, had issued an edict against the formation of such arene, the result was that the arene (threshing-floors) of the heathen lacked corn the following year. So the *Acta Proconsularia* of the trial of Felix (in Baronius, ann. 314 § 24) speak of the arene, "where you Christians make prayers" (ubi orationes facitis). These arene were frequently named from some well-known person buried there; thus St. Cyprian is said to have been buried "in area Candidi Procuratoris" (*Acta Mart. S. Cypriani* in Ducange's *Glossary* s. v.). In the *Gesta Purgationis Caeciliani* (*Ibid.*), certain citizens are said to have been shut up "in area martyrum," where, perhaps, a church is intended. Compare CEMETERY, MARTYRIUM.

II. The court in front of a church [ATRIUM.] (Bingham's *Antiquities*, viii. 3 § 5.) [C.]

**ARELATENSE CONCILIUM.** [ARLES.]

**ARETHAS** and companions, martyrs, commemorated Oct. 24 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**ARGEUS**, martyr, commemorated Jan. 2 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ARICION**, of Nicomedia, commemorated June 23 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**ARIMINENSE CONCILIUM.** [RIMINI.]

**ARISTARCHUS**, disciple of Apostles, commemorated Aug. 4 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); "Apostle," April 15 [14, Neale], (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**ARISTIDES**, of Athens, commemorated Aug. 31 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ARISTION**, one of the Seventy Disciples of Christ, commemorated Oct. 17 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ARISTOBULUS**, "Apostle," commemorated Oct. 31 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**ARISTON**, and others, martyrs, commemorated July 2 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ARISTONICUS**, martyr, commemorated April 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ARISTONIPPUS**, commemorated Sept. 3 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**ARISTUS**, commemorated Sept. 3 (*Mart. Bedae*). [C.]

**ARLES, COUNCILS OF (ARELATENSIA CONCILIA).**—I. A. D. 314, summoned by the Emperor Constantine to try afresh the cause of the Donatists against Caecilian, Bishop of Carthage,—a cause "de Sancti Coelestisque Numinis cultu et fide Catholica;" because the former complained that the judgment given at Rome in 313 by the Pope and certain Gallic bishops (whom Constantine had appointed to try the case there), was an unfair one. The emperor accordingly summoned other bishops, from Sicily, Italy (not the Bishop of Rome, he having been one of the former judges), the Gauls (which include Britain), and Africa itself, to the number of 200 according to St. Augustin, to come to Arles by August 1 to retry the case. The sum-



mons to Chrestus of Syracuse (Mansi, ii. 466, 467, from Euseb. x.) desires him to bring two presbyters and three servants with him at the public expense. And the letter of Constantine to the *Vicarius Africae* (ib. 463-465) claims it as the emperor's duty to see that such contentions are put an end to. The sentence of the Council, adverse to the Donatists, is likewise to be enforced by the civil power (*Rescript. Constant. post Synodum*, ib. 477, 478). But Constantine in the same letter expressly disclaims all appeal to himself from the "judicium sacerdotum" (ib. 478). The Synod also announces its judgment and its canons to Pope Sylvester, in order that "per te potissimum omnibus insinuari," regretting also the absence of their "frater dilectissimus," who probably would have passed a severer sentence. The canons begin with one enacting that the observance of Easter shall be "uno die et tempore," the Bishop of Rome "juxta consuetudinem" to make the day known. They include also among other regulations a prohibition of the rebaptizing of heretics if they had been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity; an exhortation ("consilium") to those whose wives had been guilty of adultery, not to marry another "viventibus uxoribus;" a requirement to the consecration of a bishop of eight bishops, if possible, but of three at the least; and a condemnation of those "sacerdotes et Levitae," who do not abstain from their wives. The Council was purely a Western one, and of the emperor's selection, although St. Augustine (*De Bapt. cont. Donat.*, ii. 9, and elsewhere) calls it "universal." Among the signatures to it, according to the most authentic list, are the well-known ones of, "Eborius Episcopus de civitate Eboracensi provincia Britannia; Restitutus Episcopus de civitate Londinensi provincia superscripta; Adelfius Episcopus de civitate Colonia Londinensium" (i. e. probably, Col. Legionensium i. e. Caerleon on Usk); "exinde Sacerdos presbyter, Arminius diaconus" (Mansi, ib. 476, 477). There were present, according to this list, 33 bishops, 13 presbyters, 23 deacons, 2 readers, 7 exorcists, besides 2 presbyters and 2 deacons to represent Pope Sylvester.

II. A.D. 353, of the Gallic bishops, summoned by the Emperor Constans to condemn the person of St. Athanasius (but without discussing doctrine) under penalty of exile if they refused, Paulinus, Bishop of Trèves, being actually exiled for refusing (Sulp. Sever., ii.; Hilar., *Libell. ad Constant.*; and Mansi, iii. 231, 232).

III. A.D. 452, called the second, which compiled and reissued 56 canons of other recent Gallic Councils respecting discipline (Mansi, vii. 875). Possibly there had been another in 451 (Id. ib. 873).

IV. A.D. 455, commonly called the third, provincial, determined the dispute between Bishop Theodorus and Faustus abbat of Lerins, by decreeing that the right of ordination, and of giving the chrism, &c., pertain to the bishop, but the jurisdiction over laymen in the monastery to the abbat (Mansi, vii. 907).

V. A.D. 463, provincial, convened by Leontius, Archbishop of Arles, to oppose Mamertinus, Archbishop of Vienne, who had encroached upon the province of Arles (Mansi, vii. 951, from St. Hilary's *Epist.*).

VI. A.D. 475, provincial, under the same Leontius, to condemn the error of "predestination."

The books of Faustus, *De Gratia Dei*, &c., were written to express the sense of the Council, and the Augustinians condemned it as semi-Pelagian (Mansi, vii. 1007).

VII. A.D. 524, commonly called the fourth, provincial, among other canons on discipline, appointed 25 as the age for deacons' orders, and 30 for priests' (Mansi, viii. 625).

VIII. A.D. 554, commonly called the fifth, provincial, chiefly to reduce monasteries to obedience to their bishop (Mansi, ix. 702).

IX. A.D. 813, under Charlemagne, enacted 26 canons respecting discipline, and among others, that the Bishop "circumeat parochiam suam semel in anno" (c. 17), and that "Comites, judices, seu reliquus populus, obedientes sint Episcopo, et invicem consentiant ad justitias faciendas" (c. 13; Mansi, xiv. 55). [A. W. H.]

ARMARIUS, in monastic establishments, the precentor and keeper of the church books. Armarius is continually used by Bernard (in *Ordine Cluniacensi*, &c.) for Cantor and Magister Cereemoniarum.\* [J. H.]

ARMENIA, COUNCIL OF.—A council was held in Armenia, simultaneously with another at Antioch, A.D. 435, condemning the works of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and Diodorus of Tarsus, lately translated into the language of Armenia and circulated there (Mansi, v. 1179). [E. S. F.]

ARMOGASTES, confessor, commemorated March 29 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

ARMORICA, COUNCIL IN, A.D. 555, to excommunicate Maclou, Bishop of Vannes, who had renounced tonsure and celibacy on the death of his brother Chanao, Count of Brittany (Greg. Tur., *Hist.* iv. 4; Mansi, ix. 742). [A. W. H.]

ARNULPHUS, confessor, Aug. 16 (*Mart. Bedae*); July 18 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

ARONTIUS, commemorated Aug. 27 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

ARRIANUS, martyr, commemorated Dec. 14 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

ARRHAE, OR ARRAE SPONSALITIAE, also *Arrhabo*, *Arrabo*, earnest money on betrothal. The practice of giving earnest money on betrothal, of which traces are to be found in all parts of the world, has its root evidently in the view, common yet to many savage races, of marriage as the mere sale of a wife, to which betrothal stands in the relation of contract to delivery.

Among the Jews, as will be seen from Selden's treatise, *De Uxore Hebraica* (Book ii. cc. 1, 2, 3, 4), betrothal was strictly a contract of purchase for money or money's worth (although two other forms were also admitted); the coin used being, however, the smallest that could be had. The earnest was given either to the wife herself, or to her parents. It could not be of forbidden things or things consecrated to priestly use, or things unlawfully owned, unless such as might have been taken from the woman herself; but a lawfully given earnest was sufficient to constitute betrothal without words spoken. In

\* Praeceptor et Armarius: Armarii nomen obtinuit, eo quod in ejus manu solet esse Bibliotheca, quae et in alio nomine *Armarius* appellatur.—*Ducange*.

strict consistency with the view of marriage as a purchase by the man, it was held that the giving of earnest by the woman was void. And when, at a later period, the use of the ring as a symbol of the earnest crept into Jewish betrothals from Gentile practice, so carefully was the old view preserved that a previous formal inquiry had to be made of two witnesses, whether the ring offered was of equal value with a coin.

The first legal reference among the Romans to the *arrha* on betrothal, and the only one in the *Digest*, belongs to the 3rd century,—i.e. to a period when the Roman world was already to a great extent permeated by foreign influences,—at this time chiefly Oriental. It occurs in a passage from Paulus, who flourished under Alexander Severus, 223–235 (*Dig.* 23. tit. 2. s. 38). The jurist lays it down that a public functionary in a province cannot marry a woman from that province, but may become betrothed to her; and that if, after he has given up his office, the woman refuses to marry him, she is only bound to repay any earnest-money she has received,—a text which, it will be observed, applies in strictness only to provincial functionaries, and may thus merely indicate the existence of the practice among subject nations. Certain it is that the chapter of the *Digest* on betrothals (*De Sponsalibus*, 23. tit. 1) says not a word of the *arrha*; Ulpian in it expressly states that “bare consent suffices to constitute betrothal,” a legal position on which the stage betrothals in Plautus supply an admirable comment.

About eighty years later, however—at a time when the northern barbarians had already given emperors to Rome—the *arrha* appears in full development. Julius Capitolinus—who wrote under Constantine—in his life of Maximinus the younger (killed 313), says that he had been betrothed to Junia Fadella, who was afterwards married to Toxotius, “but there remained with her royal *arrhae*, which were these, as Junius Cordus relates from the testimony of those who are said to have examined into these things, a necklace of nine pearls, a net of eleven emeralds, a bracelet with a clasp of four jacinths, besides golden and all regal vestments, and other insignia of betrothal.”<sup>a</sup> Ambrose indeed (346–397) speaks only of the symbolical ring in relating the story of St. Agnes, whom he represents as replying to the Governor of Rome, who wished to marry her to his son, that she stands engaged to another lover, who has offered her far better adornments, and given her for earnest the ring of his affiance (et annulo fidei suae subarrhavit me, *Ep.* 34). To a contemporary of Ambrose, Pope Julius I. (336–352) is ascribed a decree that if any shall have espoused a wife or given her earnest (si quis desponsaverit uxorem vel subarrhaverit) his brother or other near kinsman may not marry her (Labbe and Mansi, *Concil.* ii. 1266). About a century later, the word *arrha* is used figuratively in reference to the Annunciation, considered as a betrothal, by Peter Chrysologus, Archbishop of Ravenna in 433, as quoted by Du Cange, in *verbo*.

In the days of Justinian, we see from the Code

that the earnest-money was a regular element in Byzantine betrothal. It was given to the intended bride or those who acted for her, and was to be repaid in the event of the death of either party (*Cod.* 5. tit. 1. s. 3, Law of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, A.D. 380), or of breach of promise by the woman; in the latter case, indeed, the woman *sui juris*, or the father, mother, grandfather or great-grandfather of one under age having to pay an equal additional sum by way of penalty; though a woman under age was only bound to simple repayment, as was also the case in the event of any unlawful marriage, or of the occurrence of some cause unknown at the time of betrothal which might dispense the woman from fulfilling her promise. The fourfold penalty of the earlier law was still, by the one now quoted, made exigible by special contract (*Ibid.* 5, Law of Leo and Anthemius, A.D. 469). Simple restitution was sufficient in case, after betrothal, either party chose to embrace a religious life (1. tit. 3. s. 56; Nov. 123, c. xxxix.); or in case of diversity of religious faith between the betrothed, if discovered or occurring after betrothal, but not otherwise (*Code*, 1. tit. 4. s. 16, law of Leo and Anthemius, A.D. 469).

It is difficult not to seek for the reason of this development of the *arrha* within the Roman or Byzantine world of the 6th century in some foreign influence. Accordingly, if we turn to the barbarian races which overran the empire from the end of the 4th century, we find almost everywhere the prevalence of that idea of wife-buying, which is the foundation of the betrothal earnest; see for instance in Canciani, *Leges Barbarorum Antiquae*, vol. ii. 85, the (reputed) older text of the Salic law, tit. 47, as to the purchase of a widow for three *solidi* and a *denarius*, vol. iii. 17, 18, 22; the *Burgundian Law*, titles xii. 1 and 3, xiv. 3, and xxxiv. 2; vol. v. 49, 50; the *Saxon Law*, titles vi. 1, 2, 3, xii. xviii. 1, 2, &c., or (in the volume of the *Record Commission*) our own *Laws of Ethelbert*, 77, 83; *Ine*, 31. And in the regions overspread by the Frankish tribes in particular, the *arrha*, as a money payment, is visible as a legal element in betrothal. Gregory of Tours (544–595) repeatedly refers to it (i. 42; iv. 47; x. 16).

In the earlier writers there is nothing to connect the betrothal earnest with a religious ceremony. Nor need we be surprised at this, when we recollect that, in the early ages of Christianity, marriage itself was held by the Roman world as a purely civil contract; so that Tertullian, enumerating those ceremonies of heathen society which a Christian might innocently attend, writes that “neither the virile robe, nor the ring, nor the marriage-bond (neque annulus, aut conjunctio maritalis) flows from any honour done to an idol” (*De idolol.*, c. 16). And indeed the opinion has been strongly held, as Augusti points out, whilst disclaiming it, that church betrothals did not obtain before the 9th century. The earliest mention of a priestly benediction upon the *sponsi* appears to occur in the 10th canon of the Synod of Reggio, A.D. 850 (see Labbe and Mansi, *Concil.* xiv. p. 934); and it is not impossible that that confusion between the *sponsus* and *maritus*, the *sponsa* and *uxor*, was then already creeping into middle age Latin, which has absolutely prevailed in French, where

<sup>a</sup> A few words of the above passage have greatly exercised commentators.

*sponsa, sponsa*, are synonymous with *marit* and *femina* in the sense of *uxor*. In a contemporary document, the reply of Pope Nicolas I. (858-867) to the consultation of the Bulgarians, the question whether betrothal was a civil or religious ceremony remains undecided; but as he professes to exhibit to them "a custom which the holy Roman Church has received of old, and still holds in such unions," his testimony, though half a century later than the death of Charlemagne, deserves to be here recorded, bearing witness as it does expressly to the betrothal earnest.

"After betrothal," he says, "which is the promised bond of future marriage, and which is celebrated by the consent of those who enter into this, and of those in whose authority they are, and after the betrother hath betrothed to himself the betrothed with earnest by marking her finger with the ring of alliance, and the betrother hath handed over to her a dower satisfactory to both, with a writing containing such contract, before persons invited by both parties, either at once or at a fitting time (to wit, in order that nothing of the kind be done before the time prescribed by law) both proceed to enter into the marriage bond. And first, indeed, they are placed in the Church of the Lord with the oblations which they ought to offer to God by the hand of the priest, and thus finally they receive the benediction and the heavenly garment."

It will be seen from the above passage that whilst Pope Nicolas recognises distinctly the practice of betrothal by *arrha*, symbolized through the ring, yet the only benediction which he expressly mentions is the nuptial, not the sponsal one.

It has been doubted in like manner whether church betrothals were practiced at this period in the Greek Church, and whether the form of betrothal in the Greek Euchologium is not of late insertion. That at the date of the last quoted authority, or say in the middle of the 9th century, the Greek ceremonies appertaining to marriage differed already from the Roman appears from the text of Pope Nicolas himself; his very object being to set forth the custom of the Roman Church in contrast to that of the Greek (*consuetudinem quam Græci in nuptialibus contuberniis habere dicunt*). Now the striking fact in reference to the form of the Euchologium is that in it the earnest or *ἀρραβών* is not a mere element in betrothal, but, as with the Jews, actually constitutes it—a practice so characteristic that it can hardly be supposed to flow otherwise than from ancient usage. Here, in fact, the words *ἀρραβών, ἀρραβών (εἶδος)*, can only be translated "betrothal," "betrothing." The formula, repeated alternately by the man and the woman, runs: "So and so, the servant of God, betroths to himself (*ἀρραβών (εἶδος)*) this handmaid of God in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, now and ever, and world without end. Amen." The prayer is in like manner: "Look upon this Thy servant and this thine handmaid, and confirm their betrothal (*εὐαγγελίζου τὸν ἀρραβῶνα αὐτῶν*) in faith and concord, and truth, and love. For thou, Lord, didst show us to give the earnest and thereby to confirm all things." And the heading—which may indeed well be more modern—is "service for betrothal, otherwise of the earnest."

The most therefore that can be concluded on

this still doubtful subject seems to be this—1st. That the earnest-money on betrothal, symbolizing as it clearly does the barbarous custom of wife-buying, must essentially have been everywhere in the first instance a civil, not a religious act. 2. That the practice was unknown to ancient Greek and Roman civilization, and was especially foreign to the spirit of the older Roman law. 3. That it was nevertheless firmly rooted in Jewish custom, and may not improbably have passed from thence into the ritual of the Eastern Church, where, as with the Jews, the giving of earnest constitutes the betrothal. 4. That it was very generally prevalent among the barbarian tribes which overran the Roman empire, and seems from them to have passed into its customs and its laws, making its appearance in the course of the 3rd century, and becoming prominent by the 6th century in Justinian's Code, at the same time when we also find its prevalence most distinctly marked in Gaul, and as a Frankish usage. 5. That no distinct trace of it in the ceremonies of the Church can however be pointed out till the later middle age, although it may very likely have prevailed in the Eastern Church from a much earlier period.

It follows, however, from what has been said above that whatever may have lingered in later times of the betrothal *arrha* must be ascribed to very ancient usage; as in the formula quoted by Seiden from the Parochial of Erast, Archbishop of Cologne and Bishop of Liège, which includes the use, not only of the ring, but also, if possible, of red purses with three pieces of silver, "*leo arrhae sponsæ dandæ*." Our own Sarum ordinal says in reference to betrothal: "man call *arres* the rings or money or other things to be given to the betrothed by the betrother, which gift is called *arrarotha*, particularly however when it is made by gift of a ring." And the two forms of Sarum and York respectively run as follows: (Sarum) "With this ring I thee wed, and this gold and silver I thee give;" (York) "With this ring I wed thee, and with this gold and silver I honour thee, and with this gift I honour thee." The latter formula indeed recalls a direction given in one of the two oldest rituals relating to marriage given by Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiis Ritibus*, vol. ii. p. 127 (extracted from a Rennes missal, to which he ascribes about 700 years of antiquity, or say, of the 11th century), entitled, "*Ordo ad sponsam et sponsam benedicendam*," which says that "after the blessing of the ring in the name of the Holy Trinity . . . the betrother shall honour her (the betrothed) with gold or silver according to his means" (*honore aure vel argente prout poterit sponsam*).

As respects the use of the ring in betrothal, see further under RING, and also BETROTHAL. (Augusti, *Dombuchhalten*, vol. ix. 295, and foll. may be consulted, but is far from satisfactory. Bingham, *Antiquities*, book xxi. ch. iii., confounds together everything that can be confounded. Seiden, *Uxor Hebræica*, book ii., remains by far the best single source of reference.) [J. M. L.]

ARSENTIUS. (1) *δ πάππας*, May 8 (Cal. Syriac).

(2) Confessor, July 19 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(3) Martyr, commemorated Dec. 14 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ARTEMIUS.** (1) Husband of Candida, martyr, at Rome, commemorated June 6 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) Μεγαλόμερτυρ of Antioch, Oct. 20 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**ARTEMON**, commemorated Oct. 24 (*Cal. Armen.*). [C.]

**ARVERNENSE CONCILIUM.** [GALLICAN COUNCILS.]

**ASCENSION DAY:** (*Ascensio* and *Ascensa Domini*; *dies festus Ascensionis*: ἑορτὴ τῆς ἀναλήψεως; ἡ ἀνάληψις and ἡμέρα ἀναλήψιμος). This festival, assigned, in virtue of Acts i. 3, to the fortieth day after Easter-day, is not one of those which from the earliest times were generally observed. No mention of it occurs before the 4th century, unless an earlier date can be made good for the "Apostolic Constitutions," or for the passages in which mention is made of this festival—I ib. v. 19: "From the first day (Easter-day) number ye forty days to the fifth day (Thursday), and celebrate the Feast of the ἀνάληψις τοῦ Κυρίου, καθ' ἣν πλήρωσας πᾶσαν οἰκονομίαν καὶ διάταξιν ἀπῆλθε, κ. τ. λ.": viii. 33, "On what days servants are to rest from work: τὴν ἀνάληψιν ἀργεῖταισαν διὰ τὸ πέρασ τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν οἰκονομίας." Origen (*c. Cels.* viii. 362), names as holidays generally observed, besides the Lord's Day, only Parasceue (Good Friday), Pascha (Easter-day), and Pentecost. No others than these are mentioned by Tertullian. Of sermons preached on this festival, the oldest seems to be one extant only in a Latin version, ap. Sirmondi *Opp. Varia*, t. i. p. 39, which he and Valesius, on insufficient grounds, assign to Eusebius the Church historian; Cave, and later writers, to Eusebius of Emesa. Its title is *de Resurrectione et Ascensione Domini*, and the preacher dwells chiefly on the Resurrection; but the opening words show that it was preached on Ascension Day: "Laetantur quidem coeli de festicitate praesenti, in qua Dominum susceperunt victorem." Next, perhaps, in point of antiquity, is one by Epiphanius (t. ii. 285, ed. Petav.). In the opening, he complains that the greatness of this festival is not duly appreciated, though it is, to the others, what the head is to the body, the crown and completion. First, he says, is the Feast of Incarnation; second, the Theophania; third, the Passion and Resurrection. "But even this festival brought not the fulness of joy, because it still left the risen Lord fettered to this earth. The Pentecost, also, on which the Holy Ghost was communicated, contains a great, unspeakable joy. But to-day, the day of the Ascension, all is filled with joy supreme. Christ, opening highest heavens, &c." It is, of course, only with a rhetorical purpose that Pentecost is here named before Ascension. There were indeed heretics, Valentinians and Ophites (*Iren.* i. 1, 5, and 34 *ad fin.*), and other Gnostics (represented by the *Ascensio Esaias*, Aethiop.), who assigned a period of eighteen months to our Lord's sojourn on earth after the Resurrection; and besides, there are traces of a belief among the orthodox that the bodily presence of the risen Lord with his disciples, from time to time, was continued during three years and six months (*Eua. Dem. Ev.* viii. 400 B.; Browne's *Ordo Saeculorum*, p. 82 f.); but certainly the day on which the Ascension was celebrated was, in all the churches, the fortieth after Easter-day. Of

CHRIST. ANT.

about the same time, is a sermon by St. Gregory of Nyssa, remarkable for its title: *Εἰς τὴν λεγομένην τῷ ἐπιχωρίῳ τῶν Καππαδόκων ἔθει, Ἐπισωζομένην, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνάληψις τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν* I. X. Bingham, Augusti, Rheinwald, Alt, and others, explain this as ἑορτὴ τῆς ἐπισωζομένης φύσεως ἀνθρωπίνης (or ἐπὶ σωζομένη φύσει ἀνθρωπίνῃ), with reference to the crowning work of redemption in the glorification of the Manhood. The name, marked by Gregory as local to Cappadocia, is not retained in the Greek calendar, but it occurs in the title of St. Chrysostom's 19th sermon on the Statues (*ad pop. Antioch.*, t. ii. 188 Ben.), τῇ κυριακῇ τῆς Ἐπισωζομένης, αἰ. Σωζομένης. Leo Allatius (*de Domn. et Hebdom. Graecorum*, § 28), who evidently knows the designation only from these two places, says that the Sunday is the fifth after Easter, the Sunday of Ascension week. Tillemont (see the *Benedictine Praefat.* t. ii. p. xi. sqq.) infers from the place of this sermon in the series between S. 18, preached after mid-Lent, and S. 20, preached at the end of the Quadragesima, that it was delivered on Passion Sunday, 5 Lent. But Chrysostom's own recital in the first sermon *de Anna* (t. iv. 701 A.) clearly shows that the 19th sermon is later by "many days" than the 21st, preached on Easter-day: see the *Benedictine Monitum*, prefixed to the sermons on Anna, and also (for Montfaucon's final conclusion) *Vit. Chrysost.* t. xiii. 128 sqq. ed. Par. Ben. 2. Hence it appears that the Sunday Ἐπισωζομένης cannot be, as Savile (t. viii. 809) supposes, the octave of Easter, *dominica in albis*, and it seems most probable that Leo Allatius is right in making it the Sunday of Ascension week. In this case, the term Ἐπισωζομένη belongs to the Feast of Ascension. Baumgarten (*Erläut. des Christl. Alterthums*, p. 299 ap. Augusti) takes it to mean any day specially retained for solemn celebration over and above the great festivals; in this sense, or rather, perhaps, in that of "a holiday gained or secured in addition," it will be suitable to the Feast of Ascension as one of recent introduction, regarded as a welcome boon especially to servants and labourers. On the Feast itself, Chrysostom has one sermon (t. ii. 447), of uncertain date. The celebration was held ἔξω τῆς πόλεως: this, which was the established rule for Good Friday (*Serm. de Coemet. et de Cruce*, t. ii. 397), was here done on a special occasion, in honour of the martyrs whose remains the bishop Flavian had rescued from impure contact, and translated to the martyrion called Romanesia outside the walls. It does not follow that an extramural celebration or procession was the established practice at Antioch on Ascension-day, as some writers have inferred from this passage. In the sermon *de b. Philogonio*, preached 20th Dec. 386, St. Chrysostom (t. i., 497 C.), extolling the dignity of the approaching Feast of Nativity (then of recent introduction), says: "From this the Theophania and the sacred Pascha, and the Ascension, and the Pentecost have their origin. For had not Christ been born after the flesh, He had not been baptised, which is the Theophania; not crucified, which is the Pascha; had not sent the Spirit, which is the Pentecost." Here the words καὶ ἡ ἀνάληψις are clearly an interpolation. The three ancient festivals, he would say, are Theophania, Pascha, Pentecost: they require Nativity as their

L



ground. So in Serm. 1 *de Pentecoste* (t. i. 458)—also of unknown date—he enumerates as the three leading festivals, Epiphany, Pascha, Pentecost, with no mention of Nativity or of Ascension, although p. 461 he refers to the Ascension as an event: “for, ten days since, our nature ascended to the royal throne,” &c. But in another, the second *de Pentecoste* (ib. 469), he says: “Not long since we celebrated the Cross and Passion, the Resurrection, after this, the Ascension into heaven of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

On the whole, it would seem that, so far as our sources of information go, the institution of this festival, in the East, dates at earliest from the middle of the 4th century.

Nor do we find it earlier in the Western Church: there is no mention of it in Tertullian, SS. Cyprian, Ambrose, Hilary, or in the canons of the early councils. In St. Augustine's time, indeed, the usage was so well-established that he speaks of it as universal, therefore of Apostolic institution. In the Epistle to Januarius, liv. [al. cxviii.] (t. ii. 123, sqq. Ben.), he ranks it with Pascha and Pentecost. “*Illā autem quae non scripta sed tradita custodimus, quae quidem toto terrarum orbe servantur, datur intelligi vel ab ipsis Apostolis vel plenariis conciliis. . . commendata atque statuta retineri, sicuti quod Domini passio et resurrectio et ascensio in caelum, et adventus de caelo Sp. sancti, anniversaria solemnitate celebrantur,*” &c. (He does not name the Nativity, this was well understood to be of recent institution.) Beverege, *Cod. Can. Vindic.* c. ix. puts the argument thus:—“Whatever is universal in the Church must be either Apostolic or ordained by general councils; but no general council did ordain these festivals, therefore they come to us from the Apostles themselves.” On the authority of this passage of St. Augustine, liturgical writers, Martene and others, have not hesitated to conclude that the Feast of Ascension is as old as Pascha and Pentecost. In the silence of the first three centuries, we can, at most, accept the passage as testimony to matter of fact, that at the end of the 4th century Ascension-day was generally kept; as in the second of his five Ascension-sermons (261–265, t. v. 1065 sqq. Ben.), St. Augustine says, § 3, “*Ecce celebratur hodiernus dies toto orbe terrarum.*” From this time, certainly, the observance of the day was general in East and West. But it does not appear to have ranked with the highest festivals, which were Nativity, Easter, and Pentecost (*Concil. Agathense*, a. 506. can. 63, and *Aurelianense* 1, a. 511, can. 25). As a feast of secondary order, it ranked, in the Latin Church with Epiphany and St. John Baptist's-day (comp. *Concil. Agath.* can. 21). In the Eastern Church it was celebrated with solemn extra-mural processions—possibly as early as St. Chrysostom's time at Antioch, though, as before observed, this is not necessarily implied in the passage cited; in Jerusalem, to the Mount Olivet, on which the Empress Helena had erected a church. Bede says that the celebration there was almost as solemn as that of Easter; it began at midnight, and with the multitude of tapers and torches the mountain and the subjacent landscape were all ablaze (*de loc. sacr.* c. 7). Elsewhere, the procession was to the nearest hill or rising ground, from which at the same time a benediction was pronounced on the fields and

fruits of the earth. In the Western Church this procession and benediction were transferred to the Rogation-days; and when Gregory of Tours, ob. 595 (*Hist. Franc.* v. 11), speaks of the solemn processions with which Ascension-day was everywhere celebrated, perhaps he means only processions into the churches. Martene describes one such as held at Vienne, in France. The archbishop, with deacon and subdeacon, headed it: on their return to the church, they are received by all standing in the nave; two canons advance towards the cantors: Cant. *Quem quaeritis?* Canon. *Jesum qui resurrexit.* Cant. *Jam ascendit, sicut dixit.* Canon. *Alleluia.* Then all proceed into the choir, and mass is celebrated. There was also, on this day, in some churches (in others reserved for Pentecost) a service of benediction over loaves provided for the poor, and also over the new fruits of the earth.

The vigil of Ascension was kept by some as a fast, as an exception to the ancient rule, rigidly maintained by the Greeks, and long contended for by many of the Latins. “*Hoc [paschali] tempore nullius festi vigiliam jejunare vel observare jubemur, nisi Ascensionis et Pentecostes.*” (Micrologus, *de Eccl. Observat.* c. 55.) Isidore of Seville (610) (*de Eccles. Off.* c. 37) acknowledges no fast whatever between Easter and Ascension-day: he holds that all fifty days to Pentecost are days of rejoicing only; but some, he says, on the ground of our Lord's words, St. Matt. ix. 15, “*Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn,*” &c., kept fast on the eight days from Ascension to Pentecost. The extended fast of three days before Ascension, which Amalarius (*de Eccl. Off.* iv. 37) calls *triduanum vigiliae Ascens. jejunium* (apologising, as do other early liturgical writers, for that institution as an innovation upon the known ancient rule of East and West) came but slowly into general observance in the Western Church. Especially was this the case in Spain. “*Hispani, propter hoc quod scriptum est,*” says Walafrid Strabo (823) (*de rebus Eccl.* c. 28), “*‘Non possunt filii sponsi lugere quamdiu cum illis est sponsus,’ infra quinquagesimam Paschae recusantes jejunare, litanias suas post Pentecosten posuerunt, quinta, sexta et septima feriis ejusdem hebdomadis eas facientes.*” Accordingly, in the Spanish collection of the Canons, the wording of those relating to the Rogation fast is altered. In *Conc. Aurelian.* i. can. 27, the title, “*De Litiis ante asc. Domini celebrandis,*” is made, “*Ut Litaniae post Dom. asc. celebrentur;*” and in the body of the Canon, for “*Rogationes, i.e., Litanias ante asc. Dom. ab omnibus ecclesiis placuit celebrari ita ut praemisum triduanum jejunium in Dom. ascensionis festivitate solvatur,*” the Spanish codex has, “*Rog., i.e., lit. post Asc. Dom. placuit celebrari, ita ut praem. trid. jej. post Dom. asc. solemnitatem solvatur;*” and the next canon which pronounces censure “*de clericis qui ad litanias venire contempserint,*” is made to affect only clerics who refuse to come *ad officium, ad opus sacrum* generally.

The Mosarabic Order does not even recognise a vigil of Ascension, though it has one for Pentecost.

There was no octave of Ascension; the following Sunday is simply *Dominica post Ascensionem*.



(Binterim, *Die vorzüglichsten Denkw. der Christ-Kathol. Kirche*, B. v. Th. i. 253-256. Augusti, *Denkw. der Christl. Archäologie*, B. ii. 351 sqq. Rheinwald, *Die Kirchliche Archäologie*, 204 sq. Horn, *Ueber das Alter des Himmelfahrtsfestes*, in *Liturg. Journal*, v. J. H. Wagnitz, 1806.) [H. B.]

**ASCETICISM.** The difficulty of tracing the history of asceticism in the early ages of Christianity arises in part from scantiness of materials, but chiefly from the circumstance that this and the cognate terms have been used in two senses, one general, one more specific. These two significations, and this enhances the difficulty, cannot be strictly assigned to different periods, being not infrequently synchronous; nor is it always easy to distinguish one from the other merely by the context. The neglect of this important distinction and the vehemence of partisanship have complicated the controversy on the origin and growth of asceticism; some writers contending that Ascetics as an order are coeval with Christianity, some denying their existence altogether till the 4th century. Neither statement can be accepted without some qualification. The following attempt at an historical sketch of asceticism among Christians, in its earlier phases, is based on a collation of the principal passages in early Christian writers bearing on the subject.

The principle of asceticism, and this is allowed on all sides, was in force before Christianity. The Essenes, for instance, among the Jews, owed their existence as a sect to this principle. It was dominant in the oriental systems of antagonism between mind and matter. It asserted itself even among the more sensuous philosophers of Greece with their larger sympathy for the pleasurable development of man's physical energies. But the fuller and more systematic development of the ascetic life among Christians is contemporaneous with Christianity coming into contact with the Alexandrine school of thought, and exhibits itself first in a country subject to the combined influences of Judaism and of the Platonic philosophy. Indeed, the great and fundamental principle on which asceticism, in its narrower meaning rests, of a two-fold morality, one expressed in "Precepts" of universal obligation for the multitude, and one expressed in "Counsels of Perfection" intended only for those more advanced in holiness, with its doctrine that the passions are to be extirpated rather than controlled (Orig. *Ep. ad Rom.* Lib. iii.; Tertull. *de Pallio*, 7, 8; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 529, vi. 775) is very closely akin to the Platonic or Pythagorean distinction between the life according to nature and the life above nature, as well as to their doctrine of the supremacy of the contemplative above the practical life, and is more naturally deducible from this source than from any other (Porphy. *de Abstin.*; Eus. *H. E.* ii. 17). In fact the ascetics of the 3rd and 4th centuries loved the designation of philosophers (Row. *Vitae Patr.* pass.; cf. Greg. Nyss. *Orat. Catech.* 18; Soz. *H. E.* i. 13). At the same time it must be noted that the Church uttered its protests from time to time against the idea of there being anything essentially unholy in matter, and its cautions against excessive abstinence. Thus Origen insists that the Christian reason for abstinence is not that of Pythagoras (c. *Celsum* v. 264); and the so called "Apostolic Canons" (51, 53) while approving asceticism as a useful

discipline condemn the abhorrence of things in themselves innocent as if they involved any contamination (cf. Eus. *H. E.* v. 3).

During the 1st century and a half of Christianity there are no indications of ascetics as a distinct class. While the first fervour of conversions lasted, and while the Church, as a small and compact community, was struggling for existence against opposing forces on every side, the profession of Christianity was itself a profession of the ascetic spirit; in other words, of endurance, of hardihood, of constant self-denial (cf. Acts ii. 44; iv. 34, 35). Thus, even at a rather later date, Clemens of Alexandria represents Christianity as an *ἀσκησις* (*Strom.* iv. 22; cf. Minuc. Fel. *Oct.* cc. 12, 31, 36). Similarly the term is applied to any conspicuous example of fortitude or patience. Eusebius so designates certain martyrs in Palestine (*de Mart. Pal.* 10), a region into which monks, strictly so called, were not introduced till the middle of the 4th century (Hieron. *Vit. Hilar.* 14), and Clemens of Alexandria, calls the patriarch Jacob an *ἀσκητής* (*Paedagog.* i. 7). This more vague and more general use of the word appears again and again even after the formal institution of monachism. Athanasius, or whoever is the author, speaking of the sufferings of the martyr Lucian, in prison, calls him "a great ascetic" (*Synops. Scr. Sacr.*). Cyril, of Jerusalem, calls those who, like Anna the prophetess, are frequent and earnest in prayer "ascetics" (*Catech.* i. 19). Jerome applies the word to Picrius for his self-chosen poverty, and to Serapion, Bishop of Antioch (*Scr. Ecc.* 76. 41); and Epiphanius to Marcion because, prior to his lapse into heresy, he had abstained, though without any vow, from marriage (*Haer.* xlii.). Cyril of Alexandria uses *ἀσκησις* as equivalent to self-denial (in *Joan.* xiii. 35) in the same way as Chrysostom speaks of virtue as a discipline (*Hom. in Inscr. Act. Apostol.* ii. β). So far there is nothing to prove the existence of an ascetic class or order bound by rules not common to all Christians.

For about a century subsequent to 150 A.D. there begin to be traces of an asceticism more sharply defined and occupying a more distinct position; but not as yet requiring its votaries to separate themselves entirely from the rest of their community. Athenagoras speaks of persons habitually abstaining from matrimony (*Apol. pro Chr.* xxviii. 129; cf. Irenaeus ap. Eus. *H. E.* v. 241; cf. Dionys. Alexandr.). Eusebius mentions devout persons, ascetics, but not an order, who ministered to the poor (*de Mart. Pal.* cc. 10, 11), and calls Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem, an "ascetic" (*H. E.* vi. 9). Tertullian uses the term "exercitati" or disciplined, (*de Puercr.* 14), but, apparently in reference to students of Holy Scripture. Clemens of Alexandria styles the ascetics *ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτοτέροι* "more elect than the elect" (*Hom. "Quis Dives?"* 36; cf. *Strom.* viii. 15); and Epiphanius in a later century speaks of monks as *οἱ σπουδαῖοι* or "the earnest" (*Expos. Fid.* 22; cf. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 11), just as the word "religious" came in the middle ages to be restricted to those who devoted themselves to a life of more than ordinary strictness. This increasing reverence for austerities as such is seen in most of the sects, which were prominent in the 2nd century; only with the exaggeration which usually characterises move-

ments of the kind. The Montanists prescribed a rigorous asceticism, not for their more zealous disciples only, but for all indiscriminately. The Syrian Gnostics, the followers of Saturninus and Basilides, the Encratitae, the disciples of Cerdo and Marcion in Asia Minor and Italy, all carried the notion of there being an inherent pollution in the material world, and of it being the positive duty of Christians to shun all contact with it, to an extent which left even the Church doctrine of asceticism far behind (Iren. *adv. Haer.* i. 24; Epiphan. *Haer.* 23). How far their practice corresponded with theory is doubtful. The proneness of human nature to a reaction into excessive laxity after excessive austerities hardly admits of exception, and gives probability to the allegations made by the orthodox writers of flagrant licentiousness in some cases.

The middle of the 3rd century marks an era in the development of Christian asceticism. Antony, Paul, Ammon, and other Egyptian Christians not content, as the ascetics before them, to lead a life of extraordinary strictness and severity in towns and villages, aspired to a more thorough estrangement of themselves from all earthly ties; and by their teaching and example led very many to the wilderness, there to live and die in almost utter seclusion from their fellows. The Great Decian persecution was probably the immediate occasion of this exodus from the cities into the desert; not only by driving many to take refuge in the desert, but by exciting a spirit which longed to emulate the self-renunciation of the martyrs and confessors. But it was probably the influence of the Alexandrine teaching, as has been already suggested, which had fostered the longing to escape altogether from the contaminations and persecutions of an evil world. It was no longer, as in earlier days, only or chiefly from external enemies that a devout Christian felt himself in danger. As Christianity widened the circle of its operations, it became inevitably less discriminating as to the character of those who were admitted into the community; and the gradual intrusion of a more secular spirit, among Christians, first forced those who were more thoroughly in earnest to aim at a stricter life in the world, and then thrust them out of the world altogether. Eusebius bears witness to this Alexandrine influence on Christian asceticism in a remarkable comparison of the ascetics of his own creed with the Therapeutae in Egypt (*H. E.* ii. 17; Soz. *H. E.* i. 13). There seems to have been something in the climate and associations of Egypt (as in Syria) which predisposed men thus to abdicate the duties and responsibilities belonging to active life. The exact position which these Therapeutae occupied is uncertain. Probably they were in existence prior to Christianity; are not to be confounded with the Essenes; but were chiefly, though not exclusively, Jews. From Philo's account (*de Vitâ Contempl.* pp. 892-4) it seems clear, at any rate, that this manner of life resembled in many respects that of the Christian ascetics in the desert. They dwelt in separate cells not far from one another; renounced their possessions; practised fastings and other austerities; and devoted themselves partly to contemplation, and in part to study. In this last point their example was not imitated by their Christian anti-types in Egypt. They seem to have been imbued with the mystical spirit of

Alexandria. Their name signifies that they gave themselves either to serve God, or, more probably, to cultivate their own souls and those of their disciples. (*Eus. H. E.* ii. 17.)

Hitherto Christian asceticism has been individualistic in its character. About the middle of the 4th century it begins to assume a corporate character. Naturally, as the number of recluses increased, the need was felt of organisation. Pachomius is generally regarded as the first to form a "Coenobium," that is an association of ascetics dwelling together under one supreme authority (Hieron. *Reg. Pach.*; cf. Graveson *Hist. Eccl.* i. 116). A fixed rule of conduct and a promise to observe the rule were the natural consequences of forming a society. But the exaction of an irrevocable and lifelong vow belongs to a later phase of asceticism. James of Nisibis speaks of ascetics practising a rigid celibacy (*Serm.* 6tus). The term ascetic begins now to be nearly equivalent to monastic. The so-called "Apostolical Constitutions," which are generally assigned to this period, enumerate "ascetics," but not "monks" among orders of Christians (13). The λόγος ἀσκητικὸς of Basil of Caesarea is on the monastic life. So ἀσκησις is used by Palladius (*Hist. Laus.* Proem. c. 46, &c.); in canons of the Council of Gangra against excessive asceticism (12, 13), and by Athanasius in his life of Antony. Athanasius calls the two disciples who waited on Antony ἀσκούμενοι, "learning to be ascetics." Ἀσκητηρίον in Socrates (*H. E.* iv. 23) means what is now called a monastery; ἀσκητικὴ καλυβή, a monastic cell (Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 25). At that time μοναστηρίον was, as the word literally expresses, a separate cell; ἀσκητηρίον a common dwelling-place under the rule of a superior, in which those who desired, according to the idea of the age, a yet higher stage of perfection, might be trained and disciplined for absolute seclusion (Greg. Naz. *Or.* xx. 359). In the middle ages the word "asceterium" was altered into "arcisterium" or "archisterium" (*Du Cange*, s. vocc.).

In the beginning of the 6th century the widows and virgins who were officially recognised as such, are designated ἀσκητρίαι (Justinian, *Novell.* cxxiii. 43). At a later period the word means a nun: and is the Greek equivalent for "sanctimonialis," or "monialis" (Phot. *Nomocan.* Tit. ix. 1 p. 207). Ἀσκητρίος is a later form for ἀσκητής.

The history of asceticism, after the institution of monastic societies belongs to the history of MONASTICISM. There it will be seen with what marvellous rapidity this development of Christian asceticism spread far and wide from the deserts of the Thebaid and Lower Egypt; how Basil, Jerome, Athanasius, Augustine, Ambrose, were foremost among its earliest advocates and propagators, and how Cassian, Columbanus, Benedict and others crowned the labours of their predecessors by a more elaborate organisation. It is enough here to endeavour to trace the gradual and almost imperceptible process by which asceticism, from being the common attribute of Christianity, became in course of time the distinctive speciality of a class within the Christian community.

(Besides the writers quoted already, see Bingham, *Origines*, bk. vii. Paleotimo, *Summa Antiquitatum*, lib. vii. Gluck's *Atteserrae Origines Rei Monasticae*. Mamachi, *Costumi dei primitivi*

*Christiani. Dissertatio de Ascetis prof. J. Jar. Nis. Seren. vi. Claudii Balmasti Ratione in Tertull. de Pallio.* [I. G. E.]

**ASCHAIMENSE CONCILIIUM.**—A council was held, A.D. 783, at Aschheim, under Tassilo II., Duke of Bavaria, that passed 15 decrees on discipline. [E. S. F.]

**ASCLEPIADES**, bishop and martyr, commemorated Oct. 18 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ASH WEDNESDAY.** [LEST.]

**ASIATICUM CONCILIIUM.**—A council was held, A.D. 245, in Asia Minor against Noetus, but at what place is uncertain. [E. S. F.]

**ASINARI** (Tertull. *Apol.* c. xvi.), a term of reproach against the early Christians. That the Jews worshipped an ass, or the head of an ass, was a current belief in many parts of the Gentile world. Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 4) says that there was a consecrated image of an ass in the temple, the reason for this special honour being that a herd of wild asses had been the means of guiding the Jews, when they were in the desert, to springs of water. Plutarch (*Sympos.* iv. 5, 2) tells virtually the same story. Diodorus Siculus says (*lib. xxiv. Frag.*) that Antiochus Epiphanes found in the temple a stone image representing a man sitting upon an ass; but on the other hand Josephus (*c. Apion.* ii. c. 7) adduces the fact that no such image had been found in the temple by any conqueror as an argument for the groundlessness of the calumny.

The same belief appears to have prevailed in reference to the early Christians. It is mentioned by both Tertullian (*Ad Nat.* i. 14; *Apol.* xvi.) and Minucius Felix (*Octav.* 9 and 28), but, though referred to in later times, appears to have died out in the course of the 3rd century. (The fact mentioned by Serretus, *De Trin. Error.* c. 15, that he heard the same reproach made by the Turks against the Christians in Africa is probably to be connected with the mediæval "Festival of the Ass" rather than with the earlier calumny.)

The origin of the reproach has been a subject of various speculations:—(1) It has been considered to have arisen somewhere in the Gentile world, and to have been applied to the Jews before the Christian era. On this hypothesis various explanations of it have been given. Morinus (*De Cyprio Amiano Deo Christiano*, Dordrecht, 1620) thought that there was a confusion between the two words *Chomer* (חומר), which is used (?) for the "pot" of manna in the temple, and *Chomer* (חומר), which means a "wild ass," and that this confusion was confirmed by the appearance of the pot of manna with its two large ears. Haasius (*De Idololatria olim Judæis et Christianis impartita*, Erfurt, 1716) thought that the use among the Jews (?) more probably late Samaritans) of the word "Ashma" (= "name") for the more sacred word "Jehovah" may have suggested the perversion "asina" to the Roman writers; and Heinsius (*De Laude Amm.* p. 186, ed. 1646) thought that the *aspidæ* which the Jews were reputed to worship ("nil præter asbes et cæli numen adorant," *Juv. Sat.* xiv. 97) was corrupted into *ass*. (2) It has been considered to have arisen in Egypt, and on this hypothesis two explanations have been given. Tanaquil Faber (*Ægypt.* i. 4) thought that it was a corrup-

tion from the name of Onias, who built a Jewish temple at Heliopolis; and Bochart (*Hieroglyphic.* l. 2, c. 18) thought that the Egyptians willfully perverted the expression "Pi iso" (= "mouth of God") into "Piso," which in an Egyptian vocabulary edited by Kircher signifies "ass." (3) It has been viewed as a calumny of the Jews against the Christians, which was reflected back upon the Jews themselves. In favour of this view it is urged that Tertullian distinctly speaks of it as a Jewish calumny; and against it is the prevalence of the story in writers whom a Jewish calumny, however industriously spread, would hardly reach. (4) It has been regarded as having originated from the use of the ass as a symbol by some Gnostic sects. That the ass was thus used is clear from the statement of Epiphanius (*c. Hæres.* 28, 10; see also Origen, *c. Col.* vi. 9).

Between these various hypotheses it is hardly possible, in the absence of further evidence, to make a choice; the question must be left undecided. A slight additional interest has been given to it by the discovery at Rome, in 1856, on a wall under the western angle of the Palatine, of a *graffito*, which forcibly recalls the story mentioned by Tertullian. The apologist's words are (*Ad Nat.* i. 14)—"super quidam perditissimus in ista civitate, etiam suas religiosas deos, solo detrimento cutis Judæus . . . picturam in nos propositis sub ista proscriptio ONOCOETES. Is erat asinus canterorum at in toga, cum libro, altero pede ungulato. Ea credidit vulgus infami Judæus." The *graffito* in question represents an almost similar caricature, evidently directed against some Christian convert of the 2nd century. Upon a cross is a figure with a human body wearing an *intercus*, but with an ass's head. On one side is another figure lifting up his head, possibly in the attitude of prayer. Underneath is written ALEXAMENON SEBETE SEON ("Alexamenos is worshipping God"). The form of the letters points to the *graffito* having been written towards the end of the 2nd century, about the very time at which Tertullian wrote (see P. Garrucci's article, with a copy of the *graffito*, in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, serie 3, vol. iv. p. 529). This *graffito* is now preserved in the library of the Collegio Romano in Rome. [E. H.]

**ASPERGILLUM.** The brush or twig used for sprinkling Holy Water [HOLY WATER]. It anciently was, or was said to be, of hyssop, a plant supposed to possess cleansing virtues, from its use in the Mosaic law, and the well-known reference to it in the 51st Psalm. Thus, in the Gregorian Sacramentary (p. 148) the bishop in the consecration of a church, sprinkles the altar seven times with hyssop. The modern French name *Goupil* indicates that a fox's brush was some time used as an *aspergillum*. (*Goupil* for *Vulpicula*, DuCange's *Glossary*, a. v.) [C.]


**ASPERSION.** [ASPERSION.]

**ASS, WORSHIP OF THE.** [ASINARI.]

**ASSUMPTION OF THE VIRGIN MARY.** [MARY THE VIRGIN, FESTIVAL OF.]

**ASTERISCUS** (sometimes called *Stellula* by Latin writers). To prevent the veil from disturbing the particles arranged on the discus or paten, in preparation for the celebration of the Eucharist, St. Chrysostom is said to have invented two small arches to support it. These, when

placed so as to cross each other, resembled a star, and hence were called ἀστήρ or ἀστήρισκος, the star; hence the priest, placing it over the paten, is directed to say, "And the star came and stood over where the young child was." In modern times the arches are riveted together at the point of intersection, but so loosely as to admit of one arch being turned within the other for convenience of carriage. See woodcut. (Neale, *Eastern Church, Introd.* 350; Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, iv. 336, 390.) [C.]



Asteriscus.

**ASTERIUS**, martyr, commemorated March 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**ASTORGA, COUNCIL OF (ASTURICENSE CONCILIUM)**, A.D. 446, condemned certain Manichees, or Priscillianists (Cave; Mansi, vi. 490; but omitted by Labbe). [A. W. H.]

**ASTROLOGERS.** No element of heathenism was more difficult to eradicate than the belief that the stars in their courses influenced the lives of men, and that the destinies of individuals and of nations might be foretold by those who studied their combinations. Under the names of *Chaldaei* (as representing those who were more famous than any other people of the ancient world for their devotion to this study), *Mathematici* (in popular language this had become the exclusive meaning of the word), *Apotelesmatici* (as dealing with the ἀποτελεσμαματα, or influences of the stars), *Genethliaci* (as casting horoscopes of the positions of the planets at the hour of birth), they were to be found in every city of the empire. They became on many grounds objects of suspicion to its police. They were cheats and impostors; they brought in the foreign, eastern superstitions of which Roman magistrates stood in dread; they might at any time play into the hands of political rivals by predicting their success as the favourites of heaven. The annals of the empire accordingly present a series of edicts against them. They were banished from Rome by Agrippa and Augustus (Dion. Cass. xlix. 43, lvi. 25), by Tiberius (Tacit. *Ann.* ii. 32; Sueton. *Tiber.* c. 36), by Claudius (Tacit. *Ann.* xii. 52), by Vitellius (Sueton. *Vitell.* 14). The frequent repetition of the measure shews how ineradicable was the evil. Sometimes the emperor himself, Vespasian, in his eager ambition (Tacit. *Hist.* ii. 78), Domitian, in his restless suspicion, yielded to their influence. Otho's murder of Galba had been prompted by their counsels. Over the minds of most men, and yet more, of women, they exercised an unbounded sway (Juven. vi. 553-568), often in proportion to the notoriety which they had gained by being mixed up in political or other mysteries, and were on that account expelled from the city.

Christian feeling was opposed to the practice

on other grounds. It belonged to the system of demon-worship and lying magic, which Scripture had forbidden. The astrologer was a child of the devil. His art had come down from the Egyptians and Chaldaeans (Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 16, p. 132). It substituted the idea of destiny for that of the providence of God, and tampered with the sense of responsibility by leading men to impute their vices to the stars. (August. *de Civ. Dei*, v. 1; Tract. in *Ps.* lxi.; *de Mathem.*; Greg. Nyss. *Ep. contr. Fatum*; Tertull. *de Idol.* c. ix. p. 156.) Some teachers pointed to the case of Esau and Jacob, born in the same hour yet with such different destinies, as a proof that the system was false (August. *de Doctr. Christ.* ii. 21). Some conceding that the heathen world was subject to these influences, favourable or malignant, held that baptism placed men in another region in which they were set, and that the "new birth" annulled the horoscope that was cast for the first nativity. The action of the Church was in accordance with the teaching of its chief writers. The burning of the books of those who used "curious arts" in Acts xix. 19, served as a precedent. *Mathematici* were to give up their books to the bishop, or to burn them (*Constit. Apost.* i. 4). Clergy of all orders were forbidden to practise the art under pain of excommunication (C. Laod. c. 36). In two or three instances the operation of the laws connects itself with memorable names. Aquila, the translator of the Old Testament, was said to have been expelled from the Church on the charge of being an astrologer (Epiphan. *de Mens. et Pond.* § xv. t. ii. p. 171, but the narrative is hardly more than a legend). Eusebius, of Emesa, had to contend against the suspicions to which his love of science exposed him, that he was addicted to the μέρος ἀποτελεσματικὸν of astrology (Sozom. *H. E.* iii. 6). It was one of the crimes imputed to the Priscillianists of Spain that they had revived the old superstitions of the *Mathematici*, and had taught men that the several parts of their body were under the control of the signs of the zodiac (August. *de Haer.* lxx.) [E. H. P.]

**ASTURICENSE CONCILIUM. [ASTORGA.]**

**ASYLUM. [SANCTUARY.]**

**ASYNCRITUS**, "Apostle," commemorated April 8 (*Cal. Byz.*). [C.]

**ATHANASIUS** (1) Bishop of Alexandria; *Natale* commemorated Jan. 18 (*Cal. Byzant.*); Jan. 26 and June 6 (*Armen.*); May 2 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); Dec. 20 (*Mart. Bedae*); translation, May 2 (*Cal. Byzant.*); commemorated Maskarram 13 = Sept. 16, and Ginbot 7 = May 2 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(2) Presbyter, Oct. 11 (*Mart. Bedae, Hieron.*).

**ATHEISTS** (ἄθεοι), a name of reproach which was applied to the early Christians. The absence of material symbols of the Deity, of sacrifice, of temples, and of almost all the external observances which constituted the religion of contemporary heathendom, naturally induced a popular cry that Christianity was a new form of atheism. The cry was repeated by Jews as well as by Gentiles (see Justin Mart. c. *Tryph.* cviii.). It was a leading cause of the general animosity against the Christians and the apologists were at some pains to refute it (see especially Athenag. *Legat. pro Christ.* 3 and 4). The following are the



chief allusions to the calumny outside the writings of the apologists:—Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 15) tells us that the formula in which Polycarp was desired by the proconsul to abjure his faith was *ἀπερὸς θεῶν*. Dion Cassius (lrvii. 14) relates that Flavius Clemens, the uncle of Domitian, whom some writers have identified with Clemens Romanus, and who was no doubt a Christian, was put to death for *atheism*. Lucian (*Alexand. Pseud.* c. 25, cf. c. 38) says that Pontus was full *ἀθεῶν καὶ Χριστιανῶν*. Even so late as the 4th century we find Licinius accusing Constantine of having embraced *τὴν ἄθεον δόξαν* (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* c. 15); and Julian summed up his objections to Christianity when he described it as *ἄθεότης* (Julian, *Ep. ad Arsac. ap. Sozom. H. E.* τ. 16). But by that time the Christian fathers had already begun to turn the tables upon their adversaries and atheism became a reproach, not of Paganism against Christianity, but of Christianity against Paganism (see Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* p. 11). [E. H.]

ATHENAGORAS, with ten disciples and five priests, commemorated July 23 (*Cal. Armen.*). [C.]

ATHENOGENES, martyr, and ten disciples, commemorated July 16 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

ATRIUM, the court attached to churches in the earlier centuries. It was usually placed before the front of the church, and surrounded by porticoes. In the centre of the open area was a fountain, or at least a cantharus [CAN-THARUS], a large vessel containing water for ablution. This fountain was sometimes covered with a roof and surrounded by railings. The atrium was in the earlier ages considered an important, almost indispensable adjunct to at any rate the larger churches. Eusebius describes (*Eccles. Hist.* x. 4, § 39) the atrium with its four porticoes in his account of the church built by St. Paulinus at Tyre; and atria dating from the 5th century existed at St. Peter's and S. Paolo f. l. M. at Rome. Examples, though not dating from the period with which this work is concerned, may be seen in several churches at Rome, as S. Clemente, S. Cecilia, and others, and indeed elsewhere. In the ruins of the basilica of S. Stefano, in Via Latina, the atrium, instead of occupying its normal place, is placed by the side of the apse, the reason probably being that the Via Latina ran past the apse, and that those who wished to enter the church from that great thoroughfare would thus pass through the atrium. Where, however, no important street or public building prevented the architect from fully developing his plans, the atrium, it should seem, during the whole period treated of in this work (and indeed until a later period), in Italy at least, and probably elsewhere, formed a part of every important church. [A. N.]

ATTIGNY, COUNCILS OF (ATTINIACENSIA COSSILIA), held at Attigny (Attiniacum), a town of France, on the river Aisne, N.E. of Rheims.—I. A.D. 765, provincial, under Pipin (Mansi, xii. 674).

II. A.D. 822, at which the Emperor Louis did public penance, "de omnibus quae publice peccatum gessit," and especially for his cruelty to his nephew Bernard (Mansi, xiv. 403).

III. A.D. 834, November, under Ludovicus Pius, a synod of "the whole empire," passed

some canons on behalf of the Church, and referred a criminal cause, brought before them by the emperor, to the state tribuna. (Mansi, xiv. 655). [A. W. H.]

ATTINIACENSE CONCILIUM. [ATTIGNY.]

AUBERTUS or AUTBERTUS, bishop and confessor, commemorated Dec. 13 (*Mart. Bedae*). [C.]

AUCTOR, bishop, commemorated Aug. 9 (*Mart. Bedae*). [C.]

AUDACTES, martyr, commemorated Oct. 24 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

AUDACTUS. [ADAUCTUS.]

AUDAX, martyr, commemorated July 9 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

AUDIENTES (Ἀκροώμενοι). Two stages have to be noted in the history and significance of this word. Down to the time of Novatus and the consequent development of the penitential system of the Church, it is used as equivalent to catechumen. The *Audientes* are those who are present in the Church, but are not yet baptized, and who therefore, in the nature of the case, were not present during the passages of the *Fideles*, or the yet more sacred service which followed. They heard the psalms, the lessons, the sermon, and then left (Tertull. *de Poenit.* c. vi., vii.; Cypr. *Ep.* 13). At Carthage they were placed under the special care of a catechist or *Audientium Doctor* (Cypr. *Ep.* 31). The treatise of Augustine, *de catechizandis rudibus*, was written for such a catechist, and shews fully what was the nature of the instruction given. The word seems to be used with somewhat of the same vagueness by Augustine (*Serm.* 132). There is no trace at this period, if indeed at any time in the West, of a distinct position for them in the place where Christians met for worship.

In the East, however, we find from the time of Gregory Thaumaturgus onwards a more systematic classification, and that one made subservient to an elaborate penitential system. The *Audientes* are the second in a graduated series of those who, as catechumens or members of the Church, have fallen, and need to be restored. Outside the Church stood the *Fientes* (κλειόμενοι) mourning over their guilt, catching only the indistinct sounds of what was passing within, exposed to sun or rain. Then within the *narthex*, the portico in one sense outside the church, but communicating with it by open doors, were the *Audientes* (Greg. Thaum. *Can.* xi.). They might stay there and listen, like those who bore the same name in the older system, till the sermon was over. Then the deacon bade them depart along with the unbelievers (Const. Apost. viii. 5), and they had not the privilege of joining in any prayers. After a year thus passed they came within the church, as *Flectentes* (γονυκλίοντες), joining in the prayers up to the commencement of the proper Eucharistic service, but kneeling in their contrition. Lastly, they became *Consistentes* (συνιστάμενοι), standing with those in full communion with the Church, but not yet admitted themselves to that privilege. Such was the ideal system laid down by the Council of Nicaea (c. xi.), elaborated by Basil (*Can.* xxii., lxxv.), and more or less acted



on throughout the churches of the East. It brought with it, in the rank of degradation from a higher order to one of shame and dishonour, from the position of full membership to any one of them, a system of secondary punishments the actual effect of which it is not easy to estimate. [CATACHUMENS; PENITENTS.] [K. H. P.]

**AUDIENTIA EPISCOPALIS.** This term one of the heads or titles in the first book of Justinian's *Index*, and is there used in relation to an authority, not only in spiritual but also in certain secular matters, conferred upon the bishops of the Church. In conjunction with the temporal magistrates, they were empowered to take part in managing the revenues of cities, the guardianship of young persons, and various other matters of a civil nature (see Guizot, *Hist. of Civilization in Europe*, Lecture II., as to the influence which the Church thus exercised in society). But the phrase more especially denotes the power given to the bishops of hearing and deciding disputes as to temporal rights in certain cases. Thus we find (Cod. i. tit. 4, s. 8) "et qui ex consensu apud sacras legis antistitem litigare voluerint, non vtabantur. Sed experiantur illius in civili duntaxat negotio, more arbitri sponte residentes, iudicium;" and (*Ibid.* s. 9) "Episcopale iudicium ratum sit omnibus, qui se audiri a sacerdotibus elegerint; eamque eorum iudiciali iudicanda omne reverentiam habentia, quam vestris deferri necesse est potestatibus, a quibus non licet provocare, &c." Two limitations appear on the face of these passages:—1. That the matter in controversy must be of a civil character, as criminal cases bring to be thus decided. 2. That both parties to the dispute must voluntarily agree to have their cause thus tried. The result therefore is to make the bishop an authoritative arbitrator, whenever the parties submitted themselves to his decision. This repeats what had been previously authorized by Arcadius and Honorius (see Theod. Codex. *De Jurisd.* li. 1), and by Valentinian III.; and, indeed, was perhaps little more than an acceptance and recognition on the part of the state of a custom which had long prevailed in Christian communities, of bringing their disputes before their Christian superiors instead of before heathen judges, in accordance with the words of St. Paul (1 Cor. vi.). At one period, however, there is some ground to believe that the secular power of Rome was inclined to go much further. According to Eusebius (*Vit. Const.* iv. 27) and Sozomen (i. 9), Constantine ordained that either party in a dispute of a civil nature might select the bishop as his judge, even against the will of the other party; and that the episcopal decision should be conclusive, and should be executed by the temporal authorities. This compulsory setting aside of the ordinary tribunals of the Roman Empire at the pleasure of either litigant, did not long endure, and seems to have been superseded by the more moderate principle adopted by Arcadius and Honorius. Indeed the learned commentator Gothofred, who is followed by Bingham (*Antiq.* li. 7, 3), doubts whether Constantine ever really made any such decree. Later writers, however, have not shared these doubts (see Harnack, *Real. Encycl.* sub voce, "audientia Episcopali"). This alleged decree was in later ages revived in the west, being then attributed to Theodosius. In that form it was accepted by

Charlemagne (*Capit.* vi. 306), passed into the collections of laws, and finally found its way into the Decretum of Gratian (Part II. canon xl. quest. i. 35). Innocent III. lays stress upon it (Decretal. Greg. i. lib. 2, tit. l. 13), and indeed in this shape it was well calculated to minister to the Papal pretensions. [B. S.]

**AUDIPAX**, martyr, commemorated Jan. 20 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron.*). [C.]

**AUDOENUS** or **AUDOINUS** (St. Ouen), bishop of Rouen, commemorated Aug. 24 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**AUFINUS**, *Natalis* in Africa, Oct. 16 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

**AUGENTIUS**, in Africa, Jan. 4 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**AUGULUS**, bishop and martyr, commemorated Feb. 7 (*Mart. Bede, Hieron.*). [C.]

**AUGURIES**. [DIVINATIONS.]

**AUGUSTA**, virgin, commemorated July 28 (*Mart. Bede*). [C.]

**AUGUSTALIS**, commemorated at Arles, Sept. 7 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**AUGUSTINE'S OAK**, Conference at, between Augustine of Canterbury and the British bishops.—I. is A.D. 602 or 603, and probably at Aust on the Severn, or some spot near to it, with a view to induce the British bishops to give up their Easter Rule, and to co-operate with Augustine in preaching to the Saxons. The first conference (Bede. li. 2) was only preliminary (Augustine, however, working a miracle at it, acc. to Bede), and led to—II. A more formal conference shortly after, in the same year, at the same place, at which seven British bishops were present, with "many learned men," especially from Bangor monastery (near Chester), then under Dineth as its abbat. On this occasion Augustine limited his demands to three, conformity in keeping Easter, and in the baptismal rite, and co-operation in preaching to the Saxons; suppression, if Bede's account is complete, all claim of the jurisdiction which Gregory the Great had bestowed upon him over the British bishops, and saying nothing of the tonsure; but disgusting the Britons by refusing to stand up at their approach—a token, according to the words of a certain anchorite whom they had consulted, that he was not a man of God, and therefore was not to be followed. The conference accordingly broke up without any other result than that of drawing from Augustine some angry words, which unfortunately came true a dozen years afterwards, when he was dead, in the slaughter of the Bangor monks at Chester (Bede. *ib.*). The baptismal differences have been conjectured by Künzmann to relate to trine immersion, by Dr. Rock (upon the better evidence of the Stowe Missal) to have referred to the washing of the feet which the Britons are supposed to have attached to baptism; but both are conjectures only. For the date, locality, and history of these conferences, see Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, lii. 40, 41. And for the well-known "Answer of Dineth," which is plainly the work of some mediæval Welsh antiquary, see *ib.* l. 123. [A. W. H.]

**AUGUSTINUS**. (1) Martyr at Nicomedia, commemorated May 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron.*).

(2) Bishop and confessor, Apostle of England, May 26 (*Martyrol. Bedae, Adonis*).

(3) Commemorated at Rome Aug. 22 (*M. Hieron.*).

(4) Bishop of Hippo, confessor, Aug. 28 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., et Bedae*). In *Mart. Hieron.*, under May 26, "in Africa Agustini Episcopi;" under Aug. 28, "Ipono regio Depositio Agustini Episcopi;" so that May 26 seems to have been given to St. Augustine of Canterbury at a date later than that of *Mart. Hieron.* His name is recited in the Gregorian Canon.

(5) Presbyter, Oct. 7 (*M. Bedae*).

(6) "In Cappadocia Agustini Episcopi," Nov. 17 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

#### AUGUSTODUNENSE CONCILIUM.

[ACTUN, COUNCIL OF.]

AUGUSTUS. (1) Of Alexandria, Jan. 11 (*M. Hieron.*).

(2) Martyr, commemorated May 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(3) Confessor, commemorated at Bourges, Oct. 7 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

#### AURELIANENSE CONCILIUM.

[ORLEANS, COUNCIL OF.]

#### AUREOLA. [NIMBUS.]

AURELIUS, commemorated April 26 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

AUSTERIUS, commemorated Oct. 19 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

AUSTREBERTANA, abbess, commemorated Feb. 10 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

AUTHENTIC. The sounds connecting the final (in Gregorian music) with its octave, or a melody in which they only are employed, were called Authentic, in contradistinction to those connecting the 4th below the final with its 8ve, the 5th above it, which were called Plagal (v. PLAGAL). In Ambrosian music authentic scales only were employed, and of these only four; the Phrygian (D—d), Dorian (F—e), Hypolydian (F—f), and Hypophrygian (G—g) of the Greek system. The Aeolian (A—a) and the Ionian (C—c), subsequently added to the number of the church scales (tones or modes), were subjected to the same classification. Authentic scales are characterised by the harmonic division (6 : 4 : 3) of their octaves; e. g. C—g—c; the plagal by the arithmetical division (4 : 3 : 2); e. g. G—C—g. Authentic melodies are thought to have generally greater dignity and strength than plagal. A good modern example of the former is the well-known German chorale *Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott*, and of the latter our *Evening Hymn*, attributed to Tallis; and it would be difficult to find in pure melodic music better examples of the sublime and the beautiful. But the tune known in England as the *Old Hundredth* (essentially plagal) certainly contravenes this theory in a very striking instance and manner.

The relations of subject and answer in the modern tonal fugue (as when C—g are "answered" not by g—d but by g—C) obviously grew out of the division of scales into authentic and plagal. [J. H.]

#### AUTISSIODORENSE CONCILIUM.

[AUXERRE, COUNCIL OF.]

AUTOCEPHALI (Ἀυτοκέφαλοι, from αὐτός and κεφαλή), a name given by canonists and in

the *Notitiae*—1. To Metropolitans who remained independent of Patriarchs after Patriarchs were established, i. e., who then continued still to be what all Metropolitans originally were. So the Cyprian archbishop (*Conc. Ephes. A.D. 431, act. vii.*; and again, as late as *Conc. Trull. A.D. 691, can. 39*, at a time when the Cypriots had fled from Cyprus itself, and had taken refuge in the Ἐπαρχία Ἑλλησπόντιος): to whom Balsamon joins the archbishops of Bulgaria and of Iberia (Georgia). The privilege had been given to the former of these two by Justinian. (See, however, Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.*, vol. i. 96.) The latter would seem to have been at first reckoned as subject to the Patriarchate of Antioch, and then to Constantinople; but from A.D. 450 he styled himself αὐτοκέφαλος, and appears to have been considered as such (Malan, *Hist. of Georg. Ch. 35, 196, &c.*). The Armenian Church is also so styled in the *Notitiae* (see Bingham II. xviii. 2); but it would rather appear to have claimed to be in itself a patriarchate, inasmuch as Nerses its second bishop, present at *Conc. Constantin., A.D. 381*, styled himself Patriarch and Catholicos of Armenia, as did thenceforward his successors (Malan, *Life of Gregory the Illuminator*, 27). Ravenna in the west is also said to have arrogated the privilege of "autocephalism," and only to have surrendered it under the pontificate of Pope Donus, A.D. 676–679. Roman (and Welsh) Britain, which is usually adduced as another western instance, and which undoubtedly had no relations to the Roman patriarchate or any other for three centuries (400–700),—as neither had Celtic Ireland nor Columban Scotland,—was rather a case of bishops who still remained without a metropolitan, the legends of the archbishoprics of Caerleon or of St. David's, or indeed of any archbishopric in the island at all except as an honorary and unmeaning title, being without any historical authority whatever. The epithet is applied to Britain only by late controversial writers.

2. A name given to a class of bishops who came to exist in the 9th century in the eastern patriarchates, as Constantinople, Jerusalem, Antioch, who were dependent directly upon their patriarch without the intervention of a metropolitan, and who might be more accurately (and sometimes were) called archbishops or metropolitans themselves, only without suffragans (see authorities in Bingham II. xviii. 3).

3. The name *might* be applied, on the same principle upon which it is attached to metropolitans whose independence survived the establishment of patriarchs, to bishops whose independence survived the establishment of metropolitans. But the origin of metropolitans was too early and too universal to allow of any ancient authority signaling possible temporary exceptions of this kind by a name. The British bishops, however, appear to be (substantially) a case in point. And Valesius, although inaccurately in point of fact, has applied the name to the Bishop of Jerusalem before that Bishop became himself a patriarch (Bingham. *ib.* 4).

4. No doubt also the name *might* be applied, as Bingham suggests, to any case where there happened to be only one bishop in the country, as in Scythia in the time of Sozomen.

*Acephalus* (Ἀκέφαλος) is said to be sometimes used for *Autocephalus*.

(Bingham; Brerewood, *Patriarch, Gov. of Anc. Ch.*; Cava, *Dissert. on Gov. of Anc. Ch.*; Beveridge, *Pandect.*; Du Cange; Meursius; Saisier.) [A. W. H.]

**AUTONOMUS**, commemorated June 24 (*Cal. Armen.*) [C.]

**AUTUN, COUNCIL OF** (AUGUSTODUNENSIS CONCILIUM), A.D. 670, under Bishop Leodegar, passed some canons respecting monks, and one enforcing the Athanasian creed (*Mansi*, xi. 123). [A. W. H.]

**AUVERGNE, COUNCILS OF.** [CLERMONT, COUNCIL OF.]

**AUXENTIUS**, holy father, commemorated Feb. 14 (*Cal. Byzant.*); July 28 (*Mart. Hieron.*) [C.]

**AUXERRE, COUNCILS OF** (AUTUNODUNENSIS CONCILIA). I. A.D. 578, diocesan, where the bishop, with his 7 abbats, and 34 presbyters and 3 deacons, passed 45 canons, and among others, one requiring a synod of abbats every November and of presbyters every May (*Mansi*, ix. 911).

II. A.D. 841, provincial, gathered by the Emperors Louis and Charles to consult respecting the slaughter in the war between them, for which a 'three days' fast was appointed (*Mansi*, xiv. 786). [A. W. H.]

**AVE MARIA.** [HAIL MARY.]

**AVITUS.** (1) Bishop, deposition, Feb. 5 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

(2) Presbyter, commemorated June 17 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(3) Confessor, June 23 (*Id. et Hieron.*) [C.]

**AZARIAS**, martyr, with Ananias and Misael, commemorated Dec. 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); April 23 (*Mart. Bedae*); Dec. 17 (*Cal. Byzant.*) [C.]

**AZYME.** [ELEMENTS.]

## B

**BABYLA.** (1) Bishop, martyr at Antioch, A.D. 253; commemorated Jan. 24 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae*); Sept. 4 (*Cal. Byz.*).

(2) Saint, Natale, June 11 (*M. Bedae*). [C.]

**BACCANELDENSE CONCILIUM.** [BAPCHILD, COUNCIL OF.]

**BACCHUS.** (1) Secundianus, martyr, A.D. 290; commemorated Oct. 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Cal. Byz.*). (2) "Passio S. Bacchi," Sept. 25 (*M. Bedae*). [C.]

**BAOULUS.** [STAFF.]

**BAGAJENSE CONCILIUM**, Donatist, at Vagis or Bagaia, in Numidia, A.D. 394, where 310 bishops, under Primian the Donatist Primate of Carthage, condemned Maximian, the Catholic bishop of that city (*St. Aug. Cont. Crescon.* iii. 53, v. 10, *Opp.* x. 465, 490; Tillemont, *M. E.* vi. 165; Labb. ii. 1154). [A. W. H.]

**BAGAN**, virgin, commemorated with Eugenia, Jan. 22 (*Cal. Armen.*) [C.]

**BAHED.** The name of a fast in the Ethiopic Calendar, observed on Ter 10 = Jan. 5 (*Neale, Eastern Ch. Ind.* p. 810). [C.]

**BALANCE** (SYMBOL). The balance appears sometimes upon Christian tombs. A sepulchral

stone from the cemetery of St. Cyriac (Arimgh, *Roma Subt.* ii. 139) displays this instrument in conjunction with a crown; it may also be seen upon a marble slab taken by Bosio from a cemetery of the Via Latina (Arimgh, ii. 658), accompanied by a house, a fish, by a doubtful object which has been taken wrongly for a candelabrum, and by a mummy set up in a niche. A monument of the same nature reproduced in the work of M. Perret (*Inscript.* No. 37) represents a balance with a weight (see woodcut). De Rossi (*Roma Sott.* T. i. p. 86) notices another example in the church of St. Cecilia at Rome.



Balance with weight, from the Catacombs.

Some antiquaries, as Mamachi (*Origines* v. 96) have supposed that the balance is symbolical of judgment or justice. And it is true that it is found, doubtless with this signification, on coins of Gordian, Diocletian, and other emperors of pagan Rome. The mediæval artists again have frequently made use of this idea. We may see it, for instance, in the tympanum of the great doorway of Notre Dame in Paris, and in that of the cathedral of Autun, where it may be considered as a translation in sculpture of the words of the Apocalypse (xii. 12). But in the first two instances which we have mentioned, and which are almost the only examples transmitted to us by Christian antiquity properly so called, it is important to observe that mention is made of the contract entered into between the purchasers of the tombs and the *ROSSORES* Montanus and Calevius: *VRISICINVS ED QVINTILIANA SE BIBI (viva) CONPARAVERVNT LOCV A MONTANV. | CALEVIVS BENDIDIT (vendidit) AVIN TRISOMV.*

It is therefore more natural to suppose that the balance symbolises purchase and sale, *per aes et libram*.

Sometimes upon tombs the balance is simply indicative of a trade, as for example on the slab of a Roman moneyer found in the cemetery of St. Priscilla (*Marini Papiri diplom.* p. 332): *AVR. VENERANDO. NVM | QVI. VIXIT. ANN. XXXV | ATILIA. VALENTINA. FECIT | MARITO. BENEMERENTI. IN. PACE.* Bronze balances were found in a Frankish sepulchre of the Merovingian period by the Abbé Cochet (*Sépult. Gauloises*, p. 253 and following), where in all probability they indicated the tomb of a monetary officer, or fiscal agent, or accountant of some kind. This is rendered almost certain by the fact that a balance in the Faunett collection (*Inventorium Sepulchrale*, p. 43; pl. xvii. fig. 1, 2, 3), was found in the same tomb with a "touch-stone" for the trial of metals. Another, found like the preceding in an ancient tomb in Kent, is described and figured by Mr. Roach Smith in *Collectanea Antiqua*, vol. iii. pp. 13-14:

pl. iv. fig. 1 (Mortigny, *Dioc. des Antiq. Chréti.* p. 97). [C.]

**BALBINA.** (1) Virgin, martyr at Roma, A.D. 130; commemorated March 31 (*Mart. Rom. Vol. Bodes*).

(2) *Natalis*, Oct. 8 (*M. Bodes*).

**BALDEGUNDIS**, deposition at Polistina, Feb. 11 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

**BANNER.** [LABARUM; VEKILLUM.]

**BAPCHILD, COUNCIL OF** (BAGGABURGH CONCILIUM), or rather WITENAGEMOT.

(1) Between A.D. 696 & 716, at Bapchild, near Sittingbourne, in Kent; a Kentish Witenagemot, at which abbesses and presbyters, as well as bishops and abbots, were present, and where the celebrated Privilege of Whitred was enacted, granting to the Kentish metropolitan a free election in the case of abbots, abbesses, priests, and deacons. The date cannot be precisely determined; and is further confused by a discrepancy between the Canterbury Register and the *Textus Roffensis* on the one hand, and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* on the other, respecting the dates of Gebmund and Tobina, successively bishops of Rochester. Spurious forms of the Privilege extend it to the election of bishops and to the whole of Saxon England. See Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 236-247.—(2) A.D. 796, if at all; said to have been held under Kenulf, king (not of Kent, but) of Mercia, and Archbishop Athelard, with bishops (two lists, both spurious), abbots, and an archdeacon; and to have prohibited lay interference with churches and monasteries, in compliance with a mandate of Pope Leo III. The decree, however, is *verbalium* that of the (genuine) Council of Cloveshoe of A.D. 803, from which also one of the lists of bishops is partially taken (Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* 1018, 1024, *Wilks* i. 162; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils* iii. 517). The copy in Reg. A 1 at Canterbury, however, has no signature. [A. W. H.]

**BAPTISM.** This Article is arranged as follows:—I. Terms used to designate Baptism. II. The Order of Baptism in various Churches. III. The several Parts of the entire Ritual, viz.: Consecration of the Water; Interrogations and Responses (Renunciation and Profession); Preparatory Unction; Unclothing of the Catechumen; the Immersion; the Baptismal Formula; the subsequent Ceremony, viz.: the Kiss, the lighted Tapers, the white Garments, the red and white Thread, the Chaplet, and the washing of Feet. IV. At what times, in what places, and by whom, Baptism was administered; with what matter, in what mode, and at what age. V. Graphic representations of Baptism. VI. Literature. The subject of *SPONGIUM*, and that of *BAPTISMAL NAMEN*, are treated separately in their alphabetical order.

#### I. Terms used to designate Baptism.

§ 1. *Baptizō* and derived words. The meaning of this verb is not, as commonly asserted, identical with that of *bdavro*, to "dip," but presented this idea under special modifications characteristic of the various ages in which it was employed. In classical usage it was commonly used metaphorically in speaking of one "drenched" with wine, "overwhelmed" with misfortune, and the like. Polybius uses it (iii. 72) in speaking of troops passing through water which reached

up to their breasts; *πάσις τις τῶν περὶ τοῦ τοῦ βαπτισμοῦ διδύμων*. In the Canonical Books of the LXX it occurs but once in speaking of Naaman either "washing" or "dipping" himself in the Jordan (1 Kings v. 14). In the Apocrypha, in speaking of one washing himself (*ἀβαπτίζω* ἐν τῇ ᾠδῇ, Jud. xii. 7) at a spring; and again (Eccl. 34, 37 of 39) of one washing himself after touching a dead body; both cases having reference to ceremonial purification. In the New Testament it is occasionally used metaphorically (Matt. xx. 22; Mark x. 39, 39; Luke xii. 30). But it generally has reference either to Jewish ceremonial purification (Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 28), or to Christian Baptism.

§ 2. *Abaptizō*, or *ᾠδῇ*, *lavacrum*, *font*. These terms (*lav* and *font*) have reference, like the last noticed, to the outward circumstances of the Baptismal Rite. *Abaptizō*, the Latin *lavacrum*, means literally, "what serves for washing the body," that is, either the vessel, or the water so used. St. Paul twice (Eph. v. 26, and Tit. iii. 5) uses the word in reference to baptism. In Justin Martyr it appears as an evidently technical designation of baptism (*τὸ ἀβαπτισμὸν*, *Apol.* i. c. 70), and from that time onward the word is repeatedly used. The terms *ᾠδῇ* and *font*, meaning a spring, or a pool fed by a spring, date as technical terms from the time when either natural pools (see § 39) in the open air, or baptisteries supplied, as was continually the case, by natural springs, were made use of for the purpose of Christian baptism.

§ 3. *Forme expressive of doctrine*.—The most common of these doctrinal designations are those which have reference to the idea of Regeneration—in Greek *ἀναγεννησις*, and more rarely *ἀναγεννησις* and *ἀναγεννησις*, in Latin *regeneratio*, *renovatio* or *spiritualis renovatio*, *renovatio*, and *renovatio*. Terms of regeneration had been used in a figurative sense both by classical authors and by Hellenists, such as Philo and Josephus, before they were adopted into the language of Christianity. They served to express the idea of an entire change of condition, as for example the passing out of a state of misery, of slavery or of subjection, into a state of well-being, of freedom and of independence. (See Weistat on Matt. xii. 28; Trench's *Synonymes of NT* pp. 71, 72. Add Tertullian, *de Bapt.* c. 5.) The Rabbinical use of such terms more directly illustrates the Christian meaning of these words, but the ultimate date to which that use is to be traced is open to doubt. (See Lightfoot on John iii. 4; *Opp.* tom. ii. p. 610, fol. Rotterdam 1687; Schoettgen, *Hor. Heb.* i. p. 704, Dresden 4, 1733; *Carpeovii Annotaciones in 72. Genesim* *Moson et Aaronum*, Francofurti 4, 1748, lib. i. cap. iii. § vii.)

§ 4. *ᾠδῇ*, *Signaculum*, *Seal*. Baptism is not unfrequently spoken of as "the seal," or more fully "the seal of the Lord," (Clement Alex.), and that partly perhaps with reference to the language of Holy Scripture (2 Cor. i. 22, Eph. i. 13, and iv. 30). But other thoughts were also connected with the term, as e.g. that of the sign of the cross (this being more especially the seal) being the seal of the Christian covenant or of the "spiritual circumcision." (St. Cyril. Hieron. *Controv.* v. *Μὲν τὸ πᾶν τὸ ἀναγεννησθαι ἀναγεννησθαι ᾠδῇ, ὡς τὸ πᾶν τὸ ἀναγεννησθαι ἀναγεννησθαι*.) Hence further modi-

fications of the same idea, such as "Character Dominicus," the mark impressed by the Lord (St. Augustine *de Bapt. c. Donat.* lib. vi. cap. i. and *Epist.* 194 dis, c. vi. § 23. Migne, tom. ii. p. 803); *δεσποτείας σημεῖωσις*, a mark indicative of ownership or dominion (St. Greg. Naz. *Or.* xl.; compare St. Isaac of Armenia, quoted below, § 101); or again the *Nota Militaris* (St. Augustine *de Bapt.* lib. i. cap. iv.), *ἡ τοῦ στρατιώτου σφραγίς* (St. Chrysostom in ii. Cor. *Hom.* iii. ad fin.), the mark put upon soldiers to ensure their recognition.

§ 5. *Terms of Initiation or Illumination.*—The idea of baptism being an initiation (*μύησις*, *μυσταγωγία*, *τελετή*) into Christian mysteries, an enlightenment (*φωτισμός*, *illuminatio*, *illustratio*) of the darkened understanding, belonged naturally to the primitive ages of the Church, when Christian doctrine was still taught under great reserve to all but the baptized, and when adult baptism, requiring previous instruction, was still of prevailing usage. Most of the Fathers interpreted the *φωτισθέντες*, "once enlightened," of Heb. vi. 4, as referring to baptism. In the middle of the second century (Justin M. *Apol.* ii. *καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμός ὡς φωτισζόμενων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μαθανόντων*) we find proof that "illumination" was already a received designation of baptism. And at a later time (St. Cyril Hieros. *Catech. passim*), *οἱ φωτιζόμενοι* (*illuminandi*) occurs as a technical term for those under preparation for baptism, *οἱ φωτισθέντες* of those already baptised. So *οἱ ἀμύητοι* and *οἱ μεμνημένοι*, the uninitiated and the initiated, are contrasted by Sozomen, *H. E.* lib. i. c. 3.

§ 6. *Modern terms.*—In most of the modern European languages the words expressive of baptism are derived directly from the Latin *baptizare*, and testify to the fact of Latin having been in the Western Churches the one ecclesiastical language almost to the exclusion of all others. But there is one notable exception. The German *taufen*, to "baptize," akin to our English "dip," has the same technical meaning as *baptizare*, and recalls the time when on the conversion of the German tribes baptism was as a rule performed by "dipping" (see § 92), and when not Latin, but as far as possible the mother-tongue of the converts was employed in the baptismal offices. Our countryman, St. Boniface, in his *Statuta* (Martene, *de Ant. Ecc. Rit.* tom. i. p. 48) desires that the catechumens be taught to make the Renunciations and Confessions of Faith in Baptism "in ipsa lingua qua nati sunt," and directs any presbyter to leave the diocese who is too proud to obey this direction.

## II. The Order of Baptism in various Churches of the East and of the West.

§ 7. *Described by Justin Martyr.*—The earliest description of the actual rite of baptism is that given by Justin Martyr in his first *Apology* (cap. lxxix.), which dates from the middle of the second century. "We will now relate after what manner we dedicated (*ἀνεθήκαμεν*) ourselves unto God, when we were new-made through Christ (*καινοποιηθέντες διὰ τοῦ Χ.*). So many as are convinced, and believe the truth of what we teach and affirm, and who promise to be able to live accordingly, are taught both to pray, and with fasting to ask of God remission of their past

sins, while we join with them in their prayers and in their fast. Then they are conducted by us to a place where there is water, and they are regenerated (*ἀναγεννώνται*) after the same manner of regeneration as that in which we ourselves were regenerated. For they then make their ablution (*τὸ λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται*) in the water, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the Universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost. For Christ said: 'Except ye be regenerated (*ἐὰν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῇτε*) ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.'"

§ 8. It will be seen that the description here given is without full details concerning the rite itself, as was natural in one writing concerning a Christian Sacrament to persons who were not Christians themselves. But we may trace clear allusions to the prefatory instruction and guidance of the catechumens—to the baptismal promises or stipulations—to a place of baptism apart from the ordinary place of assembly for the faithful (*ἄγονται ὅφ' ἡμῶν ἐνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ*). We find also the baptismal formula, "In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," though with slight interpolations which are probably due to the need of some explanation in addressing a heathen audience on such a subject.

§ 9. *Ritual described by Tertullian.*—About fifty years later than Justin Martyr, and about the close of the second century, we find evidence in the works of Tertullian of the nature of the baptismal rite as observed at that time. He speaks first of the Preparation of the Catechumens immediately before Baptism—saying that they should be frequent in prayer, with fasting and kneeling (then a penitential attitude), and watching, and with confession of all former sins. "Ingressuros baptismum, orationibus crebris, jejuniis et geniculationibus, et pervigiliis, orare oportet, et cum confessione omnium retro delictorum, ut exponant etiam baptismum Joannis. Tinguiebantur, inquit, confitentes delicta sua" (*De Bapt.* c. 20). § 10. He describes the solemn renunciation of the devil and his pomp, and his angels, distinguishing the renunciation made at the time of baptism from that made some time previously in the church (on admission as catechumens). ("Aquam adituri ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia sub antistitis manu, contestamur nos renuntiare diabolo et pompae et angelis ejus." *De Cor. Mil.* c. 3.) He speaks then of other "responses" made by the baptized while standing in the water, alleging these as an example of custom founded on tradition only, not on any express direction of our Lord. ("Dehinc ter mergitatur amplius aliquid respondentem quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit." *Ibid.* See below, § 93.) § 11. The words (ter mergitatur) just quoted, and those of the treatise *De Bapt.* c. 1, "in aquam homo demissus et inter pauca verba tinctus," have reference to the Trine Immersion then customary (see below, § 49) and the use of the words implicitly prescribed in Matt. xxviii. 19. These points he more exactly determines elsewhere. ("Novissime mandans ut tingerent in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum, non in unum: nam nec semel sed ter, ad singula nomina, in personas singulas tinguimur." *Adv. Praxeas*, c. 26.) § 12. Among the traditional customs, Tertullian mentions the tasting of a mixture (concordiam) of honey and milk on leaving the font ("Inde suscepti lactis et mellis concordiam



praegustamus." *De Cor. Mil.* c. 3). But there is no reference to this in his treatise *de baptismo*, so that it may not improbably have been of occasional or local usage only in his time. § 13. The anointing with a consecrated (*benedicta*) oil, and the imposition of hands by the bishop, which followed upon baptism, is spoken of as being intimately connected with the actual baptism. In the font, according to his view, we are washed from sin, and so prepared for the reception of the Holy Spirit. ("Non quod in aquis spiritum sanctum consequamur sed in aqua emundati sub Angelo Spiritui Sancto praeparatur . . . . Angelus baptismi arbiter superventuro Spiritui Sancto vias dirigit ablutione delictorum quam fides impetrat obsignata in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto . . . . Exinde egressi de lavacro perungimur benedicta unctione . . . . Dehinc manus imponitur per benedictionem advocans et invitans Spiritum Sanctum." *De bapt.* cc. 6, 7, 8). The evidence of Tertullian on other points will come under notice later in this article.

§ 14. *Ritual at Jerusalem*, A.D. 347. The Catecheses of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, delivered in Lent, a. 347, picture to us in tolerably full detail the ceremonial usages there customary in his time. Throughout Lent (*Catech.* i. τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας οὐ σχολάζεις τῇ προσευχῇ; and again τεσσαράκοντα ἡμερῶν ἔχεις μετάνοιαν) the catechumens assembled day after day in the church of the Anastasis (*Cat.* xiv.) for prayer, and for catechetical instruction. § 15. And at the close of Lent, on the "Sabbath," or Easter Eve, as the evening (*Myst. Catech.* i. κατ' ἐκείνην τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὴν ἑσπέραν. Compare Chrysost. in 1 Cor. *Hom.* xl., where he speaks of τὴν ἑσπέραν ἐκείνην, that evening in which baptism is solemnized) closed in upon the holy city, those to be baptized assembled in the outer chamber of the baptistery (εἰς τὸν προαύλιον τοῦ βαπτιστηρίου οἶκον, *Myst. Cat.* i.) and facing towards the west, as being the place of darkness, and of the powers thereof, with outstretched hand, made open renunciation of Satan. § 16. Then turning them about, and with face towards the East, "the place of light," they exclaimed, "I believe in the Father (εἰς τὸν Π.) and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, and in one baptism of repentance." § 17. This said, they went forward into the inner chamber (οἶκος) of the baptistery, and (*Myst. Cat.* ii.) put off the garment (*chiton*) wherewith they were clothed, and being thus naked were anointed with oil from head to foot. § 18. After this preparatory unction they were led by the hand to the font itself, and then each one was asked, "Dost thou believe in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?" and they, in answer, witnessed the saving confession of their faith, and dipped themselves thrice in the water, and thrice lifted themselves up from out thereof; and so set forth, by symbol, the three days' burial of the Lord, and his Resurrection; and the saving water was to them at once death and life, at once "a tomb and a mother." § 19. Then, on coming forth from the water, they were clothed with white garments, significant of the purity and brightness of that spiritual vesture with which they were ever henceforth to be clothed (*Myst. Cat.* iv. in fin.). § 20. Afterward, as Christ, coming up out of the waters, was anointed with the unction of the Holy Ghost,

descending upon Him in bodily shape as a dove, an unction, not bodily but spiritual, so the baptized, when made partakers of "the anointed," are themselves "anointed" with a holy oil "on the forehead, the ears, the nostrils, and the breast; and while the body was thus touched with material ointment, the spirit was sanctified [or 'consecrated,' ἀγιάζεται] by the holy and life-giving Spirit" (*Myst. Cat.* iii.). § 21. *Holy Communion*. After this followed holy communion, of which all the newly baptized were partakers, therein becoming "of one body and of one blood" with Christ (σύσσωμοι καὶ σὺναιμοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ), and there partaking of a heavenly bread, and of a cup of salvation, that sanctify both soul and body (*Ib.* iv.). § 22. *Psalms and lights*. Under the figurative language employed by St. Cyril in his prefatory address, we may see evident allusions to the accompanying ceremonial of the great Easter rite. This was celebrated, as we have already mentioned, on the eve, and during the night (πότε μὲν ὑμῖν δείξῃ ὁ θεὸς ἐκείνην τὴν νύκτα κ.τ.λ., *Praefatio*) preceding Easter day. And the use of artificial light, thus rendered necessary, was singularly in harmony with the occasion, and with some of the thoughts most prominently associated with it (see § 5 above). It would be difficult to imagine any scene more moving than that pictured to us in the pages of St. Cyril, when on the eve of the Saviour's resurrection, and at the doors of the church of the "Anastasis," the white-robed (§ 19) band of the newly baptised was seen approaching from the neighbouring baptistery, and the darkness was turned into day (τὸ σκότος τὸ ἡμεροφανές, *Praefat. ad Catech.*) in the brightness of unnumbered lights. And as the joyous chant swelled upwards, "Blessed is he whose unrighteousness is forgiven, and whose sin is covered," it might well be thought that angels' voices were heard echoing the glad acclaim, "Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth no sin, and in whose spirit there is no guile." (ὅτε ὑμῶν σωθέντων, i. e., after your baptism, οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐπιφωνήσουσιν, Μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν, κ.τ.λ., *Praefat.*)

§ 23. *Other Eastern rites. In Egypt*. The order of baptism which we have traced above as observed at Jerusalem in the year 347 A.D., bears a close resemblance in all its more important details to those of which we find record elsewhere. The limits of this article do not admit of our quoting these in full. For the order followed in the Egyptian Church, see the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aegyptiacae*, § 46 seqq., published by Lagarde (*al.* Bötticher) in his *Reliquiae Juris Ecclesiastici antiquissimae*. It will be found also in Bunsen's *Christianity and Mankind*, vol. vi. p. 465, seqq., in a Greek translation by Lagarde from the Coptic original. With this, which may probably date from the 4th or 5th century (not as a MS. but as a rite), may be compared the *Ordo Baptismi* of Severus, Patriarch of Alexandria in the 7th century (*Biblioth. Max. Patrum*, Paris, fol. 1654, tom. vi. col. 25), and, for a much later time, see Vansleb, *Histoire de l'Église d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1677, cap. 21, p. 80.

§ 24. *In Aethiopia*. The Ethiopic rite must originally have resembled that of Alexandria. Our first detailed accounts of it come to us from the Jesuit missionaries (*Bibl. Max. Patr.* as above, tom. vi. col. 57, seqq.). With their state-

menta, which coming from various quarters appear at times somewhat inconsistent with each other, may be compared the account given by Ludolf in his *Historia Aethiopica*, lib. iii. cap. vi.

§ 25. *The Descriptions of the Rite given by Dionysius*, the so-called Areopagite (*Ecc. Hier.* lib. ii.), and in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, cannot be assigned with certainty to any particular date or locality; but they afford interesting points of comparison with the ritual described elsewhere.

§ 26. *Western Rites.* The only complete *Ordines Baptismi* of any early Western churches are the Roman and the Gallican. The Roman may be traced with slight variations in the sacramentary attributed to Gelasius (*Migne, Patrol.* tom. 74, p. 1105, and Muratori, *Liturg. Roman. Vet.*), and that of Gregory the Great (ed. H. Menard). Many variations of the Gallican *Ordo Baptismi* are given by Martene (*De Ant. Ecc. Rit.* tom. i. Part 1) and of these we select one example as being of exceptional interest.

§ 27. *The Gotho-Gallican Rite.* The earliest of the Gallican *Ordines Baptismi* is probably that sometimes described as the Gothic, as having been in use in the Visigothic Church. The order commences with a prefatory address, remarkable for the figurative language employed, which is utterly unlike that to be met with in any other known ritual, and in which we may probably see traces of the peculiar circumstances under which Christianity was first introduced into Gaul. "Standing, dearest brethren, on the bank of this crystal-clear fount, bring ye from the land to the shore new-comers to ply the traffic whereof they have need (*mercatus sua commercia*). Let all who embark on this voyage make their way over this new sea, not with a rod [*virga*, probably with reference to Moses and the Red Sea], but with the cross; not with bodily touch, but with spiritual apprehension; not with traveller's staff, but in sacramental mystery (*non virga, sed cruce, non tactu sed sensu, non baculo sed sacramento*). The place is small but full of grace. Happy hath been the pilotage of the Holy Spirit. Therefore let us pray the Lord our God, that He will sanctify this fount, and make it a laver of most blessed regeneration in remission of all sins; through the Lord." § 28. *The Collect* then follows, being a prayer for the benediction of the font. "God who didst sanctify the fount of Jordan for the salvation of souls, let the angel of thy blessing descend upon these waters, that thy servants being bathed (*perfusi*) therewith may receive remission of sins, and being born again of water and the Holy Spirit, may devoutly serve thee for ever; through the Lord."

§ 29. *The Contestatio.* "It is meet and right, Holy Lord, Almighty Father, Initiator of the Saints, Father of all Uncion, and author of a new sacrament through thine only Son our Lord God; Who, through the ministry of water bestowest in place of the riches of the world (*'ante divitias mundi'*, evidently from the Greek *ἔντι τοῦ πλοῦτος τοῦ κόσμου*) thine Holy Spirit; Thou that providest the waters of Bethesda through the healing operation of the Angel; Who didst sanctify the channel of Jordan by the worthiness of Christ thy Son; have regard, O Lord, to these waters prepared for the doing

away of the sins of men; grant that the Angel of thy fatherly love (*pietatis tue*) may be present to this holy fount; may he wash off the stains of the former life, and sanctify a shrine wherein Thou mayest dwell, causing them that herein shall be regenerated to grow and be strengthened evermore in the inner man (*procursans ut regenerandorum viscera aeterna florescant*, probably *ἵνα θάλλῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὰ σπλάγχνα τῶν ἀναγεννωμένων*), and bestowing that true renewal which is of baptism. Bless, Lord God, this water that Thou didst create, and let Thy healing power (*virtus tua*) descend upon it. Pour down from above Thy Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, the messenger [angel] of truth. Sanctify, O Lord, these waters as thou didst the streams of Jordan; that they who go down into this fount, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, may be found worthy to obtain both pardon of sins and the on-pouring of the Holy Spirit, through our Lord Jesus Christ, Who with (*apud*) Thee and the Holy Ghost is blessed for evermore." § 30.

*Consecration with Chrism.* "Then thou makest a cross with chrism, and sayest: I exorcise thee, thou water of God's creation; I exorcise thee, the whole army of the devil, the whole power of the adversary, and all darkness of evil spirits; I exorcise thee in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ of Nazareth, to whom the Father hath subjected all things in heaven and in earth. Fear and tremble, Thou and all the malice that is thine: give place to the Holy Spirit, that all who descend into this font may have the laver of the baptism of regeneration, unto remission of all sins, through Our Lord Jesus Christ, who will come unto the judgment seat of the Majesty of His Father with the holy angels, to judge thee thou enemy, and the world, through fire, for evermore." § 31. *Insufflation.* "Then thou shalt breathe (see § 42) three times upon the water, and put chrism therein in the form of a cross, and say: 'the on-pouring of the salutary chrism of Our Lord Jesus Christ, that this may be made a fountain of water springing up unto life eternal.' Amen."

§ 32. *The interrogations and the baptism.* "While baptizing thou shalt make the interrogations (*dum baptizas interrogas*: see below, § 43) and say: 'I baptize thee (naming him) in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, unto remission of sins, that thou mayest have eternal life. Amen.'" § 33. *Unction.* "While touching him with chrism thou shalt say: 'I anoint thee with the (chrism) unction of holiness, the clothing of immortality, which our Lord Jesus Christ first received, bestowed by the Father, that thou mayest present it entire and undiminished before the judgment seat of Christ, and mayest live for ever and ever.'" § 34. *The washing of feet.* "While washing his feet, thou shalt say: 'I wash thy feet, as our Lord Jesus Christ did unto his disciples. Do thou the like to strangers and pilgrims, that thou mayest have eternal life.'" § 35. *The clothing.* "While putting the garment upon him thou shalt say: 'Receive this white garment, which thou mayest keep and present (*quam perferas*) before the judgment seat of our Lord Jesus Christ.'" § 36. *The collect.* "Let us pray, most dear brethren, our Lord God, for these his neophytes, now baptized, that when the Saviour shall come in His ma-

venty. He will come them whom He hath regenerated of water and the Holy Spirit to be clothed for ever with the garment of salvation; through the Lord." § 37. *Another collect.* "For these who are now baptized, and crowned (see § 65) in Christ, on whom our Lord hath deigned to bestow regeneration, we pray thee, Almighty God, that they may preserve undefiled unto the end the baptism which they have received; through Our Lord."

§ 38. *Peculiarities of this Rite.*—There is strong internal evidence that this rite in its present shape is a translation into debased Latin of an older Greek original. There are many parts of it of which the sense can only be guessed by first translating it back into Greek, word for word, taking Latin, such as that of the translator of Irenæus, as a guide in so doing. And this fact, coupled with that of the metaphors in the opening address being taken wholly from the language of trade and of navigation, bears out in a remarkable manner the conclusion to which other independent evidence points, viz., that Christianity was introduced into Gaul through Greek missionaries, and in connection with the great line of commercial traffic of which Marseilles was the chief western entrepôt, and the cities of Cysica, Phocæa, and Alexandria the principal eastern ports. It has another point of interest for English readers, viz., that there are strong grounds for believing that the primitive British and Irish rites were based on the old Gallican use, of which that just quoted presents, probably, the oldest example now remaining.

§ 39. *British and Irish Rites.*—No complete *Ordo Baptismi* appears to have been preserved which will illustrate the primitive usage of the British and Irish Churches. Incidental notices of the latter in ancient documents serve to determine many points of detail which will be noticed in their place. The fullest of these, and one which is of great interest on many grounds, is the story told by Tirechan (8th century) in the Book of Armagh, concerning St. Patrick's baptizing the two daughters of King Laoghaire at the pool of Clebach in Connaught. For this, see Todd's *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 452.

§ 40. *Spanish Rite.*—Such details as can now be determined concerning the primitive baptismal rite in Spain are contained in a treatise of St. Ildefonsus of Seville (7th century), *De Cognatione Baptismi*. Further particulars may be inferred from Isidore of Seville *De off. Eccl.* lib. ii. cap. 24; and from the Mozarabic Liturgy, attributed by some to him. That Spanish usage in the 4th century differed in some respects from that of Rome, is indicated by the letter of Serenus of Rome to Himerius Tarraconensis. See below, § 73.

### III. Details of the Ritual of Baptism.

§ 41. Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, just at the close of the 8th century, wrote a treatise *De Ordine Baptismi* (Migne's *Patrol.* cv. 223), in which he describes the complicated Ritual practiced in Western Churches in his own time. Taking his description as a basis, but omitting here the notice of such points as will come under separate discussion in other articles, we may proceed now to describe separately the main features of the order of baptism as they had been

developed in the 8th century, viz., the Consecration of the Water, the Renunciations, the Profession of Faith, the Immersion with accompanying Interrogations, and the subsequent ceremonial.

§ 42. *Consecration of the Water of Baptism.*—This consecration is first mentioned by Tertullian (*de Bapt.* c. iv.) as brought about by invocation of God. St. Cyprian (*Epist.* lxx. ad Januar.), speaks of the water "being cleansed beforehand and sanctified by the bishop (a sacerdos);" and a Council held at Carthage under him, speaks of this sanctification being brought about (*proce sacerdotis*) by the bishop's prayer. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* iii., speaks of the water receiving power and being sanctified upon invocation of the Holy Spirit and of Christ. St. Basil the Great (*de Sp. Sancto*, cap. 27) reckons the blessing of the baptismal water among the traditional customs derived from the Apostles. From St. Augustine, however (*de Bapt.* lib. vi. c. 25) we learn that the "invocations" were not regarded as essential to the validity of the sacrament. In St. Augustine first (*in Joann. Evang. Tract.* 118 ad fin.) we hear of the sign of the cross being made at this invocation. Oil also, poured crosswise, was used, at least in some churches, in the consecration of the water. (Dionys. Areop. *De Hier. Eccl.* cap. 11; Severus Patriarch. Alexandr. *De Ordine Baptismi*, *Bibl. Patr. Max.* t. vi. p. 25.) To the same effect the Sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great and the early Gallican Rite already quoted in § 30. This ceremony, and the baptism of an infant by immersion, are represented in the engraving below, which is from a Pontifical of the 9th century. A further ceremony, used at times went on, was Exorcism accompanied by insufflation, or breathing upon the waters. See § 31 above, and Martens, *De A. E. R.* tom. i. pp. 63, 64.



Consecration of Water, and Baptism.

### The Interrogations and Responses.

§ 43. *Renunciation and Profession.*—The two portions of the Order of Baptism next to be considered, viz., Renunciation followed by Profession of Faith, are often classed together in early writers under the designation of the *Interrogationes et Responsæ*, *ἑρωτημαῖς καὶ ἀποκρίσεις*, in reference to the formulae of question and answer by which both one and the other were expressed. These phrases had their ultimate origin probably in an exceptional word (*ἑρωτημαῖς*, an answer formally made to a question formally put) used by St. Peter (1 Pet. iii. 21) in speaking of baptism. This was a word of technical legal use, having reference especially to forms of covenant stipulation. And this, with very slight modification only, appears as a received technical

term of the baptismal ceremonial in the middle of the 3rd century. At that time there were forms of interrogation and response recognised as of "legitimate ecclesiastical rule" in Africa (Tertullian, above, § 10; Cyprian. *Epist.* lxx. *ad Januar.*), in Egypt (Dionysius apud Euseb. *H. E.* lib. vii. c. 9), in Cappadocia (Firmilianus apud Cyprian. *Opp.* Baluz. *Ep.* lxxv.), and at Rome (*ib.*).

§ 44. *The ceremonial of Renunciation.*—The Catechetics of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, when combined with allusions incidentally made by Dionysius, St. Basil, and others, put before us very vividly the ceremonial with which these renunciations were made. St. Cyril (*Cat. Myst.* i.) addressing the neophytes, says, "Ye entered in first into the outer chamber of the baptistery, and standing with your faces to the west ye heard how ye were bidden to stretch forth the hand with a gesture of repulsion (ἀπεθούρτα τὰς χεῖρας, Dionys. Areop. *Ecc. Hier.*), and ye renounced Satan, as though there present before you . . . saying, 'I renounce thee, Satan' . . . Then, with a second word thou art taught to say, 'and thy works' . . . and then again thou sayest, 'and [his] thy pomp.' And afterward thou sayest, 'and all thy worship' (λατρείαν) . . . When thou hadst thus renounced Satan, breaking altogether all covenants with him, then . . . turning from the west toward the sunrising, the place of light, thou wast told to say, 'I believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and in one baptism of repentance.'" From Dionysius we learn further that before making this renunciation the catechumen was divested of his upper garment, and standing barefoot, and in his chiton (shirt) only, made three separate renunciations in answer to questions put to him [this is implied, but not so distinctly stated by St. Cyril], and then being turned toward the east was bidden to look up to heaven, and with uplifted hands (τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείναντα) to declare his allegiance unto Christ (συντάξασθαι τῷ Χριστῷ), and after so doing he again, in answer to questions put to him, thrice made confession of his faith.

§ 45. *Words used in Renunciation.*—These are given with more or less of detail, according to the use of various churches, by the following writers after Tertullian and Cyprian already quoted:—St. Cyril, *Catech. Myst.* i.; St. Basil, *De Sp. S.* capp. xi. and xxvii.; St. Chrysostom, *Hom.* xxi. *ad Pop. Antiochenum*; *Liber Sacram.* Gelasii apud Martene, *De A. E. R.* i. p. 65; Isidore Hispal. *De Eccl. Off.* lib. ii. cap. 20; and St. Ildephonsus, *De Cognit. Bapt.* cap. iii.; Ephraem Syrus, *De Abrenuntiatione*, &c. (*Opp.* ed. Voss, 2 fol. Romae 1589, t. i. p. 199). For the Gallican usage, see Martene, as above, tom. i. p. 64. The mode of making the Renunciations, and the words employed, are very fully described in the treatise *De Sacramentis*, attributed to St. Ambrose, but of uncertain date and of doubtful authenticity. In the Baptism of Infants the Renunciations and the Profession of Faith were made by the SPONSOR.

#### *The Profession of Faith.*

§ 46. Baptism "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," involves in its very nature a profession of Faith. And of the formal Declaration of Faith made in Baptism, we may see the first trace, probably, in Acts

viii. 37 (si sana est lectio). Fuller details will be found in Tertullian, *De Bapt.* c. vi. and *De Corona Mil.* c. iii.; in St. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxx. and the letter of Firmilian published with St. Cyprian's works (*Ep.* lxxv.). A comparison of the many passages in later writers referring to these Interrogations and Responses, leads to the conclusion, that this profession was originally a recitation of the Creed, assented to with a "Credo" by the Catechumen, much as in our own baptismal service now. The form, however, varied according to the gradual enlargement of the original Creed, and special questions were sometimes added having reference to prevailing heresies or schisms in particular Churches. Examples will be found in the *Missale Gallicanum* quoted by Martene (*De Ant. Ecc. Rit.* t. i. p. 65) and in the *Ordo* iii. *ibid.* p. 64.

#### *The Preparatory Unction.*

§ 47. Without entering at length upon the subject of "Unction," which will be treated in a separate article, it may be well to note here that in many documents dating from after the close of the 3rd century, we find allusions to an Unction preceding Baptism, in addition to that which was given (see § 58) after Baptism. Neither Justin Martyr, nor Tertullian, nor St. Cyprian, say anything of such a preparatory Unction. But this is spoken of in the Apostolical Constitutions (lib. iii. c. 15), even in the earliest form in which they have been preserved to us, and by St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. Myst.* ii.). This last gives us as a fixed date the year 347 A.D. The use may of course have been even earlier than this at Jerusalem and elsewhere. But in Africa we may infer that it had not been introduced even at the close of the 4th century, as St. Augustine nowhere alludes to any such rite; and, what is more, in one passage (*Sermo* ccxxvii. in die Paschae; *al. De Diversis*, 83) he dwells with much emphasis on the fact (necessary to the argument he is pursuing) that the Unction of Christians follows after their baptism. Among books of doubtful date, which contain allusions to this particular rite are the "Recognitions," ascribed, though falsely, to St. Clement of Rome (lib. iii. c. lxxvii.); the *Responsiones ad Orthodoxos* (*Quaest.* 137, ed. Ben. p. 501, E. 7) falsely attributed to Justin Martyr; the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of Dionysius, the so-called Areopagite (see § 39, above); and the Constitutions of the Egyptian Church already referred to.

#### *The Unclothing of the Catechumens.*

§ 48. A comparison of all the evidence leads to the conclusion that the catechumens entered the font in a state of absolute nakedness. See particularly St. Cyril, *Hieros. Myst. Catech.* ii. *ad init.*; St. Ambrose, *Serm.* xx. (*Opp.* t. v. p. 153, Paris, 1642), and *Enarrat. in Ps.* lxi. 32 (BB. t. i. p. 966); St. Chrysostom, *ad Illum. Cat.* i. (Migne, tom. ii. p. 268). Possibly a cincture of some kind (quo pudori consuleretur) may have been worn, as indicated in some mediaeval works of art. But in any case, the question arises, considering the great numbers, of both sexes and of all ages, baptised at one time, how could the solemn celebrations at Epiphany, Easter, or Pentecost have been conducted with decency and order? The explanation of this difficulty seems to lie in the construction of the ancient bap-



baptisteries, in which the actual *κολυμβήθρα*, or pool, occupied the centre of a much larger chamber, from which it was in a measure separated by rows of surrounding columns. If we suppose the intervals of these columns to have been occupied at the time of baptism by curtains, it is easy to imagine how the necessary arrangements could be made without difficulty, the more so, as the custom was for the baptism of men to take place first, that of women afterwards. And that curtains were so used we may infer with some certainty from the following facts. St. Gregory of Tours, in his well-known description of the baptism of Clovis and his followers, speaks thus of the preparations made at the baptistery for the occasion (*Hist. Franc.* lib. ii. c. xxii.). "The open spaces of the church are shaded (or are darkened, *adumbrantur*) by coloured hangings, and fitted up with white curtains; the baptistery is duly arranged, balsams diffuse their scent, burning lights are gleaming, and the whole enclosure of the baptistery is bedewed with a divine fragrance," &c. Similar arrangements to these we find extemporised some centuries later by St. Otto in Pomerania. He himself baptised boys in one place, while the grown men and the women respectively were baptised in separate places by others. Large vessels were let down deep into the ground, the edge reaching upwards, above ground, to the height of the knee, or somewhat less. These were filled with water. And round these curtains were hung on "columellae," probably stout poles, and attached to a rope. A further arrangement is described in the following terms: "Ante sacerdotem vero et comministros, qui ex una parte adstantes sacramenti opus explere habebant, linteam fune trajecto pependit quatenus verecundiae undique provisum foret." (*S. Ottonis Vita*, lib. ii. c. 15, apud Surium, 2 Julii.)

#### The Immersion.

§ 49. *Triple Immersion*, that is thrice dipping the head (*καθάπερ ἐν τινὶ τάφῳ τῇ ὕδατι καταδυόμενος ἡμῶν τὰς κεφαλὰς*, St. Chrysost. in Joan. iii. 5. *Hom.* xv.) while standing in the water, was the all but universal rule of the Church in early times. Of this we find proof in Africa (Tertullian c. *Praxeam*, cap. xxvi.), in Palestine (St. Cyril Hiero. *Catech. Myst.* ii.), in Egypt (*Constit. Eccl. Aegypt.* see above, § 23), at Antioch and Constantinople (St. Chrysostom, *Hom. de Fide*, t. ix. p. 855), in Cappadocia (St. Basil *De Sp. Scto*, c. xxvii. and St. Gregor. Nyssen. *De Bapt.* ὕδατι ἑαυτοὺς ἐγκρύπτομεν . . . καὶ τριτὸν τοῦτο ποίῃσantes). For the Roman usage Tertullian indirectly witnesses in the second century; St. Jerome (*adv. Lucifer.* cap. iv. t. iv. p. 294) in the fourth; Leo the Great (*Epist.* iv. *ad Episc. Sicul.* c. iii.) in the fifth; and Pope Pelagius (*Epist. ad Gaudent.* apud Gratian. *Distinct.* iv. cap. lxxxii.), and St. Gregory the Great (*Epist.* i. 41, *ad Leandrum*) in the sixth. Theodulf of Orleans witnesses for the general practice of his time, the close of the eighth century (*De Ordine Baptismi*, cap. xi. sub trina mersione in fontem . . . descendimus). Lastly, the Apostolical Canons, so called, alike in the Greek, the Coptic, and the Latin versions (*Can.* 42 *al.* 50), give special injunctions as to this observance, saying that any bishop or presbyter should be deposed who violated this rule.

CHRIST. ANT.

§ 50. *Single Immersion*.—While trine immersion was thus an all but universal practice, Euno-mius (circ. 360) appears to have been the first to introduce simple immersion "unto the death of Christ" (Sozomen. *H. E.* lib. vi. c. 26; and Theodoret. *Haeret. Fab.* iv. § 3; Schultze, t. iv. p. 356). This practice was condemned, on pain of degradation, by the *Canon. Apost.* 46 [*al.* 50]. But it comes before us again about a century later in Spain; but then, curiously enough, we find it regarded as a badge of orthodoxy in opposition to the practice of the Arians. These last kept to the use of trine immersion, but in such a way as to set forth their own doctrine of a *gradation* in the three Persons. Hence arose, and long continued, a diversity of practice in the orthodox Churches, some following one rite and some another. Gregory the Great (*Epist.* i. 41), when his advice upon the subject was asked by Leander bishop of Hispala, replied that either simple or trine immersion are allowable, the one setting forth the Unity of Godhead, the other the Trinity of Persons. But under the special circumstances of the Spanish Churches, and in view of the fact that trine immersion was there specially the usage of heretics, he thought they would do well to hold to simple immersion. But the matter was still unsettled some twenty or thirty years later. At the Council of Toledo (the 4th, held A.D. 633) the practice suggested by St. Gregory was laid down as the rule of the Spanish Churches, and from that time onward, though triple immersion has been the prevailing practice, yet both canons of councils and writers on ritual questions have maintained the legitimacy of simple immersion. (See Martene, *De A. E. R.* lib. i. cap. i. art. xiv. § viii.)

#### The Baptismal Formula.

§ 51. Not less necessary to a valid baptism than the use of water was the pronouncing of the words prescribed by implication by Our Lord, in Matt. xxviii. 19, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." With the slight exceptions noticed below there has been at all times, and in all Christian Bodies, a practically universal assent as to the use of these "Evangelical Words," as they are called by St. Augustine. In this we find complete assent between the Churches of the East and of the West. Tertullian, in reference to this, appeals, not to any ecclesiastical tradition, but to the direct command of Our Lord, "Lex tinguendi imposita, et forma praescripta: 'Ite, inquit, docete nationes, tingentes eos in Nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti'" (*De Bapt.* c. 13. Compare his treatise *Adv. Praxeam*, c. 26, quoted in § 11). St. Cyprian, fifty years later, uses similar language in his *Epist.* lxxiii., ad Iubai. p. 200. And St. Augustine (*de Bapt.* lib. vi. cap. 25) asserts that it was easier to find heretics who rejected baptism altogether than to find any who, giving baptism, used any other than the generally received formula. The use of this form was no less carefully maintained in the East. The 41st of the "Canons of the Apostles" orders the degradation of any bishop or Presbyter who baptized otherwise than according to the commandment of the Lord εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. Didymus of Alexandria (ed. Vallars. 1735, vol. ii. p. 130), St. Basil (*De Sp. Scto*, cap. 12,

Λ



tom. iii. p. 23), and others, speak of Baptism as invalid if not given with these words.

§ 52. *Apparent exceptions.* In the language of Holy Scripture itself authority seems, at first sight, to be found for a certain variety of expression in giving effect to the command of Our Lord. Thus, in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles we find expressions such as baptizing "in the name of Jesus Christ," Acts ii. 38; "in the name of the Lord Jesus," *ibid.* viii. 16; or simply "in the name of the Lord," *ibid.* x. 48. But in all probability these are only to be regarded as compendious expressions, equivalent in meaning to a statement that the persons in question received "Christian Baptism." And the apparent exception afforded by the language of Justin Martyr, quoted above in § 7, is probably apparent only, and not real. Addressing himself as he there does to persons unacquainted with Christian Doctrine, he somewhat amplifies the actual formula, which would otherwise have been unintelligible to a heathen, and speaks of Christians being baptized "in the name of God the Father and Lord of the Universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit."

§ 53. *Real Exceptions.* On the other hand we find evidence, even as early as St. Cyprian's (*Epist.* lxiii.) time, that there were some who maintained that it was sufficient to administer "in the name of Jesus Christ." St. Ambrose favours this opinion, if the treatise *De Spiritu Sancto* (lib. i. cap. 111) be really his. In later times this same opinion was formally maintained by more than one authority. The Council of Frejns, a. 792, and Pope Nicholas I. in his *Responsa ad Bulgaros*, all maintain more or less emphatically the validity of such a formula.

Directly contrary to this is the decree of the Synodus Londinensis, held in the year 605, by Augustine of Canterbury, Laurentius, Justus, and Mellitus. There, as we learn from a letter of Pope Zacharias to St. Boniface, it was decreed, that anyone who had been "washed" without invocation of the Trinity had not the Sacrament of Regeneration. The omission of the name of any one person of the Trinity was held to be fatal to the validity of the rite (Wilkins, *Concilia*, p. 29). St. Ildephonsus of Toledo (*De Cognit. Baptismi*, lib. i. c. 112), circ. a. 663, uses similar language. "Quod si ommissa qualibet Trinitatis persona baptismum conferatur, omnino nihil egisse baptismi solemnitas deputetur nisi tota Trinitas veraciter invocetur." For the opinions of the Schoolmen on this question see Martene *De A. E. R.*, lib. i. cap. i. Art. xiv. 20. And for those of various theologians at the time of the Reformation, and subsequently, see Augusti *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vol. vii. p. 239.

§ 54. *Slight variations.* The passages above quoted shew that all the earlier Church authorities, almost without exception, speak of the use of the words "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," as absolutely required. Yet it is worth noting that it was an essential not a literal identity of expression that was required. The main point of faith in the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity being secured, slight verbal variations in the formula were not regarded as of vital importance. Indeed the usage of various churches was not absolutely identical. Thus while in most cases the identical words of Our Lord *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ*

*Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος*, were exactly reproduced (in Latin Ritual "In Nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti"), the words *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, "in nomine," were in some churches omitted. The formula, as given by Tertullian (§ 11) and in the Apostolical Constitutions (lib. iii. c. 14), serves to exemplify this omission. Elsewhere additions were made to the formula, as thus; "In nomine Patris, Amen; et Filii, Amen; et Spiritus Sancti, Amen." The corresponding Greek words are the formula of the Greek Church to this day. In the Gothic missal already quoted in § 32, we find "In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti in remissionem peccatorum, ut habeas vitam aeternam." In an ancient Gallican Missal, there is still greater variation, "Baptizo te credentem in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti ut habeas vitam aeternam in saecula saeculorum," or again, "Baptizo te in nomine Patris etc., . . . unam habentium substantiam, ut habeas vitam aeternam et partem cum Sanctis." Again Martene (*De A. E. R.* tom. i. p. 31, § xix.) quotes the formula once in use at Cambray, in which the words "Ego te baptizo" were altogether omitted, and the ministrant said only, "In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen." Hugo de St. Victor, Peter Lombard, and others, held this to constitute a valid baptism; Pope Alexander III. decided in a contrary sense. This was in the year 1175 A.D. About 400 years earlier, Zacharias (Martene § xix.), then Roman Pope, had formally to decide whether Baptism given by an ignorant Priest "In nomine Patria Filia et Spiritus Sanctus" was valid or no. St. Boniface had decided that such baptism was invalid, and was for rebaptizing a child who had so received it. But he was opposed by two other bishops (Virgilius and Sidonius) whose opinion was endorsed by the bishop of Rome on appeal made to him. "If" (so he wrote) "he who so ministered baptism did so not by way of introducing error or heresy, but only through ignorance of our Roman speech spoke with a broken utterance, we cannot consent to any repetition of the baptism so conferred."

§ 55. *Eastern and Western Forms.* One difference there is between the mode of employing the "Evangelical words," which is characteristic of Eastern and of Western Churches respectively. In the West, with very rare exceptions only, the personal office of the ministrant has been made somewhat prominent by the formula "I baptize thee (Ego baptizo te) in the name" etc. But in the Eastern use this is not the case, the third person being employed, *βαπτίζεται ὁ δεῖνα* (sometimes *ὁ δούλος τοῦ θεοῦ*, adding the name) *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα κ. τ. λ.* "Such an one" (naming him), or "The servant of God, N. or M. is baptized in the name," &c. The exceptions among Eastern Churches are very few. The Coptic Formula (Abudacni *Historia Jacobitarum seu Coptorum*, Oxon. 1675. J. E. Gerhards, *Essai de l'histoire de l'église Coptique*, 1666) is in the first person, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Amen; I baptize thee in the name of the Son, Amen; I baptize thee in the name of the Holy Ghost, Amen." And the Nestorians (Badger's *Nestorians and their Rituals*) of Syria, though their own older formula agreed with that of other Eastern Churches, adopted also that prescribed by the Roman Church, expressed in the first person. A more remark-

able exception to the usual Eastern practice is that of the Aethiopian Church, if it really were as described. Alvarez, one of the Jesuit Missionaries, states in one place that the form they employ is "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And Ludolf (who has no sympathy with these Roman authorities when he thinks them moved by prejudice) states that in the ritual books of the Ethiopians he had never been able to find any other formula. On the other hand there were others of the same Jesuit Mission who spoke of the great variety of forms which they found in use, obliging them to rebaptize. See Ludolf, *Hist. Aethiop.* lib. iii. cap. vi.

#### Subsequent Ceremonial.

§ 56. The ceremonies subsequent upon the actual baptism are commonly (as by Bellarmine, *de Bapt.* lib. i. cap. 27) reckoned as five in number, the Kiss, the Unction of the Head (distinct from the Unction in Confirmation), the lighted Taper, the white Robe, the Tasting of Milk and Honey. To these may be added the Washing of Feet, and the Chaplet on the head, which found place in the Ritual of some early Churches.

§ 57. *The Kiss.* We first hear of this as a customary practice in Africa in St. Cyprian's *Epist.* lxiv. (*al.* liv.) *ad Fidum*. St. Augustine quotes the passage (*contra duas epist. Pelag.* lib. iv. cap. viii. §§ 23, 24) in a way which shews that the usage had been maintained to his own time. It is expressly prescribed (to be given by the bishop first and afterwards by the assembled faithful) in the ritual of the Egyptian Church § 50. (See above § 23 of this Article), and in St. Chrysostom (*Sermo* 50 *de util. leg. script.* tom. iii. p. 80 l.) we find proof of a similar usage.

§ 58. *The Unction of the Head.* No trace is to be found in the earliest records of more than one Unction after baptism, viz., that given in Confirmation by the bishop. Its introduction is attributed, by Roman tradition, to St. Sylvester, bishop of Rome, from 314 to 335 A.D. See further under UNCTION.

§ 59. *The Use of Lights.* We have already seen that in the 4th century certainly, and probably therefore in yet earlier ages, baptism was administered after dark (generally late on Easter Eve). In this, as in so many other cases, what was perpetuated in late Christian usage for doctrinal or symbolical reasons took its rise in considerations of practical convenience or necessity. References made to the use of Lights by St. Cyril Hieros., have already been alleged (§ 22). And to the same effect, though with more of detail, is the language of St. Gregory Nazianz. *Orat.* xl. "The station that thou shalt take before the great bema (of the church), after thy baptism, is a foreshadowing of the glory that shall be from heaven; the psalmody wherewith thou shalt be received is a prelude of the hymns that thence shall sound; the lamps that thou shalt kindle set forth in mystery that procession of many lights wherewith bright and virgin souls shall go forth to meet their Lord, having the lamps of faith bright and burning." With these passages compare Ambrosius, *de lapsu virg. sac.* c. 5; Marcus Gazensis, *ad Arcadium Imp.* apud Baronium ad ann. 401; Gregor. Taron. *Hist. Franc.* lib. v. c. 11; St. Gregory the Great, *Lib. Sacram. de sabbato sancto*; Al-

cinus, *de Div. off. de sabbato sancto*; Amalarius, *de eccl. off.* lib. i. c. 18; Rabanus, *de Inst. Chr.* lib. ii. c. 38, 39; St. Ivo, of Chartres, *de Sacramento Neophytorum*; and the *Ordo Baptismi* xviii. in Martene, *de Ant. Eccl. Rit.* tom. i. p. 78.

§ 60. *The wearing of white garments* (λευκείμεν or λαμπροφορεῖν in Greek writers) b; the newly baptized was of universal custom both in West and East, and this was continued throughout the week to the Lord's Day immediately following, thence called the "Dominica in albis depositis," the Κυριακή τῆς διακαιημέριου (Goar, *Euchol. Graec.* p. 373) of the Greeks. By their colour these garments were significant both of innocence and of joy (Marriott, *Vestiarium Christianum*, p. 182, n. 19), and by their material, which was generally linen, they were associated with the idea of deliverance from death (Philo *de Somniis*, p. 597. Paris, fol. 1640, and Jerome, *Epist. ad Fabiol.* *Opp.* tom. ii. p. 574. Paris, fol. 1693). The allusions to this practice in early writers are innumerable. It will suffice here to state a few particulars as to the various vestments of which we find mention.

§ 61. *The Alb.* The outer garment, vestis alba, or simply "alba" (q. v.), λαμπρά or λευκή ἐσθῆς, or ἐμφωτίον, was probably not unlike that worn in early times as a vestment of holy ministry. In some instances we hear of this being kept as a memorial of baptism, to serve as a covering for the body after death (Antonini Mart. *Itinerarium*: "induti sindones . . . quas sibi ad sepulturam servant.") So Constantine the Great, dying shortly after his baptism, was buried μετ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἐμφωτίων, in the garments which he had then worn (St. Germanus Patriarch. *De Sanctis Synodis etc.* apud Spicil. Rom. A. Mai, tom. vii. § 14). And so Probus Anicius in his epitaph (Bosio, *Rom. Subt.* p. 47) is described as one, "Qui nova decedens muneris aetherii vestimenta tulit." At other times these white garments were presented to the Church. This is implied in the story of Elpidophorus and the Deacon Maritta, told by Victor of Utica (*De Persec. Vandal.* lib. v. *Bibl. Patr. Max.* tom. viii. p. 699). For the use of the poor they were provided gratuitously, as e.g. by Constantine the Great (Surii *Vit. Sanctorum*, in S. Sylvestro, die 31 Dec.), and by Gregory the Great (*Epist.* iv. 16; and vii. 24).

§ 62. *The Sabanum.* This word (in Greek σάβανον) as originally used meant either a large wrapper for covering the body immediately after bathing, or a towel used for drying it. The same word is occasionally used (as by Victor Uticensis) in speaking of baptismal vestments, and it is used in the Greek Church to this day. A letter is extant from Pope Paul I. in which he thanks King Pepin for having sent him the "Sabanum" used at the baptism of the king's daughter Gislana. It is not clear whether this is identical with the "alba" or no.

§ 63. *The Chrismale.* This was a piece of white linen tied round the head, and intended to retain the chrism upon the head throughout the week "in albis."

§ 64. *The twisted thread.* In the Armenian rite, as still celebrated, there is a curious relic of the primitive customs in regard of baptismal dress. We here read [Translation. unpublished,

by the Rev. S. C. Malan] of the priest "twisting the thread." And the Catholicos (bishop) Joseph, in his Russian translation of this order of baptism, enlarges this rubric as follows: "While the choir sings, the priest takes two threads, one white and the other red, in remembrance of the water and the blood that flowed from the side of the Saviour of the world. He lifts them up under the holy cross, and lays them at last upon the catechumen or child to be baptized." There can be little doubt that this is a last trace of former white baptismal robes with red embroidery. This hypothesis is confirmed by some references in ancient authors. A MS. at Turin, of unknown authorship and date [from internal evidence it appears to the writer to be of the 11th century], thus describes the "chrismale." "Induitur deinde chrismali neophytus, scilicet alba veste quae instar capuae lineae caputium habet, quo caput quasi quadam mitra operitur, et filo rubeo supersuitur." Durandus too (*Rationale Div. Off.* lib. vi. c. 82), mentions a custom still existing in his time (13th century) in Narbonne, that the white garment of the baptized had sewn upon it a red band like a 'corona.' And the same combination of colours was still preserved in the usage of the Ethiopic Church two centuries ago (Ludolf, *Hist. Aethiop.* lib. iii. cap. 6), and may be traced back in Africa to the 5th century of our era. Victor of Utica (*de Pers. Vand.* lib. ii.) speaks of the white robe as "purpura sanguinis Christi decoratam."

§ 65. *The Chaplet* (corona or στέφανος). The earliest certain reference to this as worn by Neophytes is in the ritual of Alexandria described by Patriarch Severus in the 7th century. "Then (i. e. after baptism and unction) he takes the baptized to the altar, and gives them the sacrament of the Eucharist, and the priest crowns them with garlands" (*Bibl. Max. Patr.* Paris 1654, tom. vi. p. 25). This usage was still maintained at Alexandria 200 years ago. Vansleb, describing their baptismal ritual, writes as follows. The priest, "trempe dans l'eau du baptême la couronne et la ceinture de l'enfant qui a été baptisé, et lui met cette couronne sur la tête, et il lui ceint les reins de cette ceinture," &c. (*Hist. de l'Eglise d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1677, 12). Allusions to a similar rite, on very slight grounds however of what is probably merely metaphorical language, have been imagined in the Gotho-Gallican Missal (baptizati et in Christo coronati), in St. Chrysostom, *Catech. I. ad Illuminandos* (δταν διδάσκει [not a chaplet, but a royal crown], ἀναθήσθε τῶν ἡλιακῶν ἀκτίνων φαυροτέρας ἔχον παντάχθεν ἐκπηδῶσας λαμπρόνας), and *Catech. II. τὸν στέφανον τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, a quotation from Scripture.) A passage of Gregory Nazianz. (*Oratio* xxiii. ad init.), quoted by Augusti for this usage, has certainly nothing whatever to do with baptism, as an examination of the entire context will conclusively shew. The "crowns" there spoken of are the words of public encomium wherewith St. Gregory welcomes Heron, a confessor of the faith, comparing him to one who has conquered in the arena.

§ 66. *Tasting of milk and honey.* This symbolical usage, like many others, originated in a prevailing metaphor. "Quid ergo lac et mel?" asks Barnabas. "Quia nimirum infans lacte et melle vivificatur, sic et nos fide promissionis et

verbo nutrimur." Tertullian in more than one passage (see § 12 above, and *adv. Marc.* lib. i. c. 14); Clement of Alexandria (*Paedag.* lib. i. cap. vi.); the Third Council of Carthage, can. 24; the Constitutions of the Egyptian Church, § 51; St. Jerome (*adv. Lucifer. Opp.* tom. ii. p. 180, and in *Esaiam.* cap. lv.); and the Leouine Sacramentary (Muratori, *Liturg. Rom. Vet.* tom. i.), all allude to the tasting of mingled milk and honey after baptism. The rite is again mentioned by Macarius Bishop of Memphis, circ. a. 756, and was still preserved both in Alexandria and in the Ethiopic Church two hundred years ago (Vansleb and Ludolf, referred to above).

§ 67. *Pedilavium.* *The washing of feet.* A peculiar custom prevailed in the early Gallican ritual, of a symbolical washing of the feet of the newly baptized, having reference to the action of our Lord recorded in the Gospel of St. John (xiii. 1-16). The so-called Gothic missal, and another early Gallican missal (Martene, *De A. E. R.* tom. i. pp. 63, 64), both contain references to this as a recognized part of the baptismal ritual. In the first, see above § 34, immediately after the application of the chrism, we read, "Dum pedes ejus lavas, dicis, 'Ego tibi lavo pedes. Sicut Dominus noster Jesus Christus fecit discipulis suis, tu facias hospitibus et peregrinis ut habeas vitam aeternam:'" (then follows the impositio vestimenti). In the second of the two documents, a collect is given "ad pedes lavandos," which follows, as before, immediately upon the "Infusio Chrismae." "Dominus et Salvator noster Jesus Christus apostolis suis pedes lavit: Ego tibi pedes lavo, ut et tu facias hospitibus et peregrinis, qui ad te venerint. Hoc si feceris habebis vitam aeternam in saecula saeculorum. Amen." In yet a third Gallican sacramentary (Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* tom. i. and Martene, *De A. E. R.* tom. i. p. 64) the same rite is noticed, but is placed after the clothing with the "Vestis Candida," instead of immediately before as in the two earlier MSS.; and there is a slight variation in the terms of the collect prescribed. From two treatises of doubtful authenticity attributed to St. Ambrose (*De Sacram.* lib. iii. c. 1 and *De Myster.* c. 6), it has been inferred that the rite was in use at Milan. In the first of the two passages the writer, whoever he was, mentions that the rite in question was not of Roman usage. No traces of it are now to be found in the Ambrosian ritual. Allusions to a similar rite after baptism, occurring in the works of St. Augustine, are not, as might be thought, a proof of a similar usage in the African Church. They occur in a sermon (*De tempore* 160) which on other grounds had been judged not to be St. Augustine's, but to have been composed by Caesarius Archbp. of Arles (†540). He quotes the words of a Gallican missal still extant (Martene, *De A. E. R.* p. 64): "Secundum quod ipsis in baptismo dictum est, Hospitum pedes lavent," &c. The 48th canon of the Council of Illiberis, forbidding the practice (neque pedes eorum [qui baptizantur] lavandi sunt a sacerdotibus vel clericis), marks probably a previous attempt to introduce the observance in some parts of Spain, in imitation of the usage elsewhere existing. No traces of the rite are now anywhere to be found in connection with the administration of baptism. But a ceremonial, similar in its origin, in which the

Pope takes part, forms one of the observances of the Holy Week at Rome to this day.

#### IV. At what times Baptism was administered.

§ 68. In the Apostolic Age no special times were appointed for the administration of baptism, this being determined by the varying circumstances consequent, in the nature of things, on the first establishment of the faith. The first administration of Christian baptism, properly so called, was on the first Christian Pentecost (Acts ii.), when some 3000 persons gladly receiving the words of Peter were at once baptized on the same day (ver. 41). The Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii.), when Philip, taking occasion from the prophecy of Isaiah (cap. liii.), had taught him the glad tidings of Jesus, was straightway baptized in water by the way side. The jailor at Philippi (Acts xvi.), when the word of the Lord had been spoken unto him (ver. 32) by Paul and Silas, was baptized with all his household while it was night (ver. 33 compared with ver. 25). And neither in Scripture nor in any of the earlier Christian writers before Tertullian, is any trace to be found of the setting apart of any special season as more suited than others for the administration. This greater liberty of the Apostolic times is often alluded to by early fathers, when dissuading men from the indefinite deferring of baptism under pretext of observing the fixed times appointed by the Church for its more solemn administration.

§ 69. Special seasons spoken of by Tertullian. The first mention of any particular season as being set apart for solemn administration of baptism, is found in Tertullian (*de Bapt.* c. xix.) writing about the close of the 2nd century. "Pascha" (i. e. Easter), he says, "offers a more solemn season for baptism, for then was fulfilled the Passion of the Lord into which we are baptized . . . . And afterward Pentecost" (i. e. the whole period from Easter to the day of Pentecost) "is a lengthened time for the preparation of the waters (ordinandis aquis). Therein was the Resurrection of the Lord celebrated among the disciples, and the grace of the Holy Spirit bestowed, and the hope of the advent of the Lord suggested." But in mentioning these as times when baptism was administered with more than usual solemnity, he is careful to add, that "every day is the Lord's . . . . no hour, no time, unsuitable for baptism; the solemnity may be less, but in the grace given there is no diversity." Other references to these two periods, or one of them, as specially observed for the solemn administration of baptism, will be found in St. Jerome, St. Gregory Nazianz., St. Chrysostom, and other writers both in East and West.

§ 70. Baptism at Epiphany. Beside the two seasons of Easter and Pentecost, there were not a few churches in which the Epiphany festival was observed in the same way. Towards the close of the 4th century, Siricius Bishop of Rome stated (*Epist. ad Himerium*, Labbe, *Concil.* t. ii. p. 1018), that all Churches agreed with that of Rome in an exclusive observance of Easter and Pentecost. But in this he was mistaken. Many Eastern Churches, and not a few in the West, which by origin or by subsequent intercourse came under Eastern influence, observed Epiphany (traditionally the time of our

Lord's baptism in Jordan) as a season for solemn administration of baptism. We find evidences of this in the churches of Cappadocia (St. Greg. Nazianz. *Orat.* xl. μένεν τὰ φῶτα), at Antioch, but before St. Chrysostom's time (this by inference from a comparison of St. Chrysostom's *Catechesis I. ad Illuminandos*; Migne, t. ii. p. 268; *De Baptismo Christi*, *ibid.* p. 433, seqq.; and *Hom. III.* in Ephes. i. *ibid.* t. xi. p. 25); at Jerusalem (*Typicum S. Sabas*, quoted by Valesius on Theodoret. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 27; and the *Itinerarium*, Antonini Martyris); in Africa (Victor Uticensis, *De Perssec. Vandal.* lib. ii. inferred from his mention of baptism when "appropinquabat jam futurus dies . . . . Kalendarum Februarium"); in Spain and Sicily (Siricius *ad Himerium*, already referred to, and Leo, *ad Episcopos Siciliae*, Labbe, *Concil.* t. iii. p. 1297); in Gaul (see Martene, *de A. E. R.* lib. i. cap. i. p. 2); in Ireland (St. Patricii . . . . *Synodi, Canones*, &c., ed. T. P. Villanuova, Dublini 1835; Wilkins, *Concilia*, p. 26, can. xix. These canons are of late date in their present form, but preserve some genuine traditions).

§ 71. Other days were observed in some churches. Thus we hear of "Natalitia Christi," or Christmas, in Spain and in Gaul (see Martene, as above), and of Festivals of Apostles and Martyrs, in Spain (Siricius *ad Himerium*), in Campania, Samnium, and Picenum (Leo M. *Epist.* 136), and of the Festival of St. John Baptist (Gregor. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* cap. 9). All days were allowable for the more private administration in cases of pressing necessity from sickness or other causes.

§ 72. Roman usage, however, was much more strict in this particular than that of other Western Churches. And with the zeal for ritual uniformity which has ever been characteristic of that Church (Gregory the Great a notable exception), her bishops, and a series of councils more or less under Roman influence, made repeated efforts to confine the solemn administration to the two seasons of Easter and Pentecost.

§ 73. Papal decrees to this effect, directed to churches of the Roman obedience, are those of Siricius (385-398), in his epistle (Labbe, *Concil.* ii. p. 1018) to Himerius, Bishop of Tarraco, in Spain; of Leo the Great (440-461), writing to the bishops of Sicily (Labbe, *Concil.* iii. p. 1297); of Gelasius (492-496), to the bishops of Lucania; Gregory II. (715-731) to the clergy and people of Thuringia, and Nicolas I. in his *Responsa ad Bulgaros*, cap. 69. It is curious to find the same Roman tradition seeking to assert itself in England many centuries later, in the face of a superstitious belief on the part of some that it was perilous to have children baptised at those times. So we learn from the language of Otto, Cardinal Legate at the Council of London, a. 1237 ("Nonnulli in Anglia periculum suspicantur si prae-fatis diebus pueri baptizentur." Wilkins, *Concil.* p. 650).

§ 74. Councils. Identical in effect with the decrees last quoted are the canons of a series of provincial councils, extending from the 6th to the 13th century. The earliest of these is the Council of Gerunda, in Hispania Tarraconensis, a. 517. With this agree the Councils of Autisiodurum (Auxerre), a. 578; of Moguntia (Mayence), a. 813, can. 4, and again, a. 847, can. 3; of Paris (Parisiense vi. a. 829, part 1. can. 7), of Meaux (Meldense, a. 845); of Worms (Worma-



tiense, a. 868, can. 1); of Tribur, or Teuver, near Mayence (Triburiense, a. 895, can. 12); of Rouen (Rothomagensis, a. 1072, can. 23); of Winchester (Wintoniense, a. 1074, can. 7); of London (Londinense, a. 1237).

§ 75. *Imperial and other authorities* were not wanting from time to time to enforce a practice which popes and provincial councils were thus continually enacting. The capitularies of Charlemagne, a. 804, direct "ut nullus baptizare prae-sumat nisi in Pascha et Pentecosten, excepto infirmo." To the same effect are the capitularia collected by Benedictus Levita (lib. 1, n. 171). "Ut baptismus non fiat nisi statutis temporibus id est Pascha et Pentecosten, nisi infirmitas inter-cesserit." And lib. ii. n. 171: "Ut nullus baptizare prae-sumat nisi per duo tempora, id est vigilia Paschae et vigilia Pentecostes, praeter mortis periculum." Bishops sometimes made this observance matter of special injunction to the clergy at their ordination (St. Hildephonsus *De Cogn. Baptismi*, lib. i. c. 108; Rodulfi Archiepisc. Bituricensis *Capitular.* n. 20; Ratherii Veronensis Episcopi *Synodica*, apud Martene, *Spicilegium*, tom. ii.), or desired parish priests to enforce this duty upon their people from the pulpit (Otto, Cardinalis, apud Wilkins, *Concilia*, p. 650).

§ 76. *Later usage.*—The limitation of baptism to one or two special periods in the year was of advantage in the first four centuries, or thereabouts, when the baptism of adults, requiring previous instruction and preparation, was still of prevailing usage. But this limitation no longer served any important end, when under the changed circumstances of the church the baptism of adults was rare and exceptional. And accordingly these restrictions have long ceased to be observed in churches both of the East and of the West.

#### *Places of administering Baptism.*

§ 77. *Originally no limitation of place* was observed. Water by the roadside (Acts viii. 36–38), private houses (Acts ix. 18), or a prison (Acts xvi. 29, 30), were all made use of for the purpose. And in sub-apostolic times we find proof of the same freedom from all limitation. See Justin Martyr, quoted above, § 7; Clementis *Recog.* lib. iv. c. 32, and lib. vi. c. 15; Tertullian *de Bapt.* c. 4. To the same effect are the traditional stories, in early Hagiologies, of baptisms performed in private houses, in prisons, in the public road. See the lives of St. Laurentius (Surii *Vit. Sanct.* die 23 Julii), of St. Apollinaris (*ibid.* die 10 August), and of the Deacon Cyriacus (*ibid.* die 16 Jan.). It is not till the close of the 3rd century that we meet with any mention of baptisteries properly so called, and under the name "baptisterium" (See the story of St. Cyriacus apud Surium, die 16 Jan.). [BAPTISTERY.]

#### *Baptism, by whom administered.*

§ 78. *In the first five centuries*, or thereabouts, the rule and the practice of the Church was, that the solemn celebration of baptism, whether at Epiphany, Easter, or Pentecost, should be presided over by the bishop. The earliest authorities bearing upon this subject are, St. Ignatius, *ad Smyrn.* cap. 8; Tertullian *de Bapt.* c. 17; *Constit. Apost.* lib. iii. cap. xi. (bishops and presbyters to baptize, deacons being in attendance upon them); St. Gregor. Nyssen. *Orat.* xl. (Paris, Morell, fol. 1630, tom. i. p. 656) where

baptism by bishops and presbyters is spoken of Council of Illiberis, a. 313, can. 77, decreeing that if a deacon baptise any one, without either bishop or presbyter, the sacrament must be "completed" afterwards by the benediction of the bishop; St. Jerome, *adv. Lucifer.* c. 4 (saying that neither Presbyter nor deacon have the right of baptising without direction from the bishop, though even laymen are frequently allowed to baptise if necessity so require). In the 5th and 6th centuries we find at one time (Gelasii Papae *Epist. ad univ. episc.* and Isidor. Hispal. *Off. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. 24), a declaration that bishops and presbyters are the only proper administrators (cases of necessity excepted); at another (Concil. Hispal. ii. a. 619, can. 7), the vindication of the supreme right of bishops in this matter, in depreciation of that of presbyters. Of the practice of the Eastern Churches at this time we find an indication in a letter written by the people of Edessa at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, a. 451, and inserted among its Acta. In it they beg that Abas, their bishop, will return to them as soon as possible, on account of the approaching Easter Festival, his presence being required for the instruction of the catechumens, and for those who are found worthy to receive holy baptism. More remarkable is a somewhat similar letter (quoted by Martene *De A. E. R.* tom. i. p. 7), in which certain of the clergy in Italy write to Constantinople, begging that the emperor will allow Dacius, bishop of Milan, to return to his diocese after an absence of fifteen or sixteen years, giving as a reason that almost all the bishops customarily ordained by the Bishop of Milan were now dead, and an immense multitude of people died without baptism (quia cum pene omnes episcopi, quos ordinare solet, . . . mortui sint, immensa populi multitudo sine baptismo moritur). It is worthy of note in connection with this that from the time of St. Ambrose to that of Cardinal Borromeo, if not later, the traditions of the Church of Milan have maintained in a variety of ways the special office of the bishop in the administration of baptism. Paulinus, writing (circ. 420) the life of St. Ambrose, says that St. Ambrose had with his own hands baptised more persons than five succeeding bishops. And in the *Caeremoniale Ambrosianum*, published by Cardinal Borromeo (Martene, p. 7), it is stated that the archbishop administered baptism solemnly twice in the year, at Easter and at Pentecost, and also at other times throughout the year in the event of any adults, converted from unbelief, being presented for baptism.

§ 79. *In later centuries.* The provision last mentioned will of itself serve to suggest why it was that as time went on the personal action of the bishop, as the recognised administrator of baptism, became gradually less and less; while that of presbyters, deacons, and even of clergy of the minor orders, was continually increasing. From the time when the baptism of adults became the exception rather than the prevailing rule, and when, from the wider extent of the Church, the number of the children brought to baptism was continually increasing, the older practice of the Church gradually changed. It was revived at a later time by missionary bishops, such as our own countryman St. Boniface in Germany, or St. Otto of Bamberg in Pomerania (*Hist. S. Bonifacii* and *Hist. S. Ottonis*, lib. ii.



c. 19, quoted by Martene *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* lib. i. cap. i. art. iii.). But with exceptions such as these last, exceptions which prove the rule, the tendency in most Churches, from about the close of the 5th century, was to make the administration of baptism of less prominent importance; and the part taken by the bishop himself became gradually less and less. In the Gregorian Sacramentary, not the bishop, but presbyters, are spoken of as being in a special sense the ministers of baptism (*ministri baptismi*). And even at the more solemn ceremonies of the Easter Baptism at Rome and elsewhere, the bishop merely inaugurated the ceremony by baptising a few himself, leaving the rest to presbyters, to deacons, or if need were to acolytes. (*Ordo Romanus* apud Mabillon *Mus. Ital.* t. ii., and Martene *De A. E. R.* t. i. p. 8, col. 2.)

§ 80. *Lay Baptism.* Tertullian (*de bapt.* cap. 17) and St. Jerome (*adv. Lucif.* cap. 4; see above, § 78) say, in effect, that for a layman to baptise is not contrary to essential Christian principles, though contrary to ecclesiastical order. And such practically has been the judgment of the Church in all later times, forbidding lay baptism as a rule, but recognising it in cases of necessity. See as to this the Council of Illiberis, a. 313, can. 38. In late mediæval times the practice of lay baptism became very common. See, as illustrating English usage in this matter, the Council of Durham (between the years 1217 and 1222; in Wilkins, *Concil.* p. 575) and the Council of Oxford, a. 1222 (*ibid.* p. 594).

§ 81. *Baptism by Women.* The question whether women may lawfully baptise is first adverted to by Tertullian. Nothing can well be stronger than his language, diluted though it be by some later writers into the assertion that women may not "publicly baptise in the church." After saying (*de bapt.* cap. 17) that in cases of perilous necessity laymen should not hesitate to give baptism, he goes on to say that women, though they took upon themselves to teach, would scarcely, with all their presumption, attempt to create a right to administer baptism, unless indeed some strange beast arose like to one that formerly had been. That former one sought to do away with baptism; some successor might perhaps seek to confer baptism herself. Compare *De Virgin. velind.* cap. 9, and *De Præscript.* cap. 41. The *Apostolical Constitutions*, lib. iii. cap. 9; Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 70; and the Fourth Council of Carthage, a. 398, canon 20 ("Mulier, quamvis docta et sancta, viros in conventu docere, vel aliquos baptizare, non præsumat"), are all to the same effect. Isidore of Hispala is referred to (by Augusti, *Denkw.* p. 115) as saying that persons baptised by women are not to be rebaptised. And Joannes Moschus (*Pratum Spirituale*, cap. 3) says that it is contrary to the canons for women to baptise, yet makes an exception for cases of the last extremity. Even as late as the 12th century we find Hugo de S. Victore speaks of it as still with some a disputed question whether baptism by women was valid.

§ 82. *Baptism by Heretics.* The question of the validity or otherwise of baptism by heretics is one which was forced on the attention of the Church in the 3rd century by the Donatist Schism. The dissension thence arising between St. Cyprian (supported by all the African bishops and by several of the Eastern Churches) and Stephen

Bishop of Rome, is on many grounds of great importance to early Church history. But this lies beyond the scope of the present article. The final settlement of the question was based upon the principle that the unworthiness of the ministrant cannot mar the act of God, or as was said, that the wickedness of the sower affects not the vitality of the seed. Hence the question of rebaptising or otherwise was for the most part determined simply by the question whether the essential elements of baptism were wanting or no, viz.: water and the words prescribed by our Lord. If these were employed the baptism was regarded as valid, though irregular, and the person so baptised was admitted into communion, if on other grounds found worthy, after imposition of the hands of the bishop.

§ 83. *Baptism by Pagans and Jews, and excommunicate persons,* has been held to fall under the same rule as that last stated. But opinions have not been altogether at one upon this point. See the authorities quoted by Martene, *De A. E. R.* lib. i. cap. 1, art. iii.

§ 84. *Baptism administered in sport.* Perhaps the strongest illustration of the feeling of antiquity in this matter is afforded by the story told by Socrates (*Hist. Ecc.* lib. ii. c. 16) and by Rufinus (*Hist. Ecc.* lib. i. c. 14). When Athanasius was a boy, so the story is told, he was playing with some young companions on the shore at Alexandria. The bishop, Alexander by name, happened to be looking on from a distance as they played, and observed, to his astonishment, that they were imitating the ceremonial of baptism, Athanasius acting as "boy-bishop," to anticipate a phrase of well-known Mediæval usage. "On diligent inquiry," we translate now the words of Rufinus, "both from those who were said to have been baptised, as to what they had been asked and what they had replied (the *ἐπερωτήσεις* and the *ἀποκρίσεις*, above, § 43), and from him also who had put the baptismal questions, when the bishop found that all things had been duly performed according to the observances of religion, he conferred with his clergy in council, and is said to have decided to this effect, that, as water had been poured upon these persons after the interrogations and responses had been duly made, their baptism ought not to be repeated, but only be made complete by the customary sacerdotal acts (*adimplere ea quæ a sacerdotibus mos est*). Doubts have been raised as to whether such an occurrence ever actually took place; but whether the story be true or no it serves equally to illustrate the feeling of the Church at the time the story was first told.

§ 85. *Baptism self-administered.* To make this subject complete, it may perhaps be added that on one occasion the question arose whether baptism self-administered was valid. The question was decided in the negative by Pope Innocent III. on the ground that there is an essential distinction of person between the baptiser and the baptised. The Council of Nismes (a. 1283) embodied this decision in one of their canons: "Si quis se ipsum baptizaverit talem non esse baptizatum ecclesia judicabit."

*With what matter Baptism was administered.*

§ 86. *Of water as the material element.* Water from natural associations has ever been associated with ideas of life in the minds of most cultivated

nations. And to Hæthema (Tertullian. de bapt. c. 5), as well as to Jews, it was associated not in thought only, but in actual ceremonial usage, with ideas of religious purification. This was the material element employed in the Baptism of our Lord, this that was united in mention by Him with the Name of the Spirit, when speaking (John iii.) of the gift of a new spiritual birth. And this accordingly from the first Christian Pentecost (Acts ii.) to this time, has been regarded in all parts of Christendom and at all times as determined by divine appointment to be the material element in the administration of Baptism. The few exceptions to this statement which require notice are the following.

§ 87. *Baptism by fire.* Philastrius of Brescia (*De hæres.* n. viii. apud Biblioth. Patr. Galland. tom. vii. p. 489), and St. Augustine quoting him as an authority (*De hæres.* cap. lii. B.E. tom. viii. p. 20 a. 7), speak of Seleucus and Hermas as founders of a Sect of which one characteristic was their maintaining the only true baptism to be "Spiritu et igne." And in an anonymous Treatise on Heretical Baptism we read of some who, by what means is not known, produced an appearance of fire on the baptismal water, in order to complete what they thought necessary for Christian Baptism. And so again Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria speak of certain heretics (Carpocratians and Heraclians) who branded a mark upon the ears of their disciples, this being in their eyes the true sealing (*σφραγισμὸς*) with the Holy Ghost.

§ 88. *Baptism with wine* and the like. The authority of a bishop of Rome, Siricius (a. 384 to 389), or according to others of Stephanus II. or III., has been claimed for the assertion, that Baptism in wine is valid though not to be allowed except in cases of the last necessity. The facts concerning this, much disputed by Roman Ritualists, may be determined by comparison of the following authorities: Antonianus Augustinus de *condemnatione Gratiani*, p. 200. Balusius, *Actes in Anton. August.* p. 431. Martene de *Ant. Ecc. Rit. lib. i. cap. i. Art. xiv. Bertini de Sacrament.* Vindob. 1774, p. 507. Harduin *Desert. de baptismo in vino.* Others mingled wine with water and were condemned (*Excerpta Egberti*, a. 750 in Wilkins, *Concil.* p. 104) for so doing.

§ 89. *Baptism with sand.* In one case, for which Joannes Monachus is the earliest authority, the question arose not as a mere abstract dispute, but in reference to an actual matter of fact, whether baptism in sand be legitimate or no. In the reign of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus a certain Jew was travelling in company with some Christians through a dry and desert country, when he was seized with grievous illness; and being apparently at the point of death begged his companions to baptize him. They replied that there was neither priest nor water at hand, and that without these baptism could not be had. "But being earnestly adjured not to refuse him, they divested the man, and sprinkled him three times with sand instead of water, saying that they baptized him in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Upon this (so the story proceeds) his strength was miraculously restored, and on their return, Dionysius, then Bishop of Alexandria, being consulted on the subject, decided "Baptismum esse Judæorum si modo aqua denuo per-

funderetur," in other words that the only thing wanting to his Baptism was the element of water, with which he was to be "perfusus." Authorities for this will be found in Joannes Monachus, *Præfatus Spirituale*, cap. 176 (De la Bigne, *Biblioth. Patr.* tom. ii. pp. 1132, 1133), in Nicephorus (*Hist. Ecc. lib. iii. c. 37*); and the story is told in detail by the Magdeburg Centuriators, who are quoted by Bingham (*Aniq. book xi. c. 2, § 5*).

§ 90. *Baptism with milk.* Benedictus Abbas Petroburgensis (in *Gestis Henrici II.* ad ann. 1171, edit. Hearne tom. i. p. 38) states that a custom prevailed in the early Irish Church of baptizing the children of the rich in milk. Occasional references are found elsewhere to such a practice. See Michælet, *Histoire de France*, vol. I. p. 243. Note.

§ 91. *Figurative expressions.* Phrases such as "the baptism of blood," meaning martyrdom; "Baptism with fire," meaning either martyrdom (as in Euseb. *H. E. lib. vi. c. 4*) or gift of the Holy Spirit (as St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in three different passages); the Baptism of Tears, meaning Repentance (as in Lisdore of Seville and others), are merely metaphorical expressions, bearing indeed upon primitive Doctrine, but not in any way upon primitive Ritual to which this article is limited.

#### *Modes of administering Baptism (by Immersion, Affusion, Aspersio).*

§ 92. *Immersion.* Passages already quoted in this article will have sufficed to show that the ordinary mode of Baptism in primitive times, at least in the case of adults, was that the Catechumen should descend into a Font of water (whether natural or artificial), and while standing therein dip the head thrice under the water. See §§ 11, 18, 49.

§ 93. *Affusion.* Yet there are not wanting indications both in literature and in art of another usage, viz., that of the bishop or other ministrant pouring water out of the hand, or from some small vessel, on the head of the baptized. Thus we meet more than once in Latin writers with the expression "perfusus" applied to the Catechumen (see §§ 28 and 89; and aqua infusa § 84). And it is to be noted that the word *σπρίγγειν*, which is used in Greek Ritual in speaking of the act of the ministrant, might be used with perfect propriety of such a pouring of water upon the head and body as that now in question. One common mode of bathing among the ancients was the pouring of water from vessels over the body, as we may see in ancient



*Representation of Baptism, from the Cemetery of Caligula.*

vase paintings (compare Ovid's description of Diana's bath, where her attendants "urnis capicibus undam effundunt"). And it is remarkable that in almost all the earliest representations of

Baptism that have been preserved to us, this is the special act represented. Such appears to be the representation in the fresco from the Cemetery of St. Calistus here engraved.

In the picture of Our Lord's Baptism in the Baptistery of St. John at Ravenna (Ciampini *Vet. Mon. tom. i. Tab. lxx.*) dating probably from about the year 450, our Lord is standing in the Jordan, the water reaching to the waist, and the Baptist is standing near, as if upon the bank, and pouring water from a shell, or from some small vessel, upon the head of our Lord. And there is a similar representation, varying, however, in some of its details, in the Church of S. Maria in Cosmedin, also at Ravenna (Ciampini *Vet. Mon. i. Tab. xxiii.*), the Mosaics of which are said to date from the year 553 A.D. And it would seem probable on a review of all the evidence, that in primitive times, while adult Baptism was still of prevailing usage, the two modes hitherto described were combined. The dipping of the head under water took place, in some churches certainly, so we find clearly stated, during the final Interrogations. And where this was the case we may infer that the "Affusio" or "Perfusio," the pouring on of water by the Ministrant, took place during the pronouncement of the formula. This hypothesis of a double use explains some difficulties in ancient authors, more particularly in the Treatise *De Sacramentis* attributed to St. Ambrose, and in the Egyptian Ritual already referred to. And its probability is confirmed by the fact that in the Armenian Order of Baptism even to this day the double usage of Immersion and Affusion is maintained. There the actual administration is described as follows: The priest asks the child's name, and on hearing it, lets the child down into the water, saying, "This N. servant of God, who is come from the state of childhood (or from the state of a Catechumen) to Baptism, is baptized in the Name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." . . . While saying this the priest *buries the child*, (or Catechumen) *three times in the water*, as a figure of Christ's three days' burial. Then taking the child out of the water *he thrice pours a handful of water on his head*, saying, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. Hallelujah. As many of you as have been enlightened by the Father, the Holy Spirit is put into you. Hallelujah." (From an unpublished translation by the Rev. S. C. Malan.)

§ 94. *Affusion and Aspersio in clinic Baptism.* In one case of very common occurrence in early times, viz., that of the Baptism of the sick under fear of approaching death, the administration was necessarily by Affusion or by Aspersio. And in the middle of the third century we find the question formally raised, by one of the African bishops, whether persons so baptized (*clinici*, or as they were also called *grabatarii*, baptized on a sick-bed) could be regarded as "legitimi Christiani." could be supposed, in other words, to have received baptism in a legitimate and regular manner. The manner in which Cyprian replies to the enquiry (Cyprian *Epist. lxxvi. ad lxxix. ad Magnum*) shows that no formal decision had, to his knowledge, ever been given previously on the question. He judges of the question submitted to him to the best of his own ability (*quantum concipit mediocritas nostra*), and ex-

presses an opinion that the mode in which the water was applied was a matter of minor importance, provided that Faith was not wanting on the part both of Ministrant and Recipient. In the ninth century Walafrid Strabo speaks of Baptism by Affusion, "desuper fundendo," as exceptional only (*De Reb. Eccl. cap. 26*). Not till the 13th century (Augusti *Denkwürdig. cap. ix. § 11*) do we find proof that Affusion or Aspersio had become the rule of the Western Church. The older practice is maintained in the East to this day.

*Age at which Baptism was conferred.* (Infant and Adult Baptism.)

§ 95. *Infant Baptism. St. Irenaeus.* Direct evidence of the practice of Infant Baptism first occurs in St. Irenaeus, who was born, probably, in the year 97 A. D., and who had sat at the feet of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John. In his book against Heresies (lib. ii. cap. 39 al. 22) he says that our Lord came (into the world) in order that through Himself He might save all men, *infants, and little ones, and children and youths and elders, even all who through Him are born again unto God*. No unprejudiced interpreter, acquainted with the forms of speech habitually employed by Irenaeus himself, and by the early fathers generally, will doubt that when Irenaeus thus speaks of infants and little ones, as well as others of more mature age, being "born again unto God," he refers to the fact of their being baptized. (For Irenaeus' own usage see particularly *adv. Haer. lib. i. c. 18 eis ἐξόρῃσιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως*, and cap. xix., where authority to baptize is described as "potestas regenerationis in Deum.")

§ 96. *Tertullian* was of full age before the death of Irenaeus, and in knowledge of antiquity, and of the usages of the Church, was second to none then living. And he gives absolutely conclusive proof that Baptism of Infants was a common practice of the Church in his own time, towards the close of the second century. With characteristic freedom he expresses his own opinion that the practice might wisely be altered, stating reasons for his opinion (*de Bapt. c. 18*). But he nowhere says one word to imply that the practice of his own contemporaries was an innovation upon the earlier usage of the Church.

§ 97. *Origen.* We have testimony no less decisive from Origen as to what was the traditional practice of the more Eastern Churches. He was born probably in the year 186 A. D. and was a disciple of Clemens Alex. and an inheritor of his great learning. His language in several passages shows not only that Infant Baptism was a recognised practice of the Church in his own day, but that in his belief (and no man knew more of antiquity) had been equally so from the time of the Apostles. See his *Hom. viii. on Leviticus* (Oberthur t. vi. p. 137) and *Hom. xiv. on St. Luke* (t. xiii. p. 335), where he argues that infants must have original sin, "else why are they baptized?"—and his comment in *Ep. ad Rom. lib. v. c. vi. (ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem accepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare)*.

§ 98. *Other early evidence*, but indirect and inferential only, has by some been cited (Bingham *C. A. book xi. ch. iv. §§ vi. vii.*) from Clement of Rome, and from Justin Martyr. More

conclusive than these is an expression of Clemens Alex. in the second century, when (*Paedag.* lib. iii. c. 11) he speaks of τῶν ἐξ ὑδάτων ἀναστρωμένων παιδίων, the children that are drawn up from cut of the water, in a context which shows clearly that it is of Baptism that he speaks.

§ 99. *Jewish Proselyte Baptism.*—In order to complete the subject of the evidence for Infant Baptism, it may be well to refer to the arguments based on the analogy of Christian Baptism both to the Proselyte Baptism of the Jews, which was given to infants as well as to adults, and to the rite of circumcision, administered on the 8th day after birth, and only in exceptional cases to adults. For the first of these, the Baptism of Proselytes, the argument from analogy is exceedingly strong, on the assumption that the practice in question really existed before the Apostolic age. Lightfoot (on Matt. iii. and John iii.) and many other Hebraists assume the pre-existence of the Jewish rite without doubt. To the present writer there appear to be the strongest grounds for this opinion. But among Continental scholars at the present time the prevailing opinion appears to be opposed to that of Lightfoot. A summary of the arguments on either side, and full references to the best authorities, will be found in Carpzovius *Annotiones in T. Goodwini Mosen et Aaronem*. Francofurti, 4, 1748. See particularly the Notes on Lib. i. cap. iii. § vii. For additional authorities see the *Bibliographia Antiquaria* of T. A. Fabricius, p. 385.

§ 100. *The Analogy of Circumcision* (administered as this was in infancy) with Christian Baptism, is recognised both in Scripture (Col. 2. ii.) and in early Christian writers, as Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryp. Iud.*; St. Irenaeus *adv. Haer.* lib. iv. c. xxx. (this, however, open to dispute). In St. Cyprian's time so close was this analogy considered by some as to cause doubt whether in view of "eighth day circumcision" any day earlier than the eighth were allowable for Christian Baptism (Cypriani *Epist.* lix.). St. Gregory Nazianz. expressly appeals to this as analogous to the practice of Infant Baptism (*Orat.* xl. *de Bapt.* p. 658).

§ 101. *Adult Baptism.* The general conclusion, resulting from an impartial investigation of all the evidence now available, appears to the present writer to be, that in the first four centuries of Christian History adult baptism was, from a variety of concurrent causes, the prevailing practice. Yet that during the same period infants were always baptised without delay if in apparent danger of death. But in the absence of such danger their baptism was deferred to the time of solemn baptism held at Epiphany, Easter, or Pentecost. And it is probable that in many cases Christian parents may have shared, and have acted on, the opinion expressed by Tertullian in the second century, and by Gregory Nazianz. in the fourth, and thought it well to defer the baptism of children, cases of grave sickness excepted, till they were able to make answer on their own behalf to the interrogations of the baptismal rite (see Gregor. Naz., *Orat.* xl. He urges the baptism of infants in case of danger, and yet shortly after advises the deferring their baptism in other cases till they were three years old). In the year 450 or thereabouts, we find evidence that in Syria, if not

elsewhere, the baptism of infants was regarded as not allowable only but matter of absolute duty. (St. Isaac the Great in Assemani *Bibl. Oriental.* t. i. 221. "Let the lambs of our flock be sealed from the first, that the Robber may see the mark impressed (§ 4) upon their bodies and tremble. Let not a child that is without the seal (§ 4) suck the milk of a mother that hath been baptized . . . . Let the children of the kingdom be carried, from the womb, to baptism.")

#### V. Baptism as represented in Ancient Art.

§ 102. *Direct Representations.* Of two modes in which we find baptism represented in ancient art, the first, that of direct representation, is confined to a very limited number of examples. The earliest, probably, is one of those engraved for this article (see § 93) from the cemetery of St. Calixtus at Rome, and believed by De Rossi to be of the second century. It serves to illustrate what has been said above of what appears to have been one customary mode of administering the rite, viz., by pouring water from the hand, or from a small vessel held in the hand, upon a person standing in shallow water. Two Mosaics, at Ravenna and at Rome, in which the baptism of our Lord is represented, have been already described (see § 93). Another similar representation is painted in fresco on the walls of a chamber in the cemetery of Pontianus, originally used as a baptistery; and yet another in the church of S. Maria in Cosmedin, at Ravenna (the Mosaic said to be of the 6th century), figured in Ciampini, *Vet. Monum.* i. p. 78. Millin (*Midi de la France*) has engraved (*Atlas*, Pl. lxxv. 11) a peculiar representation of this subject from a sarcophagus. With this may be compared that on the diptych of Milan, figured and described by Bugati (*Memorie di S. Celso*, p. 282), and reproduced in facsimile by the Arundel Society. No other such representations are known to the present writer, dating certainly from any period antecedent to 800 A.D. But two very curious representations were engraved by Ciampinus in his *Monumenta Vetera* (tom. i. p. 16) of Sarcophagi, to which he attributed a very great antiquity. In the first is represented the baptism of a king and queen (their rank being indicated by a Royal crown on the head of each), and these he supposes to represent Agilulfus and his wife Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, baptized, as he thinks, in the year 590. On the other sarcophagus a somewhat similar scene is represented. A man somewhat advanced in years kneels to receive baptism, which is administered by affusion only, water being poured upon his head from a small vessel, which has been filled evidently from one of larger size (not unlike the upper part of a modern English font) which stands near. Ciampinus supposes (but on very slight grounds) that the event represented is the baptism of Arrichius, second Duke of Beneventum, a contemporary of Gregory the Great, circ. 591 A.D. It is remarkable that in both these scenes the ministrant of the baptism has the distinctive dress of a layman, while all the other men represented are designated by an ecclesiastical or a monastic dress. The real date of these sarcophagi must, however, be regarded as extremely uncertain. To the 12th century belongs a fresco in the church of St. Lorenzo,

at Rome (*ibid.* tom. i. Tab. vi.), representing the baptism of St. Romanus, by St. Laurentius. This embodies the tradition alluded to by Walafrid Strabo in the 9th century. "Notandum non solum mergendo verum etiam desuper cundendo multos baptizatos fuisse, et adhuc posse ita baptizari si necessitas sit, sicuti in passione B. Laurentii quendam urceo allato legimus baptizatum. Hoc etiam solet evenire cum profectionum granditas corporum in minoribus vasis hominem tingi non patitur." The baptism of two adults by St. Paul, represented in the same plate (from a chapel in the church of S. Pudenziana) is probably of the same date. To the same period is to be assigned the representation of the imaginary baptism of Constantine by St. Silvester, formerly on the façade of St. John Lateran, at Rome (*Ciampini de Sac. Aedif.* tab. ii. fig. 4). The picture engraved below is from a



Baptismal Ceremony, from a Pontifical of the Ninth Century.

Pontifical of the 9th century, now in the S. Minerva Library at Rome. It represents the baptism of an infant and of an adult, and it is remarkable that the letter is represented as wearing a tunic in the font. This is in opposition to the conclusions drawn from literary evidence, noticed above in § 48. The engraving in § 43 is from the same MS., or rather from an exact copy in the collection of Pope Clement XI., now in the Royal Library at Windsor.

§ 103. *Symbolical Representation.* From a very early period indeed, the practice obtained of representing baptism symbolically under a figure due, probably, in the first instance, to an expression recorded in Mark i. 17 ("I will make you fishers of men"), and to the parable wherein our Lord compares the heavenly kingdom to a net enclosing fish both bad and good. A well-known passage of Tertullian will suffice for illustration of this symbolical meaning. "Nos pisciculi secundum pacem nostrum in aquis nascimur, nec nisi in aquis permanendo salvi sumus." We smaller fishes, after the example of our *ichthus*, are born in water, and only by continuing in the water do we remain safe (*de Bapt.* c. 1). We find the same figure in a passage of St. Hilary (*In Matthæum*, ed Ben. tom. iii. p. 679), in which he says that in the words recorded in Matt. iv. 19, "The future work of the Apostles is set forth, in drawing forth men, like fish from out of the

sea, into the light of the heavenly habitation." And to come somewhat nearer home we find St. Patrick and his nephew Secundinus frequently employing the same language in reference to the missionary work in which they were engaged. The former says in his "Confession," "Valde debitor sum Deo qui mihi tantam gratiam dedit ut populi multi per me in Deum renascerentur et postmodum consummarentur . . . Idcirco oportet quidem bene et diligenter piscari, sicut Dominus praeconat dicens, venite post me, faciam vos fieri piscatores hominum." And Secundinus, speaking of St. Patrick:—

"Dominus illum elegit ut doceret barbaras Nationes et piscaretur per doctrinae retia, Ut de saeculo credentes traheret ad gratiam, Dominumque sequerentur eodem ad aethera." "

This symbol of the fish is of frequent occurrence in the Roman catacombs, and in various parts of France. The writer has observed in manuscripts, and in ecclesiastical monuments of various kinds at Autun, Clermont Ferrand, and at Paris, a peculiar application of this symbol, which has not hitherto, to his knowledge, been either described or explained. Two fishes are represented in close proximity, attached the one to the other by a string which issues from the mouth of one, and attaches to the head of the other. This is in all probability a Christian adaptation of an old Celtic symbol familiar to the Gauls in Pagan times. Their God of Eloquence was represented with a golden cord issuing from his mouth, and entering the ear of one to whom he is supposed to speak. And so in the Christian symbolism of Gaul at a later period, He who spoke as never man spake, is represented under the well-known figure of an *IXOTC* or Fish, drawing to Him by the power of His Word one who is himself (in the language of the Autun inscription) *IXOTOC OTFANIOT FENOC*, the offspring of that hea-



Capital from the Church of St. Germain des Prés at Paris.



venly Fish. This representation may be seen over the western doors of the cathedral at Autun, in a MS. Bible (11th century probably) in the public library at Clermont Ferrand, and on the capital of a column in the baptistery of the church of St. Germain des Prés at Paris. There also appears a modification of the fish symbol, which is probably unique in its kind. Figures are represented which are *half-man* and *half-fish*, with their hands clasped upon a fish, which is rising upwards through the water, as shown in the accompanying woodcut. The church in which this capital is still to be seen is, even in its present state, the oldest in Paris. When it was built in the 11th or 12th century in place of a church, originally built six centuries before, the capitals of many of the older columns were preserved, and employed in the construction of the present building. And on these, as on other grounds which cannot now be stated in detail, there can be little doubt that this representation dates, in origin at least, from the very earliest period of the Gallican Church. (See Marriott's *Testimony of the Catacombs*, &c., p. 142, sq.)

#### VI. Literature.

§ 104.—It only remains to mention briefly the chief sources of information upon the various matters treated in this article. Details as to the primitive ritual of baptism are to be sought in the various authors and treatises already quoted or referred to. See particularly §§ 27 to 40. Among modern authors, who have treated of the Ritual of Baptism, may be mentioned Hugo Ménardus, whose notes on the sacramentary of St. Gregory the Great abound with instruction upon this as upon other matters of which he treats. The treatise of Edmond Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, part i., is full of information as to Western usages, and gives, what is of especial value, a large collection of the earliest "Ordines Baptismi." But he shows little acquaintance with Greek authors, and his references to them, and occasionally to Latin writers, are not always exact. Goar, in his *Euchologion Graecorum*, gives full details of the later Greek rites, and his notes upon these, illustrating modern usage from the older writers, are valuable. Bingham (*Antiquities*, book xi.) does not appear to have investigated the early ritual of baptism very thoroughly, but the later editions of his treatise are of use as containing in the notes full citations from the original text of the various authors whom he quotes. The Treatise of Augusti, *Archäologie der Taufe*, forming vol. vii. of his *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlicher Archäologie*, contains more, and more exact information, than any of the older writers on the subject. And it is also valuable as giving lists of writers who have treated either of baptism generally, or of special questions in connection with it. Binterim has given (*Die Vorzüglichsten Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Catholischen Kirche*, vol. i. pt. 1) a fair account of the ceremonies of Baptism, with abundant citations; and an essay on Baptism in Wine, Milk, and Sand (*Denkw.* ii. pt. i., pp. 2-34). [W. B. M.]

**BAPTISM, ANGEL OF.** Tertullian in his treatise *de Baptismo*, cc. 5 and 6, speaks of an angel who is present at baptism (baptismi arbiter), and who prepares the waters of the

font (aquis in salutem hominis temperandis adest—aquis intervenit), and under whose auspices men are prepared, by the cleansing of the font, for the following gift of the Holy Spirit (in aqua emundati sub angelo Spiritui Sancto praeparamur). His language is not inconsistent with a belief that this may have been a mere individual speculation of his own, rather than a doctrine generally accepted in his time. No parallel to this language has hitherto, as far as the writer knows, been alleged from any other early writers. But in more than one of the early "Ordines Baptismi" there will be found expressions, derived, in all probability, from this very passage of Tertullian. See the Article BAPTISM, § 29, where there is the same allusion as in Tertullian to the angel at Bethesda (angelum aquis intervenire si novum videtur, exemplum futuri praecurrit. Piscinam Bethesdam angelus interveniens commovebat. . . . *de Rapt.* c. 5). With this compare the "Collectio" of the Gotho-Gallican Missal. "Descendat super has aquas angelus benedictionis tuae," and again "qui Bethesdae aquas angelo medicante procuras . . . angelum pietatis tuae his sacris fontibus adesse dignare." So too in the Liber Sacramentorum of Gelasius Papa (Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* tom. i. p. 66), "Super has aquas angelum sanctitatis emittas." [W. B. M.]

**BAPTISM, ITERATION OF.** (Ἀναβαπτίζειν. *Denuo baptizare; baptismum iterare.*) It has always been held, as matter of theory, that baptism once really conferred can never be really repeated. And yet, from the 2nd century to the present time, questions concerning the repetition of baptism have continually arisen, and have been determined upon other considerations than that of the abstract principle just stated. Yet the principle itself was always maintained. Those who rebaptized heretics did so, as St. Cyril Hieros. says (*Catech.* i. οἱ αἰρετικοὶ ἀναβαπτίζονται ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρότερον οὐκ ἦν βάπτισμα), on the ground that the former (reputed) baptism was not really baptism. And baptism administered in cases where the fact of previous baptism was open to doubt, was defended in terms which imply that any conscious or intended repetition of baptism would be matter for grave condemnation. (Non potest in iterationis crimen devenire, quod factum esse omnino nescitur. Leo M. *Epist.* xxxvii. *ad Leon. Ravenn.* Labbe t. iii. p. 1326). But the abstract principle was wholly inadequate to the solution of the more difficult question, "what constitutes valid baptism?"

§ 2. *Baptism by Heretics.*—Among the questions thus left open the most important was whether baptism given by heretics and schismatics was to be regarded as valid or no. This question came prominently before the Church in connection with the Donatist controversy in the 3rd century. St. Cyprian, supported by many bishops in the East, maintained that baptism given "outside the Church" (extra ecclesiam), i.e. by schismatics or by excommunicated heretics, was not to be accounted valid, and was therefore to be repeated (in theory, given for the first time), in the case of penitents seeking reconciliation with the Church. Similar questions had to be determined in respect of the Marcionites, Paulinianists, Arians, Eunomians, and others.

§ 3. *Ultimate decision.*—The ultimate result of

the controversy concerning rebaptization was the acceptance, in the West absolutely, but with more of reserve in the East, of the principle that the validity of the Sacrament depended upon administration in accordance with Christ's Institution (i. e. with water and the "Evangelic words") without regard to the orthodoxy or otherwise of the administrator. This doctrine finds decisive expression in the language of St. Augustine (*contra Petil. de unico baptismo*, c. 3). "Si de ipsa Trinitatis unitate dissentientem haereticum invenio, et tamen evangelica et ecclesiastica regula baptizatum, intellectum hominis corrigo non Dei violo sacramentum." And again in speaking of baptism given by Marcion, "Si evangelicis verbis in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti Marcion baptismum consecrabat, integrum erat sacramentum, quamvis ejus fides sub eisdem verbis aliud opinantis quam catholica veritas docet non esset integra, sed fabulosis falsitatibus inquinata." The Council of Arles (a. 448) for the reasons stated by St. Augustine, allowed the baptism of the Bonosiani as valid, but rejected that of the Photinians. And the precedents thus established have been followed in the West, ever since, with scarcely any exceptions. See BAPTISM §§ 82 to 89. But in the Eastern Churches the difference of tendency indicated in what has been already said may clearly be traced in other cases. St. Cyril Hieros., as we have already seen, says simply that "Heretics are rebaptized," as their baptism is not really such. And with this accords the language of the Apostolic Canon, quoted by Photius (*Syntagma Canonum: Spicil. Rom. A. Mai*, tom. vii.). "If a bishop or presbyter rebaptize one who has true baptism (τὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἔχοντα βάπτισμα), or if he refuse to rebaptize one who has been defiled" (i. e. by a pretended baptism—compare St. Athanasius quoted below) "by the ungodly, let him be regarded as making mockery of the Cross and of the Death of Christ, and not distinguishing priests (ἱερείας) from pretended priests." With this St. Athanasius agrees both in doctrine and in expression. The Arians, he says (*Orat. ii. cont. Arian. BB.* tom. i. p. 510) are in peril as to the fulness of the Sacrament itself. "The baptism they bestow must be (ἄλλο ἂν εἴη—falling short of absolute assertion) alien from the truth, even though out of regard to what is written" [in Holy Scripture] "they make pretence of naming the Father and the Son." And again to the same effect (*ibid.* § 43) speaking of other heretical bodies which do but utter the divine names (in the Formula of Baptism), but without a right intention, and without salutary faith, the water that they bestow is, he says, "without profit (ἀλυσίτελές), being destitute of true godliness, so that he who is sprinkled (βαπτίζομενον) by them is rather defiled in ungodliness than redeemed with the ransom of Christ." This ἀλυσίτελές, "without profit," reminds us of the recurrent formula of St. Augustine, in speaking of heretical baptism, when followed by repentance and reception into the Church. In heresy men may have baptism, though they have not (per quod utile est) its beneficial effect. On repentance and conversion, "prodesse incipit ad salutem," that baptism "begins to avail unto salvation," which before availed only to condemnation (*De Baptismo a. Donat. lib. i. cap. xii., lib. iv. capp. iv. and xiv., lib. v. capp. v. and viii., and xviii. &c.*).

A tone like that of Athanasius may be traced in the decisions of various Eastern Councils quoted by Photius. After the "Canon of the Apostles" already quoted, there follows Canon 29 of the Council of Nicaea, which orders the rebaptizing of the followers of Paulinus. It has been conjectured (by St. Augustine first, *De Haeres.* c. 44) that this was because of some defect in the formula which they employed. This is very probable, but there is nothing in the language of the canon to imply this. Forty years later, at the Council of Laodicea, a distinction was made. Canon 78 directs that Novatians or Photinians and Quartodecimans are to be received back on conversion, with chrism and imposition of hands, and then adds, "Moreover we rebaptize, as heathens (Ἕλληνας) Manichaeans, Valentinians, and Marcionists." See further Canons on the same subject in the *Syntagma Canonum* of Photius.

§ 4. *Rebaptizing in case of doubt.*—The second class of cases involving the question of iteration of baptism was that of children whose baptism was matter of doubt. This question was formally brought before a Synod at Carthage (the Fifth, a. 425) in reference to children redeemed from slavery, and who could neither themselves recollect, nor had witnesses to testify, whether or no they had been baptized. It was determined "absque ullo scrupulo eos esse baptizandos ne ista trepidatio eos faciat sacramentorum purgatione privari." This canon was re-enacted by Conc. Carthag. vi. a. 525: and in the East, in almost identical terms, by the Quinisext Council (Constantinople a. 691). It appears again in collections of mediaeval canons, and amongst others in those of Theodore, Archbp. of Canterbury, in the Excerpta of Egbert of York, and the *Syntagma Canonum* of Photius. The hypothetical form of baptism, "If thou art not already baptized," &c., was apparently unknown till the 8th century. The earliest example of it is found in the Statuta of St. Boniface, Archbp. of Mayence (Martene *De Rit. Antiq. Eccl. t. i. p. 59*). "Si de aliquibus dubium sit utrum sint baptizati absque ullo scrupulo baptizentur: his tamen verbis praemissis: non te rebaptizo, sed si nondum es baptizatus ego te baptizo in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti." Cases of doubt arising from other causes have been noticed under BAPTISM, §§ 80 to 89. [W. B. M.]

BAPTIST, NATIVITY OF. [ST. JOHN BAPTIST, FESTIVALS OF.]

BAPTISTERY (Lat. *Baptisterium*, Greek *Βαπτιστήριον*, also *Domus illuminationis*, *φωτιστήριον*), the building or chamber set apart for the celebration of the sacrament of baptism. The receptacle for the water was called in Latin "piscina," in Greek "κολυμβήθρα," and more rarely by some other names, as *ὑπονόμος*, *lavacrum*, *natatoria*. Besides the receptacle for the water a baptistery was furnished with an altar, for the practice existed from a very early period until the 10th century, and perhaps even later (v. Martene, *De Antiq. Eccl. Rit. t. i. p. 153*), of allowing the newly baptized, even if infants, to partake of the Eucharist. In the earliest ages the administration of baptism was confined to the principal church of the diocese; and this practice still exists at Florence, Pisa, and elsewhere in Italy. Pope Marcellus (A.D. 304–309)

is said, in the *Lib. Pontif.*, to have appointed twenty-five "tituli" in Rome "as though (quasi) dioceses, on account of the baptism and penance of many." Many passages in the *Lib. Pontif.* shew that baptisteries existed attached to many of the minor churches down to the 9th century, and it is probable that every parish church in Rome had its baptistery. The existence of many baptisteries in one city was, it would seem, almost or quite peculiar to Rome.

As, during the earlier centuries, immersion, either alone or accompanied by aspersion, and not merely sprinkling, was deemed to be the proper mode of administering the rite (v. Martene, *De Antiq. Eccl. Rit.* t. i. p. 135), a large receptacle for water was required; and as Easter, Pentecost and the Epiphany were seasons specially appointed for baptisms, and large crowds of people were therefore attendant at those feasts, it became necessary to provide a spacious apartment in which the sacrament might be administered. When on Holy Saturday St. John Chrysostom was attacked, three thousand men had been baptized, and many more, both men and women, fled, who were still waiting to undergo baptism (Chrysostom, *Epist. ad Innocent.*; *Opp.* iii. 518, ed. Montfaucon; Palladius, *Vita Chrysost.* c. 9). The presence of the "piscina," or receptacle for water would have been inconvenient in a church, and all the space of even a very large edifice would be required, at the great festivals above mentioned, by those attending the solemn services of those occasions. From these circumstances the practice of constructing a building distinct from the church or basilica very naturally arose, and though we have no existing baptistery which can be referred to any period earlier than the 4th century, nor indeed any distinct account of the building of one before the time of Constantine the Great, it seems highly probable that where in Asia or elsewhere churches had been built at earlier periods they were accompanied by baptisteries. In the earliest ages a river or a pool may have served as a place of baptism, and indeed the spot in the Jordan where our Saviour was baptized by St. John is said to have been lined with marble and resorted to by crowds on the eve of the Epiphany (v. Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chrét.*, art. *Baptistère*).

That Easter was still in the 8th century chosen as a peculiar season for baptism at Rome is shewn by a passage in the *Lib. Pontif.* in the life of Hadrian I. (772-795). This Pope, we are told, repaired the Claudian Aqueduct, which supplied the baths of the Lateran palace and the baptistery of the church, and from which, it is added, many churches were supplied on the holy day of Easter. Charles the Great, by a capitulary of A.D. 804, ordered that baptisms should take place only at Easter and Pentecost.

Passages in the writings of Tertullian (*De Coron. Mil.* c. 3) and of Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. c. 61) shew that baptism was not administered in the church, but that the place of baptism was without it. Such places of baptism are believed to have existed in the catacombs at Rome; in one of these, in a cemetery known as the Ostriatum, not far from the church of St. Agnes on the Via Nomentana, St. Peter is traditionally said to have baptized. The spot was known as "ad Nymphas S. Petri," or "fons S. Petri" (v. De Rossi, *Roma Sott. Crist.*, t. i. p. 189).

Boldetti believed that he had discovered more than one of these baptisteries; but Padre Marchi says expressly (*Mon. de le Arti Crist. Prim.*, &c., p. 222) that the only "battisterio cimiteriale" known at the time that he wrote (1844) was that in the cemetery of St. Pontianus. This (engraved in Pl. xlii. of Marchi's work) consists of a small cistern or "piscina" supplied by a current of water. The piscina would appear to be between 3 and 4 feet deep and about 6 feet across; it is approached by a flight of steps, between the base of which and the water is a level space about 5 feet wide, on which the priest or bishop may have stood while performing the rite. There seems to be no trace of an altar, nor, indeed, any fit place for one. Above the water is a painting representing the baptism of Our Lord, and on another side, and partly hidden by the water, a painting of a cross adorned with gems and throwing out leaves and flowers from its stem. Two lighted candelabra rest upon the arms of the cross, and an alpha and an omega hang suspended from them by chains. [See A and ω, p. 1.]

The lighted candelabra are no doubt in allusion to the divine illumination of the soul attendant on baptism, whence baptisteries were often called *φωτιστήρια*, as has been remarked above.

This baptistery has been noticed at some length, as although the date of the paintings which decorate it cannot be fixed with any certainty, it is perhaps one of the earliest examples now remaining of a chamber set apart for the performance of this rite.

Of the construction of baptisteries in the time of Constantine the Great we have abundant proof. The anonymous pilgrim of Bordeaux, who visited Jerusalem c. A.D. 334 when speaking of the basilica which Constantine had just built at the Sepulchre of our Lord says, that by its side were reservoirs for water, and behind it a bath where children were "washed" (*balneum a tergo ubi infantes lavantur*), that is, no doubt, baptized. Eusebius evidently includes a baptistery among the Exedrae of the church of Paulinus at Tyre, and Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* 12, *ad Severum*) says that Severus built a baptistery between two basilicas. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of the baptistery as having a porch or anteroom, *προαύλιος οἶκος*, where the catechumens made their renunciation of Satan and Confession of Faith, and an *ἐσώτερος οἶκος*, the inner room where the ceremony of baptism was performed. This shows that a well-considered plan for such buildings then existed.

Constantine is usually said to have built the baptistery of the Lateran, and the *Lib. Pontif.* contains a long detail of the magnificence with which he decorated it. Niebuhr understands by the account, which is not without obscurity, that the walls of the baptistery were covered with porphyry and that the piscina was of silver, five feet in height; the water is said to have flowed into this receptacle from seven stags of silver and a lamb of gold. On the right hand of the lamb stood an image of the Saviour, of silver, five feet high, and on the left one of St. John the Baptist, of the same size and of the same metal. In the middle stood columns of porphyry bearing a "phiala" of gold, weighing 52 lbs., in which the Paschal candle was placed. As, however, the expression which Niebuhr interprets to mean the building or baptistery, is "fons sanctus," and

the expression "fons baptisterii" occurs immediately afterwards, it may be doubtful whether the meaning of the passage is not that the building (i.e. the baptistery) was constructed of or covered with porphyry, but that the piscina which it contained was of porphyry covered with silver. Niebuhr and several other writers have questioned whether this part of the *Liv. Pontif.* can be relied on as historical; the erection of images of the Saviour and of St. John the Baptist is certainly not in accordance with the practice of the Church at that period, and, in conjunction with other statements of a doubtful nature, must throw considerable doubt upon the trustworthiness of the account of the buildings and donations of Constantine which the book contains. There is, however, no doubt but that Constantine erected a basilica within the Lateran palace, or at least converted some hall of the palace into a church, and a baptistery in all probability formed a part of the group of ecclesiastical buildings. It is generally believed that the existing baptistery owes its form (though it has undergone many alterations and been much added to), to Pope Sixtus III. (A.D. 432-440). He is said by the compiler of the *Liv. Pontif.* to have added, as a decoration to the "fons," the porphyry columns which Constantine had collected, and marble "epistylia;" by which we should understand not only the capitals but the architraves, as those now there are no doubt antique, and have inscribed upon them sixteen verses referring to baptism (printed in the *Besch. v. Rom.*, bd. iii. abt. 1.), which are doubtless those which the *Liv. Pontif.* alludes to, though by a corruption of the text they are said to have been placed not on the architraves but on the columns.


The building as it now exists is an octagon about 62 feet in diameter, in the centre of which are eight columns of porphyry carrying antique capitals and architraves; lesser columns are placed on the architraves, and support the roof. This octagon is entered from a large portico with apudal ends which may answer to the *trapezoides olas* mentioned by Cyril of Jerusalem.

Hübner (*Alt. Christ. Kirchen*) asserts that the walling as well of the octagon as of the portico to a height of about 50 feet bears the stamp of the Constantinian period.

Another very remarkable building at Rome is no doubt of the period of Constantine, but it is uncertain whether it is to be regarded as a baptistery or as a sepulchral church. This is the circular church close to St. Agnes, on the Via Mentana, known as Sta. Costanza. The *Liv. Pontif.* (in *vita S. Silvestri*) says that Constantine built "basilicam Sanctae Martyris Agnetis" and "baptisterium in eodem loco;" and, as no trace of any other baptistery has been found near the place, this church has been usually taken to be the baptistery mentioned in the above-quoted book. No trace of a "piscina" has however, it would seem, been noticed; the building was certainly the place of sepulture of one or more members of the Imperial family; and it appears doubtful whether at that period it would have been deemed right to bury in a basilica or a baptistery any person, of rank however exalted.

A building very similar to this, the circular church at Nocera del Pagani, known as Sta. Maria Maggiore, was no doubt constructed for a baptistery, as it possesses a large and apparently original piscina. It is a circle about 80 feet in diameter, with an apse of about three-fourths of a circle in plan, projecting from one side. Thirty columns arranged, as at Sta. Costanza, in pairs, support arches on which rests a dome, and the aisle has barrel vaults. The piscina in the centre is circular and about 20 feet in diameter and nearly 5 feet deep; within are two steps or benches running round the whole circumference, and there is a raised wall or parapet round it, octagonal on the exterior. This parapet was decorated on the outside with slabs of marble bearing incised patterns, and upon it stood eight columns, which perhaps once supported a canopy; three only of these columns now remain (v. Hübner, *Alt. Christ. Kirchen*, Pl. xvii, xviii.). The date of this building is not known from any historical data, but it may perhaps be attributed with probability to the 5th century.

Another baptistery, which, though probably considerably older than that at Nocera, has the piscina arranged in a very similar manner, is that at Aquileia. It is now in ruins, but the annexed woodcut copied from the engraving in



Baptistery at Aquileia.

the *Mittelalterliche Kunst Denkmale des Oesterreichischen Kaiserthums*, by Heider and Eitelberger (bd. i. s. 119), will give a good idea of the manner in which a baptistery at the period was arranged. The piscina is hexagonal, and would seem to have one step and a low parapet wall on the outside, and two steps in the inside. The authors of the above-quoted work, however, state that the number of steps is five, meaning probably that any one ascending from the floor and descending to the bottom of the piscina would mount two steps and descend three. In the eastern angle of the octagon is a small apse.

This baptistery is entered by a vaulted passage-like building in three compartments, which bears the name of "Chiesa dei Pagani," and probably served as a place of assemblage and instruction for the catechumens before they were admitted to baptism. It appears to have had an upper story, which may have been set apart for women, as there is ground for believing that such a


separation of the sexes was practised in the baptisteries or the apartments connected with them.

No one of the baptisteries of this period has come down to the present time in a more unaltered condition than that of the Cathedral of Ravenna, known, like many other baptisteries in Italy, as S. Giovanni in Fonte.

It was, if not built, at least renovated and decorated by Neon, archbishop from A.D. 425 to 430, as an inscription (v. Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.* t. i. cap. xxv.) formerly existing within it testified. Hübsch (*Alt. Christ. Kirchen*) expresses an opinion that the decorations now existing may be considered as for the most part, if not entirely,

the work of Neon. The occurrence of a monogram, which may be read Maximianus (Archbishop of Ravenna in the time of Justinian), of an inscription in the mosaics, which appears to refer to Theodoric the Great (Webb, *Contin. Eccles.* p. 428), and very close similarity in the patterns of the marble inlay on the walls to those in St. Sophia's at Constantinople, and in the Duomo at Porenz, in Istria, lead to the conclusion that the work of decoration was only gradually executed and not completed until the middle of the 6th century.

As will be seen by the plan annexed, the building is an octagon, with two niches or apses; it




Lower Story.

Baptistry at Ravenna (Horizontal sections).


Upper Story.

measures about 40 feet in diameter. Recent excavations have shewn that there were originally four apses. In the centre is the piscina,

This baptistry affords one of the best examples of the internal decoration of the period, carried through the whole of a building, now existing in



Baptistry at Ravenna (Elevation).



Baptistry at Ravenna (Vertical Section).

which, according to Hübsch, is probably original. The semi-circular indentation in one side, in which the priest stood while baptising, is remarkable.

Europe; the architectural arrangement will be understood from the elevation and the section. The columns and arches are of marble, and the



lower part of the walls is lined with the same material in long slabs; above this are panels of "opus sectile," marqueterie in porphyry, serpentine, marbles of various colours, and brick. Beneath the arches carried by the upper range of columns are figures of saints (?) executed in stucco in low relief, as to the age of which there is some difference of opinion. The dome is covered with mosaic; in the centre the baptism of our Lord is represented, round this the twelve Apostles, and below them a range of eight compartments, in each of these are alternately two cathedrae placed under canopies with an altar between them, and two tombs of an altar form standing under canopies, between which is what seems to represent a slab or low tombstone lying on the ground, over which hangs a mass of drapery supported on ornamental posts. The meaning of these representations has not been clearly explained; the cathedrae and altars have been supposed to symbolize a council, but this leaves unexplained the signification of the tombs; the altar-tombs appear to stand for tombs of confessors or martyrs, as wreaths appear to crown them and lilies or palm branches to spring from them; the tombs over which the draperies hang are thought by Ciampini (t. i. p. 178) to represent the tombs of bishops. The intention may have been to symbolize the whole Church, the cathedrae standing for living bishops, the tombs for saints and bishops deceased.

The church now called S. Maria in Cosmedin, in Ravenna, was also once a baptistery, having been built (it is believed) in the time of Theodoric for the use of the Arians; it is circular internally, octagonal externally, with a small round ended apse projecting from one of the sides and a loggia of three arches from another. It is covered by a dome, on which are mosaics representing the baptism of our Lord and the twelve Apostles. These are believed to be of later date than the original building.

The baptistery of St. Sophia's, Constantinople, which no doubt is that erected by Justinian, has a portico or narthex, and is rectangular externally, with a rectangular projection containing an apse; internally it is octangular, with on the ground-plan four niches (besides the apse) on four of the sides; the upper story is octangular, with a large window in each side. It is placed near the south-west angle of the cathedral, facing westwards (Salzenberg, *Baudenkmale v. Constantinopel*, pl. vi.). At Parenzo, in Istria, the baptistery stands in front of the duomo, and connected with it by a square atrium, which last position was one frequently adopted.

The preceding examples will give a sufficient idea of the form, arrangements, and decorations of baptisteries down to the 6th century. One curious example, which perhaps should be attributed to the 7th, is the baptistery at Poitiers: this is in plan an oblong, with an apse projecting from one of the longer sides; this apse is straight lined, but not rectangular on the outside and five-sided within. Two large arches in the end walls make it probable that niches existed entered by them. A building of later date has been added on the side opposite to the apse, so that the form of the original entrance cannot now be determined. The piscina, nearly in the centre of the oblong, is octagonal. The architectural decoration is partly original and partly made up

from old materials; what is original is rude, but has something of a classical character (v. Gailhabaud, *Mon. Anc. et Mod.*, t. ii.).

The baptistery at Albenga, between Nice and Genoa, is octangular externally, but within semi-circular; three rectangular niches are formed in the thickness of the wall, and on the eighth side was the entrance. It is roofed by a dome, in the drum below which were eight windows, which were filled with slabs of marble pierced in patterns of circles and crosses. The vault of the niche opposite the entrance and the wall at its back have been covered with mosaic; the labarum, doves, and a lamb can be distinguished. No remains of the piscina are now to be traced, but a perfectly plain cylindrical font stands in one of the niches. Those architectural details which are original, e.g. the slabs in the windows, are very rudely executed, and the building is perhaps not earlier than the 7th or even the 8th century.

About A.D. 750, Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, erected a church to the east of his cathedral, and almost touching it, to serve as a baptistery, and for other purposes (Edmer, *Vita S. Breguini*, *Ang. Sac.* t. ii. p. 186). It was dedicated in honour of St. John the Baptist.

During the 8th and 9th centuries baptisteries continued to be in full use in Italy, as we may learn from the *Lih. Pontif.*, where mention is made of the building or rebuilding of five baptisteries attached to churches in Rome, between A.D. 772 and A.D. 816. In one of these cases, that of S. Andrea Apostolo, rebuilt by Pope Leo III. (795-816), we are told expressly that the place was too small for the people who came to baptism, and that the Pope therefore built a circular baptistery "ampla largitate," that he also enlarged the "fons" and decorated it with porphyry columns round about.

Martigny (*Dict. des Antiq. Chrét.*) expresses an opinion that in France the practice of placing the baptistery first in the portico and then in the interior of the church, began in the 6th century; but the passage in the *Hist. Franc.* of St. Gregory of Tours (l. ii. chap. xxi.), to which he refers, seems hardly sufficient to prove this statement. St. Gregory himself states that he constructed a baptistery "ad basilicam" (apparently of St. Perpetuus, at Tours), and the baptistery at Poitiers was evidently a separate building. The baptistery at Fréjus, which according to Texier and Pullan (*Byz. Arch.*) was built in 810, is also a detached structure.

In Germany and Italy baptisteries were built as detached structures down to a much later date; but this was not an invariable practice, for in the plan for the church of St. Gall [CHURCH], prepared in the beginning of the 9th century, there is no detached baptistery, but a circular "fons," about six feet in diameter, in the middle of the nave towards the west end of the church, surrounded by a screen.

It has been seen that the earlier baptisteries were, if not circular, octagonal; it is uncertain whether these forms were adopted merely from reasons of convenience, or as symbolical. The circular form was that almost invariably adopted for a sepulchral chapel or memorial church, and the immersions, with which the rite of baptism was in the earlier centuries invariably performed, were considered as typical of dying to the world.

The octagonal form is said to have been adopted as typical of perfection.

The piscina was usually octagonal, but sometimes hexagonal, and sometimes circular. In Lusitania, we are told by Gregory of Tours (*De Gloria Martyrum*, l. i. c. 23), it was customarily constructed of variegated marble in the form of a cross.

Of baptisteries in Asia or Africa we have but little information. Texier and Pullan (*Byz. Arch.* p. 14) however state that small baptisteries are frequently found adjoining ancient churches in the East; and Count de la Vogüé has given a drawing and plan of one at Deér-Seta, in Central Syria (*Arch. Civ. et Relig. en Syrie*, &c. pl. 117), of an hexagonal form, which would appear to be of the 6th century. It has the peculiarity of three doors, one in each of three contiguous sides; in the centre was an hexagonal piscina, with a column at each angle.

Mr. Curzon (*Monast. of the Levant*, cap. 131) describes as entered from the vestibule of the church of the White Monastery (or Derr Abou Shenood) in Egypt, a small chapel or baptistery, 25 feet long, arched with stone, with three niches on each side, and a semicircular upper end, the whole highly decorated with sculptured ornament of very good style. This, as well as the adjacent church, are said to have been built by order of the Empress Helena.

Besides being used for baptisms, baptisteries were used as places for assemblies. Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, is stated to have built the baptistery mentioned above, in order that it might serve for "baptisteria, examinationes judiciorum," and also that the bodies of the archbishops might be there buried (*Anglia Sacra*, ii. 186).

This practice of burying in baptisteries, though prohibited at an earlier period (as by the 14th Canon of the Council of Auxerre in 578), was common before burial in the church was allowed.

Many of the archbishops of Canterbury were buried in the baptistery from the time of Cuthbert, who built it, until A.D. 1067, when it was burnt. In the original entrance to the baptistery at Albenga are two tombs in the fashion of the "arcosolia" of the Roman catacombs, as early as the 8th or 9th centuries.

Baptisteries appear to have been in the earlier ages (at least in the West), almost always dedicated under the invocation of St. John the Baptist. [A. N.]

**BARBARA**, virgin, martyr in Tuscany, circ. 200; commemorated Dec. 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); Dec. 4 (*M. Hieron., Cal. Byzant.*); Oct. 8 (*Cal. Armen.*). [C.]

**BARBARIANS, BISHOPS FOR.** In ordinary cases the election of a bishop required the consent or suffrage, not only of the clergy of the diocese over which he was to preside, but of the faithful laity also. This rule, however, could obviously be applied only to countries already Christian. When a bishop was to be sent out to a distant or barbarous nation, it was required by the Council of Chalcedon, Can. xxviii., that he should be ordained at Constantinople, to which city, as the New Rome, equal privileges with "the Elder royal Rome," were now to be assigned. The Bishop of Tomi in Scythia, is an instance of a missionary bishop thus or-

dainied, and commissioned by the Patriarch of Constantinople—the consent of the people to whom he was sent to minister being, of necessity, dispensed with. In the previous century it is recorded by the Church historians that Athanasius ordained Frumentius at Alexandria to be Bishop of the Ethiopians, when, as Bingham remarks, "No one can imagine that he had the formal consent, though he might have the presumptive approbation of all his people." [D. B.]

**BARCELONA, COUNCIL OF** (BARCINONENSE CONCILIUM), provincial. (1) A.D. 540, of Sergius the metropolitan and six suffragans, passed ten canons upon discipline (Labb. v. 378, 379).—(2) A.D. 599, Nov. 1, in the 14th year of King Recared, under Asiaticus, metropolitan of Tarragona, and eleven suffragans, against simony, probably in compliance with the representations of Gregory the Great (Baron. *in an.* 599, § 23, from Gregory's letters). It also forbade ordinations *per saltum*; and ordered, in the election of a bishop, a choice by lot from two or three candidates, to be nominated by the "clerus et plebs" of the diocese, and presented to the metropolitan and bishops (Labb. v. 1605, 1606). [A. W. H.]

**BARCINONENSE CONCILIUM.** [BARCELONA, COUNCIL OF.]

**BARDINIANUS**, martyr in Asia; commemorated Sept. 25 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**BARNABAS, ST., LEGEND AND FESTIVAL OF.** There is a tradition that he became a believer after witnessing the miracle wrought by our Lord at the pool of Bethesda, and that he was one of the seventy disciples. (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 12, and ii. 1.) It is also said that he was the first preacher of Christianity at Rome, that he converted Clemens Romanus to the faith and that he founded the churches of Milan and Brescia. But these and other statements about him may certainly be regarded as unworthy of credit. There is however a general agreement of testimony about the time, place and cause of his death. From very early times, in the Western as well as in the Eastern church, he has had the credit of martyrdom. It is believed that he was stoned to death by the Jews of Salamis in Cyprus about the year 64 A.D. Tradition says that his death took place on the 11th of June and that he was buried at a short distance from the town of Salamis. Nothing however seems to have been heard of his tomb until about the year 478 A.D.

The discovery of his body is fully related in the *Eulogy of St. Barnabas*, written by Alexander, a monk of Cyprus, about the beginning of the sixth century. After giving an account of the martyrdom and burial of Barnabas, this writer asserts that in consequence of the many miraculous cures that had occurred in the neighbourhood of the tomb the spot had been called the "place of healing" (*τόπος ὑγίειας*). But the cause of these miracles was unknown to the Cypriotes until the discovery was made in the following way. Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch, a man who had been very successful in creating dissensions, was endeavouring to bring Cyprus under his episcopal sway, on the plea that the Word of God in the first instance was carried from Antioch to Cyprus. The Cypriotes resisted this claim on the ground that their church had from the time of its founders been

independent of the see of Antioch. Anthemius, the Bishop of Cyprus, a timid and retiring prelate, was scarcely a match for an opponent so able and experienced as Peter. But he was encouraged by Barnabas himself who appeared to him several times in a vision. At the saint's bidding he searched a cave in the neighbourhood of the *τόπος ὕψους*, and found a coffin containing the body of Barnabas and a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel. He proceeded to Constantinople, where the dispute was heard before the Emperor Zeno, and in support of his claim to remain independent he announced that the body of Barnabas had lately been discovered in his diocese. On hearing this the emperor gave his decision in favour of Anthemius, bade him send at once to Cyprus for the copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, and as soon as it arrived had it adorned with gold and placed in the imperial palace. After conferring great honours on Anthemius, the emperor sent him back to Cyprus with instructions to build a magnificent church in honour of Barnabas near the spot where the body was found. This order was strictly carried out, the body was placed at the right hand of the altar and the 11th of June consecrated to the memory of the saint. (*Acta Sanctorum: Junii xi.*)

However ready we may be to reject this account of the finding of the body of Barnabas, there is every reason to believe that in the Eastern Church these events were the origin of the festival. No church however was built to the saint's memory at Constantinople. It is also remarkable that from early times the day was kept in the Eastern Church in honour of Bartholomew as well as of Barnabas. When the second saint's name was added is quite uncertain, but there are good grounds for believing that the day was originally sacred to Barnabas only. In the *Menologium Basilianum*, edited by command of the Emperor Basil in the year 886 A.D., the day is the joint festival of the two saints. At what time it was first observed in the Western Church is very doubtful. Papebrochius asserts that the festival was not kept in Eastern earlier than in Western Christendom, but he has not proved this statement. The day occurs as the Feast of Barnabas in the calendar of the Venerable Bede, so that unless this be one of the additions made after the author's death, we may conclude that the day was observed in the Western Church in the 8th century. It does not however occur in all the old service-books. In the *Martyrologium Romanum* it appears as the Festival of Barnabas only.

The principal account of the traditions concerning Barnabas is the work above referred to, *Alexandri Monachi Laudatio in Apost. Barnabam*; in Migne's *Patrol., Series Graeca*, vol. 87, col. 4087; Surius, *Vitae Sanctorum, Junii xi.*

[W. J. J.]

**BARTHOLOMEW**, bishop; commemorated with Pachomius, Taksis 11 = Dec. 7 (*Cal. Ethiop.*)

[C.]

**BARTHOLOMEW, ST., LEGEND AND FESTIVAL OF.** The New Testament tells us but little of this Apostle, and there is an equal absence of any great amount of early trustworthy tradition. He is by some, with a great show of probability, identified with Nathanael,

for the arguments as to which derived from scripture, see *Dict. Bibl.*, under **BARTHOLOMEW, NATHANAEEL**. It may be further remarked in favour of the identification that in such a matter Eastern tradition is more to the point than Western (considering, that is, the scene of this Apostle's labours and martyrdom), and that the former uniformly identifies Nathanael with Bartholomew. For example, from the Armenian and Chaldaean writers cited by Assemani (*Bibl. Or.* vol. iii. part 2, p. 4), e.g. Elias, bishop of Damascus, and Ebedjesu Sobensis, we may infer that Nathanael was in those churches included among the Apostles, and viewed as one with Bartholomew; in fact, Assemani remarks, "*Bartholomaeum cum Nathanaele confundunt Chaldaei*" (*ibid.* p. 5). Moreover in martyrologies and calendars, both of Eastern and Western Churches, the name of Bartholomew is of constant occurrence, while that of Nathanael is ordinarily absent, which would be strange on the hypothesis of a difference between the two. It must be allowed, however, that the Egyptian and Ethiopian Churches seem to identify Nathanael with Simon the Canaanite, for in their Menologies and Calendars, edited by Job Ludolf (Frankfort, 1691), there is no mention of Simon the Canaanite, but on July 10 is "Nathanael the Canaanite" (p. 33). In Greek Menologies also, under the days April 22, May 10 is a similar identification, as also in the Russian Calendar for the latter day.

The general account given by tradition of the labours of this Apostle is to the effect that he preached the gospel, using especially that by St. Matthew, in India, where he suffered martyrdom by beheading, having been, according to some writers, previously flayed (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 10; Jerome, *De viris Illustr.* 36, vol. ii. 651, ed. Migne. Cf. also Ado's *Libellus de festiv. SS. Apostolorum* in Migne's *Patrol. Lat.* cxxiii. 185). In the appendix *De vitis Apostolorum* to Sophronius's Greek version of the *De viris Illustribus*, allusion is made to the Apostle's mission *Ἰνδοῖς τοῖς καλουμένοις εὐδαίμοσιν*, which might possibly refer to Arabia Felix, and it is added that he suffered in Albanopolis, a city of Armenia Major (Jerome, vol. ii. 722). The latter statement is also found in several other writers (e.g. Theodorus Studita and Nicetas Paphlago, vide infra: and the Martyrologies of Florus and Rabanus), generally in the form that the Apostle suffered through the machinations of the priests, who stirred up Astyages brother to the king Polymius whom Bartholomew had converted. See further the Pseudo-Abdias's *Acta* of this Apostle, published by Fabricius (*Codex Pseudepigraphus Novi Testamenti*, vol. i. pp. 341 seqq.).

The tenor of the tradition as to the disposition of the relics of St. Bartholomew is on the whole consistent, though not altogether free from difficulties. Theodorus Lector, a writer of the sixth century, tells us (*Collectan.* 2. in *Magn. Bibl. Patr.* vol. vi. part 1, p. 505 ed. Col. Agr. 1618) that the Emperor Anastasius gave the body of St. Bartholomew to the City of Daras in Mesopotamia, which he had recently founded (circa 507 A.D.). We next find that before the end of the sixth century, a translation had been effected to the Lipari islands (cf. Greg. Turon. *De Gloria Martyrum*, i. 33). Thence in 809 A.D. the relics were transferred to Beneventum,

and finally in 963 A.D. to Rome, where they lie in a tomb beneath the high altar in the church of St. Bartholomew in the island in the Tiber (See Ciampini, *De Sacris Aedificiis* &c., vol. III. pp. 38, 66, who refers to a temporary transference of the relics to the Vatican Basilica in consequence of an overflow of the Tiber during the Episcopate of Paul IV.). For these statements we may refer, in addition to the writers cited above, to a panegyric of Theodorus Studita (oh. 826 A.D.), translated into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, and published in D'Achery's *Spicilegium* (vol. III. pp. 19 seq.); to an oration of a certain Joseph, possibly Joseph Hymnographus, a contemporary of Theodorus Studita (*Acta Sanctorum*, August, vol. v. pp. 43 seq.); and to a panegyric of Nicetas Paphlago (Combes, *Auctor. Nov. Patrum*, I. p. 392).

It would seem that not before the eighth century did the previously existing festival commemorating the collective body of the Apostles, held upon the day after the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, develop itself into festivals of individual Apostles; consequently it is in writers of the eighth and ninth centuries that notices are to be looked for of a festival of St. Bartholomew, which would appear to have originated with the Eastern Church (for the notices in Latin writers are later), probably with that of Constantinople. Of this, indeed, the encomiastic orations of Theodorus and Nicetas are evidence, and we further have a direct statement on the part of the latter (§ 2) to the effect that the festival of this Apostle was then annually celebrated.

It will of course follow from what has been said that in the more ancient Sacramentaries (e.g. those of Gelasius and Gregory) in their original form there is no trace of a festival of this Apostle, nor indeed is there in any Latin writer for a considerable time after their date. As to the special day or days on which this festival was held, very great diversity exists in ancient Martyrologies and Calendars:—thus in the Calendar of the Byzantine Church, we find on June 11, "Bartholomew and Barnabas," while on August 25 is the "Translation of Barnabas the Apostle and Titus the Apostle:" the Armenians held the feast on February 23 and December 8, as may be seen in the two Calendars given by Assemani (*Bibl. Or.* vol. III. part 2, p. 645). The Ethiopic or Abyssinian Church again commemorates St. Bartholomew on November 19 and June 17 (Indolf pp. 11, 31). In the Arabian Calendar the name occurs several times, sometimes alone, sometimes with the added title martyr, and on November 15 and June 30, with the addition *Apostle* (Selden, *De Synodis Veterum Ebraeorum*, bk. III. c. 15, pp. 228, 243, ed. Amsterdam, 1879). It is explained in the Greek metrical *Epitaphia* that the one day (June 11) commemorates the martyrdom *ἡμετέρας θύσεως* *Βαρθολομαίου*; and the other (August 25), the finding of the relics, *ὅθεν εἶσεν εὐαγγ.* *ὑμῶν Βαρθολομαίου θρεῦμα*—on which latter day several Calendars associate him with Barnabas, e.g. in the Pictorial Moscow Calendar prefixed by Papebroch, together with the preceding, to the *Acta Sanctorum* for May, vol. I. Cf. *Assemani Calendarium Ecclesiae Universae*, vol. vi. pp. 420, 541.

The ancient Latin Martyrology which bears the name of St. Jerome follows the Greek in

the double announcement, and on June 13 has "In Perside natalis S. Bartholomaei Apostoli;" on August 24, "In India natalis S. Bartholomaei Apostoli" (vol. XI. 463, 473). The later Martyrologies content themselves with a notice on August 24 or 25: for example, those of Bale (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xciv. 804), and the amplification of this by Florus (oh. 1015), of Rabanus Maurus (oh. ex. 1164), of Wandelbert (oh. crast. 806), of Ado (oh. cxlii. 167, 335), and of Usuardus (oh. cxxiv. 393).

We subjoin the notice of the day as given in the Metrical Martyrology of Wandelbert,

Bartholomaeus natus exornat retinque beatus,  
India quo dextera Dei impetrat honorem,  
Heculae et Iacobi famulo vix erit auctor;  
Nunc tamen tuus est verus pro certo apud,  
Antium Ligure Remond et templa iugiter."

With regard to the relative importance of this festival, Binterlin (*Denkschrift*, i. 445) refers to Schulting, who gives an extract from an old English Missal which contained a special preface for St. Bartholomew's day, and he adds that before the middle of the tenth century this festival was viewed in England as of considerable importance. It is not certainly known whether the vigil is coeval with the festival; in most Calendars, however, drawn up before the middle of the tenth century the vigil is wanting, while it is marked in later ones.

We have already called attention to the fact that the date of the rise of this festival is such as to preclude its appearance in the ancient Roman Sacramentaries in their original form. In the various later recensions, however, of Gregory's Sacramentary, is a collect, &c., for this day (and first to occur in the Cod. Gemeticensis, of about the year 1000 A.D.) on which the collect of our own prayer book is based. (Migne *Patrol.* lxxviii. 138.)

The name of Bartholomew has apparently not been a favourite with the writers of pseudonymous literature. Traces, however, of writings bearing his name are not altogether wanting. Thus Jerome (*Prolog. in Comm. in S. Matt. init.*, vol. vii. 17) refers to an apocryphal gospel bearing the name of Bartholomew, doubtless the same condemned by a Council held at Rome in the episcopate of Gelasius, "Evangelium nomine Bartholomaei Apostoli apocryphum" (Migne *Patrol.* lix. 163) and this also may be that referred to by the Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita, *Ὁὗτος γοῖος ὁ θεῖος Βαρθολομαῖος φησι, καὶ πολλὰν τὴν θεολογίαν εἶπεν καὶ ἐλαχίστην καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐλάτθ' καὶ μέγα, καὶ αὐτὸς συντάξας* (*Mystica Theologia*, c. 1 § 5). Finally, in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (lib. viii. cc. 1<sup>a</sup>, 20) is given under the name of the Apostle Bartholomew the regulation as to the appointment of Deaconesses. [R. &.]

#### BASIL, LITURGY OF. [LITURGY.]

**BASIL.** (1) Holy Father and Confessor under Leo the Iconoclast; commemorated Feb. 20 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Presbyter of Ancyra, martyr under Julius; commemorated March 23 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(3) Bishop of Parium, is commemorated as "Holy Father and Confessor," April 12 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(4) Bishop of Amasea, martyr under Licinius, April 12 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(5) The Great, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, commemorated June 14 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); May 23 (*Mart. Hieron.*); Jan. 1 (*Cal. Byzant.*); Nov. 12 (*Cal. Armen.*); Ter 6 = Jan. 1 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). A standing figure of St. Basil, after ancient precedents, is given in the Benedictine edition of his works; a head in Spisellius's *Academus Verus Christi*, and in *Acta SS. June*, tom. ii. p. 936. [C.]

**BASILEUS.** (1) Martyr at Rome under Gallienus; commemorated March 2 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) "In Antiochia Basiliei et aliorum xxx martyrum" Dec. 22 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**BASILIANI.** [See *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.* ART. BASILIAN.]

**BASILICA** (sc. *aula, sedes*). This word in its classical acception signifies a hall suited for or employed as a court of justice or a place of meeting. Such buildings, often of great size and splendour, existed in every Roman city; they were usually oblong in plan, sometimes with, sometimes without ranges of columns dividing the space into a nave and aisles; at one end was usually a semi-circular apse (*v. Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiq.*, Art. 'Basilica'; Bunsen, *Die Basiliken des Christ. Roms*). When Christianity became the religion of the state, these buildings were found to be so well adapted to the celebration of public worship that some were by some slight modifications fitted and used for the purpose, and the new buildings constructed expressly to serve as churches were built almost universally on the same model. Hence basilica came to be used in the sense of church by the writers of the fourth and later centuries without any regard for the form or size of the building. Earlier writers use "dominicum" in Latin, or *basilikos* in Greek, and some other names (*CHURCH*). Eusebius, in his account of the church built by Constantine at Jerusalem, calls it *basilikos* *rebus*, and the nave *basilikos* *altus*. The use of the word "basilica" as meaning a church seems to have arisen gradually, for the anonymous pilgrim who, in 533, wrote an itinerary from Bordeaux to Jerusalem, when he says that a "basilica" had been built at the Holy Sepulchre by Constantine, adds the explanation, "id est dominicum." Mabillon (*Ann. postum.*, t. ii. p. 355) says that it has been satisfactorily shown that in the writings of authors who wrote in Gaul in the 6th and 7th centuries "basilica" is to be understood as meaning the church of a convent, cathedral and parish churches being called "ecclesiae;" the writers of other countries do not observe this distinction.

Seven churches at Rome—S. Pietro in Vaticano, S. Giovanni Laterano, Sta. Maria Maggiore, Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme, S. Paolo fuori le Mura, S. Lorenzo in Agro Verano, and S. Sebastiano—are styled basilicas by pre-eminence and enjoy certain honorific privileges.

*Basilicula* is used by St. Paulinus (*Epist.* xii. ad *Avitum*) and by Avitus Viennensis (*Epist.* vi.) for a chapel or oratory.

The word basilica is found in the Salic Law (tit. 58, c. 3, 4, and 5) in the sense of a monument erected over a tomb, apparently the tomb of a person of high rank. With the Franks they appear to have been constructed of wood, as erection is made of their being burnt. Clampus

has engraved (*Vet. Mon.*, t. i. tab. xlv.) two monuments which in his time existed in the portico of S. Lorenzo in Agro Verano at Rome, which he conceives to have been basilicas or basiliculae. One may be described as a model of a temple with four pilasters on each side, and without a cella. It has a somewhat elegant and almost classical character. The other would seem to have been only the lower part of a monument; it has three fluted pilasters in front, with an open space behind them. These pilasters carry a base of many mouldings of somewhat classical character, upon which rest the bases of two plain pilasters. Clampus gives no hint as to the date of these monuments.

Tombstones of very early date may be found, in which the top is ridged like the roof of a house and carved with an imitation of tiles or shingles; one (engraved in Fosbroke's *Encycl. of Antiq.*, vi. 1, p. 133) at Dewsbury, in Yorkshire, may be as early as the 7th or 8th century. Tombs in the form of chapels of early date still remain in Ireland (Petrie, *Round Towers and Architecture of Ireland*, p. 454), and did exist at Iona, and probably at Glastonbury and elsewhere, such structures are no doubt instances of what the Salic Law calls "basilicas" (*TOMB*).

The word *basilica* is used in the Vulgate (e. g. 2 Chron. vi. 13) for the court of the Temple; hence Christian writers occasionally use the expression "basilica ecclesiae," as equivalent (seemingly) to the *ATRIUM* or fore-court of a church. (Binterim's *Denkmalgeschichte*, iv. l. 24.) [A. N.]

**BASILICLES.** (1) Martyr at Rome, with Rogatus and others, under Aurelian; commemorated June 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) Martyr, with Polymachus and others, under Diocletian, June 12 (*M. Hieron., Bedae*). This saint has a proper collect, &c., in the *Sacram. Greg.* (p. 105), "pride Idus Junii," i. e. June 12, with Cyrinus, Nabor, and Nazarius. Antiphon in the Gregorian *Lit. Antiph.* p. 699. [C.]

**BASILIDIANS.** [See *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.* ART. BASILIDES.]

**BASILISCUS**, martyr under Maximian, A.D. 308; commemorated May 22 (*Cal. Byzant.*); March 3 (*M. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**BASILISSA**, wife of Julian, martyr at Antioch, A.D. 296; commemorated June 9 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); May 20 (*Mart. Hieron.*); March 3 (*Cal. Byzant.*); Nov. 25 (*Cal. Armen.*). [C.]

**BASILIA.** (1) Virgin-martyr at Rome under Gallienus; commemorated May 20 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae*).

(2) Commemorated Aug. 26 (*M. Hieron.*).

(3) In Antioch, Nov. 23 (*M. Hieron.*). [C.]

**BASKET.** [*CANISTRUM*.]

**BASSUS.** (1) Saint of Africa, *Natale*, March 19 (*M. Bedae*).

(2) Saint, *Natale*, Oct. 20 (*M. Bedae*).

(3) In Herculian, Nov. 20 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**BATH.** Baths in the earlier Christian centuries were in such frequent use, that they were almost necessary adjuncts to houses of a superior class. Moreover, a practice existed that catechumens should bathe before baptism, and priests on the eve of certain festivals and other occasions. We therefore find that baths, *Auriph.* are mentioned among the adjuncts of the Church.



of the Twelve Apostles, built by Constantine at Constantinople (Euseb., *Vit. Const.*, l. iv. c. 59). They are also mentioned in the *Codex Theod.*, b. ix. tit. 4, among the buildings and places included within the precincts of churches.

The anonymous pilgrim of Bordeaux, who was at Jerusalem c. A.D. 333, says that a "balneum" was placed behind the basilica, built by Constantine over the Sepulchre of our Lord, but as he adds the words "ubi infantes lavantur," it is probable that he speaks of a baptistery, or of the piscina of a baptistery.

The *Lib. Pontif.* frequently mentions baths in connexion with churches. Pope Hilarius (A.D. 461-467), we are told, built the "balneum" of St. Stephen, and in the life of Pope Hadrian I. (772-795) mention is made of a bath at the Lateran palace, and of another near St. Peter's; at this last we are told the poor who came to receive alms at Easter were accustomed to bathe. Sometimes these baths were made sources of profit, as Pope Damasus (A.D. 367-385) is stated to have built or given a bath near the "titulus," S. Lorenzo in Damaso (which he had created), which bath yielded 27 solidi. Martigny (*Dict. des Antiq. Chrét.*) mentions other instances of bishops,—as St. Victor of Ravenna, in the 6th century, and Anastasius II. of Pavia—who erected or adorned baths for the clergy; and in the 7th, of St. Agnellus of Naples, who made an ordinance obliging the priests under his authority to bathe on certain days, and made a foundation to furnish them with soap at Christmas and Easter. Certain hot baths at Pozzuoli he states are still known as "fons episcopi."

In an enclosure near the apse of the ruined church of S. Stefano, in Via Latina, near Rome, discovered in the year 1858, is a small reservoir (v. woodcut under CHURCH), which has been considered to have been a bath. It seems, however, possible that it may have been the piscina of a baptistery, or, if the area in which it stands was the atrium of the church, the place of the fountain or cantharus. [A. N.]

**BATHING.** The common use of baths throughout the Roman Empire presented to Christian converts a special difficulty and danger. The habits of the time had given a marked preference to the *thermae* or hot-air baths such as we now know as "Turkish," and neither these nor the *balneae* (swimming or plunge baths) were to be had in their own houses. To give these up was to sacrifice comfort, and, it might be, health, and yet to go to them was in many cases to run the risk of moral contamination. The feeling of the older Romans, which hindered even a grown-up son from bathing with his father (Cic. *De Off.* i. 35; Valer. Max. ii. 17), had died out, and in the *thermae* of all large cities were to be found crowds of men and boys, frequently of women also, sitting naked in the *tepidarium* or *Iaonicum*. It lies in the nature of things that in a society corrupt as was that of the Empire, this, even without the last-named enormity, must have brought with it many evils, foul speech and fouler acts. It might have seemed at first, as if those who were seeking to lead a purer life would have had to renounce the habit altogether, as they renounced the obscenities of the mimes, and the ferocities of gladiatorial shows.

It is noticeable, however, that the rigorism of

early Christian life never reached this point. Doubtless, in every city, there were establishments of different grades, and the Christian could choose those which were conducted with greater decency. Probably, too, before long, as the employment was not a forbidden one, Christians would be found to enter on it and reform its evils. The public baths at Rome which were established by emperors or placed under magisterial control, were free from the grosser evils of the mixture of the two sexes; and it is recorded to the honour of many of the emperors who were, more or less, under the influence of a higher culture, that they sought to check them. Hadrian (Spartianus, p. 25), Antoninus Pius (Julius Capit. p. 90), Alexander Severus (Lamprid. c. 42), are all named as having taken steps to put down the *lavacra mixta*, which were so flagrant an outrage on all natural decency. As it is, though the practice, like most others in the common routine of life, is but little noticed unless where its accompaniment calls for censure, we find traces enough to show that the most devout Christians did not think it necessary to abstain from the public bath. It was in the "baths" of Ephesus that St. John encountered Cerinthus (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 38). Tertullian, with all his austerity, acknowledged that bathing was necessary for health, and that he practised it himself (*Apol.* c. xlii.) Clement of Alexandria (*Paedag.* iii. c. 9), lays down rules, half medical and half moral, for its use. It formed part of the complaints of the Christians of Lugdunum and Vienna, and was mentioned by them as the first sign of the change for the worse in their treatment, that they were excluded from the public baths (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1). Augustine narrates how on his mother's death, led by the popularly accepted etymology of *βαλανεῖον* (as if from *βάλλειν ἀνίαν*) he had gone to the *thermae* to assuage his sorrow, and found it fruitless ("neque enim exsudavit de corde meo moeroris amaritudo." *Confess.* ix. 32). The old evils, however, in spite of the reforming Empire, continued to prevail, probably in worse forms in the provinces than in the capital. Epiphanius mentions *λουτρά ἀνδρόγυνα* as common among the Jews of his time (*Haer.* 30). Clement describes the mixture of the sexes as occurring in the daily life of Alexandria (*Paedag.* iii. 5); Cyprian as in that of Carthage (*de Cult. Virg.* p. 73); Ambrose as in that of Milan (*de Off.* i. 18); and both plead against it with an earnestness which shows that it was a danger for Christians as well as heathens. Even those whose sense of shame led them to avoid the more public exposure, submitted to the gaze and the cares of male attendants (Clem. Al. *l. c.*). It is even more startling to find that it was necessary, after the conversion of the Empire, to forbid, under pain of deposition, the clergy of all orders from frequenting baths where the sexes were thus mingled (C. Laod. c. 30; C. Trull. c. 77). Offending laymen were in like manner to come under sentence of excommunication. Gradually the better feeling prevailed, and the *lavacra mixta* fell into a disrepute like that of houses of ill fame. It was reckoned a justifiable cause of divorce for a wife to have been seen in one (Cod. Justin. V. tit. 17 *de Repud.*).

Another aspect of the practice remains to be noticed. Traces meet us here and there of a distinctly liturgical use of bathing, analogous to the

ablutions of Jewish worshippers and priests, as preliminary to solemn religious acts, and, in particular, to baptism. The practice existed among the Essenes (Joseph. *Vit.* c. 2), and there may probably be a reference to it in the "washed with pure water" of Heb. x. 22. Tertullian (*de Orat.* c. xi.) condemns as superstitious what he describes as the common custom ("plerique superstitiose curant") of washing the whole body before every act of prayer. In Western Africa there was a yet stranger usage, which Augustine characterises as "pagan," of going to the sea on the Feast of St. John the Baptist, and bathing as in his honour (*Serm. cxciv. de Temp.* 23). As preparatory to baptism, it was, however, recognised. The catechumens who were to be admitted at Easter had during the long quadragesimal fast abstained from the use of the bath; and there was some risk in such cases, when large numbers were gathered together for baptism by immersion, and stripped in the presence of the Church, of an uncleanness which would have been offensive both to sight and smell. Here, therefore, the bath was brought into use (August. *Epist.* 54), and the *balneator* attended with his *strigil*, and his flask of oil and his towels, after the usual fashion (Zeno Veron. *Invit. ad font.* vi.). It may be noted, as implied in this, that the employment was among those which it was not unlawful for Christians to engage in. It was probably for this purpose, as well as for the use of priests before they celebrated the eucharist, that Constantine constructed baths within the precincts of the great church which he built at Constantinople (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iv. 59), and that they were recognised as important, if not essential, appendages to the more stately churches, and were entitled to the same privileges of asylum (*Cod. Theodos.* ix. tit. 45). Popes and bishops followed the imperial example, and constructed baths in Rome, in Pavia, in Ravenna, and in Naples. A full account of their structure and use is to be found in Sidon. Apollinar. *Epp.* ii. 2. (Comp. the monograph *De sacris Christianorum balneis*, by Paciandi. Rome, 1758.) [E. H. P.]

BAVO, Saint, of Ghent (died 653), *Natale*, Oct. 1 (*Mart. Bedae, Adonis in Appendice*). In the Reims MS. of the Gregorian Sacramentary, the commemoration of SS. Bavo, Germanus, and Vedast, is joined with that of St. Remigius. [C.]

BEADLE. [*Ang. Sax.* Bydel, a messenger.] An inferior officer of the Church answering to the modern beadle, is possibly referred to in a Canon of the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) under the name of *παπαμωδῆσιος*. In the Roman Church the officer was called mansionarius. By Gregory the Great he is also styled Custos Ecclesiae—whose business it was to light the lamps or candles of the church. Later critics, however, have given a different interpretation of *παπαμωδῆσιος*. Thus, Justellus explains it by "villicus," a bailiff or steward of the lands; and Bishop Beveridge (Not. in *Conc. Chalced.* c. 2) styles him "rerum ecclesiasticarum administrator," which would have the same meaning (Bingham, iii. 13). [D. B.]

BEARDS. The practice of the clergy in ancient times in respect of wearing beards was in conformity with the general custom. Long hair and baldness by shaving being alike in ill-repute as unseemly peculiarities, the clergy were

required to observe a becoming moderation between either extreme. To this effect is the Canon of the 4th Council of Carthage—*Clericus nec comam nutriat nec barbam radat*. The contrary practice, however, having obtained in the later Roman Church, it has been contended by Bellarmine and others, that the word *radat* was an interpolation in the Canon. But this allegation has been disproved by Savaro, on the testimony of the Vatican and many other manuscripts: and it appears further, from one of the Epistles of Sidonius (lib. iv. *Ep.* 24), that in his time it was the custom of the French bishops to wear short hair and long beards: his friend Maximus Palatinus, who had become a clergyman, being thus described—"Habitus viro, gradus, pudor, color, sermo religiosus: tum coma brevis, barba proluxa," &c. (Bingham, b. vi. c. iv.) [D. B.]

#### BEASTS, IN SYMBOLISM. [SYMBOLISM.]

BEATITUDES. In the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, the Beatitudes (*μακαρισμοί*) are ordered to be sung by the choir on Sundays, instead of the third ANTIPHON (Daniel's *Codex Liturgicus*, iv. 343; Neale's *Eastern Ch.*, *Introd.* 390). Goar (*Euchologion*) seems to have been uncertain of the meaning of the word, or of the practice of the Church; for he writes that these *μακαρισμοί* are "hymni sanctorum beatitudinis memoriam recolentes; vel potius eae beatitudines de quibus S. Matthaei V.; vel tandem pia viventium vota pro defunctorum requie." Dr. Neale takes them, no doubt rightly, for the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount. [C.]

BEATRIX, martyr; commemorated July 29 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae*). The *Mart. Hieron.* has under July 29 "Veatrix;" July 28, "Beatrix;" and again "Beatrix," July 30. The Corbey MS. of the *Sacram. Greg.* has a commemoration of S. Beatrix (with S. Felix and others) on July 29. Antiphon. in *Lib. Antiph.* p. 704. [C.]

BELFRY (High-German, *Bercvrit, Berovit*, a tower for defence; Low-Latin, *bertefredum, battefredum, belfredum*, &c.; Italian, *bettifredo*, a sentry-box on a tower; Old French, *berfrois*; Mod. French, *beffroi*; Eng. *belfry*, the corrupt etymology of which has limited the application, see Wedgwood's *Dict. of Eng. Etymology*, i. 142). The place in which bells hang. *Berfredum* is also found used for the structure of timber on which a bell is hung, in German *Glockenstuhl*. In common parlance belfry and its equivalents are used for the whole tower in which bells hang.

The earliest examples of bell-towers connected with churches appear to be those of Ravenna: that of S. Francesco Hübsch attributes to the beginning of the 6th century, and those of S. Giovanni Battista and S. Apollinare in Classe to the middle or latter part of the same century. Of the towers at Rome he thinks that those of Sta. Pudenziana and S. Lorenzo in Lucina may be in part at least of the 7th; but no documentary notice of bell-towers has been found earlier than that in the *Lib. Pontif.* of the "turre" built by Pope Stephen III. (A.D. 768–772) at St. Peter's, in which he placed three bells "to call together the clergy and people to the service of God." (This passage is given by Ducange, but does not appear in all editions of the *Lib. Pontif.*) Pope Leo IV., the same

book informs us, built a campanile at S. Andrea Apostolo, and placed there a bell with a brazen hammer. [A. N.]

### BELL, BOOK, AND CANDLE. [EX-COMMUNICATION.]

**BELLS.** I. *Names of Bells.*—The name *campanum* or *campana* is commonly said to have been given to bells, because they were invented by Paullinus of Nola in Campania. Paullinus, however, who more than once describes churches, never mentions bells, and the more probable supposition is, that bells in early times were cast from Campanian brass, which Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* xxxiv. 8) describes as the best for such a purpose, and so received the name *campana* or *campanum*. The word *nōla* can scarcely be derived from the city Nōla, and is perhaps imitative of the sound, like the English "knoll."

The word which we have in the form *clock* (compare Irish *clog*, French *cloche*, Germ. *glocke*) was adopted in later Latin, both in the neuter form *cloccum* (*Vita S. Bonifacii*, in *Act. Sanct.* June, tom. i. p. 472) and the feminine *clocca* (*Bonifacii Epistt.* 9 et 75); the latter is the usual form. The "Anonymus Thuanus," quoted by Binterim (*Denkwürd.* iv. 1. 290) gives the form *cloqua* for a turret-bell (*cloquam turris*).

*Signum* (Ital. *segno*, old French *seint*, whence *tocsin*) is the most usual word for a church-bell from the 6th century. In some cases it appears to designate not a bell, but some other kind of *semintron*. (Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v.; Rosweyd, *Vitae Patrum*, *Onomast.* s. v. p. 1056.)

Small bells, such as were rung by hand in the refectories of monasteries, were called *tintinnabula*; and the still smaller bells which were sometimes appended to priestly vestments, were designated *tinniola*, from their tinkling sound. (Ducange, s. v.) *Tintinnum* seems to have been sometimes used for a larger bell (see Tatwin, quoted below).

The word *skella*, *skilla*, *scilla*, *squilla*, or *esquilla* (Ital. *squilla*, Germ. *schelle*) is also used for a small bell: see below. In the *Tabularium* of St. Remi (quoted by Ducange) a "schilla de metallo" is mentioned as well as "signum ferreum."

Other designations occasionally found are *aes*, *aeramentum*, *lebes*, *muta*, *κῶδων*.

II. *Use of Bells.*—For the purpose of announcing meetings of Christians in times of persecution a messenger was employed [CURSOR]; in quiet times future services were announced by a deacon: in time of divine worship; in some parts of Africa a TRUMPET seems to have been employed to call the people to their assemblies.

After the time of Constantine some sonorous instrument, whether a clapper [SEMANTRON] or a bell, seems to have been generally employed to give notice of the commencement of Christian assemblies. The word "signum" in Latin writers is probably used to designate both these instruments, and it is not always easy to say which is intended. Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 23, p. 73) mentions a "signum" as calling monks to matins, in the time of Sidonius Apollinaris; and elsewhere (*De Mirac. S. Martini*, ii. 45, p. 1068) he mentions the "signum" (*signum quod commoveri solet*) as if it were something swung like a bell. So Venantius Fortunatus (*Carm.* ii. 10) speaks of the "signum" of the principal church

in Paris calling to prayer. St. Columba is said, in the life by Cumineus Albus (*Acta SS. Junii*, tom. ii. p. 188, c. 10), to have gone into the church when the bell rang (*pulsante campana*) at midnight; and Bede (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 23) mentions that at St. Hilda's death, one of her nuns at a distance from Whitby heard suddenly the well-known sound of the bell which roused or called them to prayer when one departed from this world. These testimonies seem to show that bells of considerable size were used in England, at least in convents, as early as the 6th century. Tatwin, archbishop of Canterbury (731–734) in some verses "De Tintinno" (Hook's *Archbishops*, i. 206) speaks of a bell "superis suspensus in auris" hastening the steps of the crowd. The *Excerptiones* attributed to Egbert (*canon* ii.), enjoin "ut omnes sacerdotes horis competentibus diei et noctis suarum sonent ecclesiarum signa."

St. Sturm when dying (an. 779) ordered all the bells (*gloggas*) of his convent to be rung (Eigil's *Vita S. Sturmii*, c. 25, in Migne's *Patrol.* cv. 443).

In Gaul we have already seen that "signa" were used as early as the 6th century. At a later period, Flodoard (*Hist. Remens.* ii. 12) tells us of the miraculous silence of two of the bells of a Gascon church in which St. Rigobert (†749) was praying. We cannot, of course, insist upon all the details of this narrative as if they were literally true, but the account shows at any rate that Flodoard (about 950) took for granted that in the 8th century the great churches in the Gascon territory had many bells, which were rung at certain hours; and that even country churches had more than one, for the two silent bells had been stolen from a country church; moreover, the bells must have been of considerable size, for the narrator speaks expressly of their loud sound (*his altisone reboantibus*). It is worth observing, too, that he uses the words *campanae*, *nolae*, and *signa* as precisely synonymous.

By the time of Charles the Great, in fact, the use of church-bells seems to have become common in the empire. Charles encouraged the art or bell-founding, and entertained bell-founders at his court. Among the most famous of these was Tancho, a monk of St. Gall, who cast a fine bell for the great church at Aachen. (The Monk of St. Gall *De Gestis Caroli*, i. 31.) He asked for 100 pounds of silver as alloy for the copper, from which we infer that the bell may have weighed 400 or 500 pounds.

Bells appear to have been held in especial regard by the Irish ecclesiastics of the fifth and succeeding centuries. Their bells seem to have been chiefly hand-bells; but Dr. Petrie (*Round Towers of Ireland*, p. 383) says that "it is perfectly certain that bells of a size much too large for altar-bells were abundantly distributed by St. Patrick in Ireland, as appears from his oldest lives." Sinall of Cill Airis, in the tripartite life of St. Patrick supposed to have been originally written in the 6th century, is called *campanarius*. Hand-bells are preserved, which are attributed to Irish Saints or ecclesiastics from the 5th century downwards. They seem to have been reckoned among the most necessary insignia of a bishop: thus in the annotations of Tirechan, in the Book of Armagh, we are told that Patrick conferred on Fiach the

degree of a bishop and gave him a box or mitchei containing a bell, a "monster" (i. e. a reliquary), a crozier, and a "polaire" or ornamental case for a book (Petrie, p. 336). The earliest of these



The Bell of St. Patrick.

bells and the most highly venerated is that known as the "Clog-an-eadhachta Phatric,"—the bell of the will of Patrick,—given to the church of Armagh by St. Columba; this is of quadrangular form, of thick sheet iron, six inches high, five inches by four at the mouth and diminishing upwards, with a loop at the top for the hand (v. woodcut). It is kept in a splendidly orna-

mented case, made for it between A.D. 1091 and 1105.

Many other such bells are in existence, as the bell of St. Gall, in the Treasury of the church of St. Gall in Switzerland; the bell of St. Moyses (d. A.D. 824), in possession of the Primates of Ireland, &c.

In the 9th century, according to Dr. Petrie (*Round Towers of Ireland*, p. 252), the quadrangular form which is found in all the early bells began to give way to the circular. The early bells are usually of iron, but one of bronze in the collection of the Royal Irish Academy, which has been ascribed to St. Patrick, in consequence of its being inscribed with the name "Patrici," is of bronze, as are some others.

In the East, church-bells were of later introduction. No mention of them in the East appears to occur until Orso, duke of Venice, towards the end of the 9th century, gave twelve large bells of brass to Michael (or Basil) the Greek emperor, who added a bell-tower to the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople for their reception. (Baronius, in Augusti's *Handbuch*, i. 402.) [A. N.] and [C.]

We gather from the above examples that from the 6th century at least bells were used in the West, first in convents, afterwards in churches generally, to summon worshippers to the various services, and to give notice to the faithful of the passing away of one of the brotherhood. Details of the manner of making and hanging these bells are altogether wanting.

Besides these uses, we find that bells were anciently used by the Western Church in processions. For instance, the rubric of the Mozarabic *Missal* (p. 168, ed. Lesley) directs that a boy ringing a hand-bell (*esquillam*) should precede the procession which bore the Eucharist to the Sepulchre on Maundy Thursday.

Another ecclesiastical use of small bells is the following:—Benedict of Aniane (see his *Life* by Ardo, c. 8, in *Acta SS.* Febr. tom. ii. p. 612) ordered a *spullus* to be rung in the monk's dormitory before the *synnum* of the church rang for the nocturnal "Hours."

It is generally agreed, that there is no trace within our period of the practice of ringing either a small bell or the great bell of the church at the elevation of the Host. The ancient Irish hand-bells may probably have been used in processions, or in monasteries for such uses as those described above.

The belief that the ringing of bells, whether the great bells of a church or hand-bells, tended to dispel storms is of considerable antiquity. The origin of this belief is traced by hagiographers to St. Salaberga, who lived in the beginning of the 7th century. The story is, that a small bell attached to the neck of a stag, was brought from heaven to St. Salaberga, for the relief of her daughter Anstrudia, who was terrified at thunder. This belief is expressed in the lines

"Reliquias sanctas Salabergae et ceterarum puerorum  
Expulsi sunt furor et ignis temeritas pallit."

See Mabillon's *Acta SS.* Bened. aec. ii. p. 414; Bollandist *Acta SS.* Sept. tom. vi. p. 517. The supposed property of dispelling storms is alluded to in the services for the benediction or "baptism" of bells.

III. *Benediction of Bells.*—It is probable that from the time that bells first became part of the furniture of a church, they were subjected, like other church-furniture and ornaments, to some kind of consecration. Forms for the benediction of a church-bell (*Ad signum ecclesiae benedictionum*) are found in the Reims and the Corbey MSS. of the Gregorian Sacramentary (*Sacram. Greg.* ed. Mabillon, p. 438) to the following effect. After the benediction of the water to be used in the ceremony, Psalms 145-150 (Vulg.), were chanted; meantime the bell was washed with the holy-water, and touched with oil and salt, by the officiating bishop, who said at the same time the prayer, beginning, "Deus, qui per Moysen legiferum tubas argenteas fieri praecipisti;" the bell was then wiped with a napkin, and the Antiphon followed, "Vox Domini super aquas" (Ps. xxix. 3, Vulg.); the bell was then touched with chrism seven times outside and four times inside, while the prayer was said, "Omnipotens sempiterna Deus, qui ante arcam Foederis, &c.;" it was then fumigated with incense within and without, and "Viderunt te aquae" (Ps. lxxvi. 16) was chanted; the service concluded with the collect "Omnipotens Dominator Christe, quo secundum assumptionem carnis dormientes in navi," &c. Both the verses and the prayer allude to the supposed power of the bell to calm storms.

The office *Ad signum ecclesiae benedictionum* given in Egbert's *Pontifical* (pp. 177 ff. ed. Surtees Society, 1853) differs in no essential point from the Gregorian.

The custom of engraving a name upon a bell is said by Baronius (*Annales*, an. 961, c. 93) to have originated with Pope John XIII., who consecrated a bell and gave it the name John. This will probably be accepted as sufficient testimony to the fact, that the custom of engraving a name on a bell, in connexion with the ceremony of consecration, did not arise in Italy before the 10th century. It is, of course, possible that in other countries, as in Ireland, it may be of earlier date; or the names engraved on some ancient Irish bells may simply indicate ownership.

In Charles the Great's capitulary of the year 789, c. 18, the words occur, "Ut clucae non baptizentur." As it is almost certain that some kind of dedication-rite for church-bells was practised continuously through the period, we must either conclude that some particular practice in the matter—it is impossible to determine what—is here condemned, or that the

"cloacas" here intended were hand-bells for domestic use. The latter supposition is strengthened by the fact that the direction immediately follows in the capitulary, that papers should not be hung on poles to avert hail; clearly a domestic superstition. (Binterlin, *Dombuchdrucken* iv. 1, 29.) The connexion suggests, that these "cloacas" were house-bells to be used for averting storms. See the legend of St. Salaburga, above.

IV. *Literature.* N. Eggert, *De Origine et Nomine Campanarum* (Jena, 1884); *De Campanarum Materia et Forma* (ib. 1885). H. Walleril *Die Campana et praeconis curia* (Helm. 1884). P. C. Hilscher, *De Campanis Templorum* (Lipsia, 1882). J. B. Thiers, *Traité des Cloches*, 2e. (Paris, 1719). J. Montanus, *Historische Nachricht von den Glocken*, u. s. w. (Chemnitz, 1736). C. W. J. Chrysander, *Hist. Nachricht von Kirchen-Glocken* (Bielefeld, 1785). Cassin Barrand in Didron's *Annales Archéol.*, xvi. 325; xvii. 104, 276, 337; xviii. 87, 145. [C.]

**BEMA**, otherwise *tribunal*, *amatorium* (Gr. *Bēma*). The part of a church raised above the rest, shut off by railings or screens, and reserved for the higher clergy. The part so reserved, when the apse was large, was sometimes the apse alone, but often a space in front of the apse was included. When, as is the case in many churches of the basilican type at Rome and elsewhere, there was a transept at that end of the church, the bema often commenced at the so-called triumphal arch at the end of the nave. In the old church of St. Peter at Rome the bema appears to have comprised the apse alone, but at St. Paolo f. l. M. the whole transept is slightly raised. Sometimes where a transept exists, the bema does not extend into the arms of the transept, which are parted off by screens. The altar was usually placed within in the bema, often on the chord of the arc of the apse. Beneath the altar was usually a crypt or confession. Round the wall of the apse or "conchialis tematis" ran a bench for the presbytery, which was interrupted in the centre by the cathedra or throne for the bishop. These seats are alluded to by St. Augustine when (*Ep.* 203) he speaks of "apsides gradatæ" and "cathedras velatas." Such an arrangement as this was probably in use as early as the time of Constantine; for, from the description given us by Eusebius of the church built by Paulinus at Tyre (*Eccles. Hist.* x. 14), we find that the altar stood in the middle, and, together with the seats for the dignitaries, was surrounded by railings of wood admirably worked. We should probably understand by middle, not absolutely the middle of the church, but the middle of the apse, for the description is given in a very inexact and rhetorical style. At St. Sophia's, when rebuilt by Justinian, there was an enclosure (*ἵππος*) formed by a stylobate, on which were twelve columns surrounded by an architrave, which divided the bema from the solea. This enclosure had three gates, and was entirely of silver, very richly ornamented (Pauli Silentiarri *Descript. S. Sophiæ*). Such an enclosure is called by Symeon *ὑπερσώμα*, and by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *κρύπιδες*. Such was the normal arrangement, but it was not invariable; for the *Lit. Pontif.*, in the life of Pope Hadrian I. (A.D. 773-795), narrates how at St. Maria ad Praesepe

(now S. Maria Maggiore) the women who attended the service intervened between him and his attendant clergy, and in the life of Pope Gregory IV. (A.D. 827-844) that the altar at St. Maria in Trastevere stood in a low place, almost in the middle of the nave, so that the crowd surrounding it were mixed up with the clergy. The Pope therefore made for the clergy a handsome "tribunal" in the circuit of the apse, raising it considerably. This arrangement remained in use until perhaps the 11th or 12th century; it is clearly shown in the plan for the church of St. Gall drawn up in the beginning of the 9th century (*Arch. Journal*, vol. v., see CHURCH), both apses being shut off and raised above the rest of the church. Probably no example now exists of a period as early as that treated of in this work, in which a "bema" remains in its original state; but the raised tribunal may be seen in many Italian churches in Rome, Ravenna, and elsewhere. In S. Apollinare in Classe, in the latter city, a part of the marble enclosure seems to remain. The bench of marble, with the cathedra in the middle, may also be seen in that and many other churches, a good example is afforded by those at Parenzo in Istria which would seem to be of the same date as the church—the 6th century. In the church of S. Clemente at Rome marble screens of an early date (7th century?) part off the bema in the ancient fashion, but the church is not earlier than the 12th century. The word is little used by Latin writers, being in fact the Greek equivalent for what in the *Lit. Pontif.* is called "tribunal"; "presbyterium" is the same work is perhaps sometimes used with the same meaning, though by this word the "chorus" or place for the singers and inferior clergy is generally meant (v. CHORUS, PRESBYTERIUM). The word "bema" is also found in use for a pulpit or ambo, as by Symeon (l. ix. c. 2); but it is distinguished from the bema, or sanctuary, by being called *βήμα τῶν ἀποστόλων*, the readers' bema. The same expression is, however, applied by Symeon of Thessalonica to the solea, a platform in front of the bema (Nesle, *East. Church*, v. l. p. 301). [A. N.]

**BENEDICAMUS DOMINO.** This is a liturgical form of words, said by the priest at the end of all the canonical hours, with the exception of matins. The response to it is always *Deo gratias*. It is also said at the end of the mass in those masses in which *Gloria in excelsis* is not said, and which are not masses for the dead, in which the corresponding form is *Requiescat in pace*. The custom of substituting *Benedicamus* for *Te igitur* in these masses is derived from the old practice of the Church, according to which after masses for the dead, or those for penitential days, the people were not dismissed as at other times, but remained for the recitation of the psalms, which were said after the mass. *Benedicamus Domino* is sung on the same tone as *Te igitur*, which varies according to the character of the day. [H. J. M.]

**BENEDICITE.** This canticle, called also *Canticum irruum pasorum*, is part (v. 35 to the middle of v. 66) of the prayer of Amarias in the furnace, which occurs between the 23rd and 24th verses of Daniel iii. in the LXX., but is not in the Hebrew. It is used in the lauds of the Western Church, both in the Gregorian, inclu-



dling the old English, and Monastic uses, among the psalms of lauds, on Sundays and festivals, immediately before Ps. cxviii., cxlxi., cl. It usually has an antiphon of its own, though in some uses the psalms at lauds are all said under one antiphon. The antiphonal clause, "Laudate et superexaltate eum in saecula," is only said after the first and last verses. *Gloria Patri* is not said after it, as after other antiphons, but in its place the verse—

*Benedicamus Patri et Filio cum Spiritu Sancto: Inebriemur et superexaltemus eum in saecula.*

*Benedictus* or, *Dominus*, in fragments still: or *Inedictus* or *gloriosus* or *superexaltatus* in *saecula*.

In the Ambrosian lauds for Sundays and festivals, *Benedictus* occurs with an antiphon varying with the day, and preceded by a collect (*Oratio secretis*) which varies only on Christmas Day and the Epiphany. During the octave of Easter *Hallelujah*\* is said after each verse.

*Benedictus* also occurs in the private thanksgiving of the priest after mass; in the Roman office in full; in the Sacrum the last few verses only.

In the Mozarabic breviary this canticle is found in the lauds for Sundays and festivals in a somewhat different form, with a special antiphon, and is called *Benedictus*. It begins at v. 20; the antiphonal clause is omitted altogether till the end; and the opening words of the *Benedictus* proper, "*Benedictus omnia opera Domini Domine*," are never repeated after their first occurrence.

In the offices of the Greek Church this canticle is the eighth of the nine "*Odes*" appointed at lauds. The antiphonal clause is said after every verse, and a supplementary verse is added at the end, "*εὐχαριστῶ Ἀστέροισι, Προφῆταις, καὶ Μάρτυσι Κυρίου, τὸν Κύριον κ.τ.λ.*" This canticle is sometimes called (e.g. by St. Benedict and by St. Fructuosus Archb. of Braga, † 685) from the nature of its contents the *Benedictio*, in the same way as the last three psalms of the Psalter are known as the *Laudes*. [H. J. H.]

**BENEDICTA**, religious woman, martyr at Rome under Julian, commemorated January 6 (*Mart. Rom. Vrt.*) [C.]

**BENEDICTINE RULE AND ORDER**, founded by St. Benedict of Nursia, born A.D. 480, and died probably 542. [See *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.* a. c.] Even before the institution of the Benedictine Rule, monasticism was widely established in Southern and Western Europe, and was instrumental in spreading Christianity among the hordes which overran the prostrate Roman Empire. But there was as yet neither uniformity nor permanency of rule (*Mab. Act. i. S. B. Praef.*). In the words of Cassian, which seem to apply to Occidental as well as Oriental monachism, there were as many rules as there were monasteries (*Instit. ii. 2*). In Italy, always easily accessible to Greek influences, the Rule of Basil, which had been translated into Latin by Kassian (*Praef. Reg. Baz.*), was the favourite; in Southern Gaul, and in Spain, that of Cassian, or rather of Marcellus; and as the Rule of Benedict worked its way into the North-west of Europe, it was confronted by the rival system of Columbanus (*Pellie. Hist. Eccl. Chr. i. lib. 1, § 4*;

*Mab. Ann. Praef.*). Like Aaron's rod, in the quaint language of the Middle Ages, it soon swallowed up the other rules. But, in fact, there was often a great diversity of practice, even among those professing to follow the same Rule, often a medley of different rules within the same walls (*Mab. Ann. Praef.*), and a succession of new rules in successive years (*Mab. Ann. i. 29*). The Columbanists, for instance, were not, strictly speaking, a separate order (*Mab. Ann. Praef.*). The Benedictines may fairly be regarded as the first in order of time, as well as in importance, of the monastic orders.

The Benedictine Rule gave stability to what had hitherto been fluctuating and incoherent (*Mab. Ann. Praef.*). The hermit-life had been essentially individualistic, and the monastic communities of Egypt and the East had been an aggregation, on however large a scale, of units, rather than a compact and living organisation, as of "many members in one body." Benedict seems to have felt keenly the need of a firm hand to control and regulate the manifold impulses, of one sort and another, which moved men to retire from the world. Apparently there was a good deal of laxity and disorder among the monks of his day. He is very severe against the petty fraternities of the *Sarabaitae*, monks dwelling two or three together in a "cell" or small monastery, without any one at their head, and still more against the "Gyrovagi" monks, who led a desultory and nomadic life, roving from one monastery to another. Unlike his Eastern predecessors, who looked up to utter solitude as the summit of earthly excellence, Benedict, as if in later life regretting the excessive austerities of his youth, makes no mention at all of either hermits or anchorites (*Prof. Reg. S. B.*). Anything like anarchy offended his sense of order and congruity; and, with his love of organising, he was the man to supply what he felt to be wanting.

Accordingly, in Benedict's system the vow of self-addiction to the monastery became more stringent, and its obligation more lasting. Hitherto, it had been rather the expression of a resolution or of a purpose, than a solemn vow of perpetual perseverance (*Aug. Ep. ad Mon. 109, p. 587; Aug. Ret. c. Joannem. ii. 23; Hieron. Ep. 48; Cass. Inst. i. 23*). But by the Rule (c. 58) the vow was to be made with all possible solemnity, in the chapel, before the relics in the shrine, with the abbat and all the brethren standing by; and once made it was to be irrevocable—"Vestigia nulla retrosum." The postulant for admission into the monastery had to deposit the memorial of his compact on the altar: and from that day to retrace his steps was morally impossible. The Rule contemplates indeed the possibility of a monk retrograding from his promise, and re-entering the world which he had renounced, but only as an act of apostasy, committed at the instigation of the devil (c. 58). Previously, if a monk married, he was censured and sentenced to a penance (*Basil. Respons. 36; Leo, Ep. 90, ad Rustic. c. 13; Epiphani. Hær. lxi. 7; Hieron. Ep. ad Domn. 97 (8); Aug. de Don. Vrt. c. 10; Gelas. Ep. 5, ad Episc. Lucan. ap. Grat. Caus. xxvii.; Quod. i. c. 14; Conc. Aurd. i. c. 21*); but the marriage was not annulled as invalid. After the promulgation of the Rule, far heavier penalties were enacted

\* So spelt in the Antiphonary books.

The monk, who had broken his vow by marrying, was to be excommunicated, was to be compelled to separate from his wife, and might be forcibly reclaimed by his monastery: if a priest, he was to be degraded (Greg. M. *Ep.* i. 33, 40, vii. 9, xii. 20, ap. Grat. xxvii.; *Qu.* i. c. 15; *Conc. Turon.* ii. c. 15). These severities were no part of Benedict's comparatively mild and lenient code; but they testify to his having introduced a much stricter estimation of the monastic vow.

At the same time, as with a view to guard against this danger of relapse, Benedict wisely surrounded admission into his order with difficulties. He provided a year's novitiate, which was prolonged to two years in the next century (Greg. M. *Ep.* x. 24); and thrice, at certain intervals, during this year of probation, the novice was to have the Rule read over to him, that he might weigh well what he was undertaking, and that his assent might be deliberate and unwavering (c. 58). The written petition for admission was required invariably (c. 58). None were to be received from other monasteries, without letters commendatory from their abbat (c. 61); nor children without the consent of parents or guardians, nor unless formally disinherited (c. 59). Eighteen years of age was subsequently fixed as the earliest age for self-dedication. The gates of the monastery moved as slowly on their hinges at the knock of postulants for admission, as they were inexorably closed upon him when once within the walls (cf. Fleury, *Hist. Ecc.* xxxv. 19—note by Bened. Editor; Aug. Vindel. 1768).

Benedict had evidently the same object before his eyes, the consolidation of the fabric which he was erecting, in the form of government which he devised for his order. This was a monarchy, and one nearer to despotism than to what is called a "constitutional monarchy." Poverty, humility, chastity, temperance, all these had been essential elements in the monastic life from the first. Benedict, although he did not introduce the principle of obedience, made it more precise and more implicit (cc. 2, 3, 27, 64; cf. Mab. *Ann.* iii. 8); stereotyped it by regulations extending even to the demeanour and deportment due from the younger to the elder (cc. 7, 63); and crowned the edifice with an abbat, irresponsible to his subjects. Strict obedience was exacted from the younger monks, towards all their superiors in the monastery (cc. 68–71); but the abbat was to be absolute over all (c. 3). He alone is called Dominus in the Rule; though the word in its later form, Domnus, became common to all Benedictines (c. 63). The monks had the right of electing him, without regard to seniority. Supposing a flagrantly scandalous election to be made, the bishop of the diocese, or the neighbouring abbats, or even the "Christians of the neighbourhood," might interfere to have it cancelled; but once duly elected his will was to be supreme (c. 64). He was indeed to convoke a council of the brethren, when necessary: on any important occasions, of them all; otherwise, only of the seniors: but in every case the final and irrevocable decision, from which there was no appeal, rested with him (c. 3). He was to have the appointment of the prior, or provost (c. 65; cf. Greg. M. *Ep.* vii. 10), and of the decani or deans, as well as the power of

deposing them (c. 21),<sup>a</sup> the prior after four, the deans after three warnings (c. 65). Benedict was evidently distrustful of any collision of authority, or want of perfect harmony, between the abbat and his prior; and preferred deans, as more completely subordinate (c. 65); for, while the abbat held his office for life, the deans as well as all the other officers of the monastery, except the prior, held theirs for only a certain time (cc. 21, 31, 32). Even the cellerarius, or cellarius, the steward, who ranked next to the abbat in secular things, as the prior in things spiritual, was to be appointed for one, four, or ten years; the tool-keepers, robe-keepers, &c., only for one. The abbat was armed with power to enforce his authority on the recalcitrant, after two admonitions in private and one in public, by the "lesser excommunication," or banishment from the common table and from officiating in the chapel; by the "greater excommunication," or deprivation of the rites of the Church; by flogging, by imprisonment, and other bodily penances (cc. 2, 23–29; cf. Mart. *de Ant. Mon. Rit.* ii. 11) in case of hardened offenders; and, as an extreme penalty, by expulsion from the society. Benedict, however, with characteristic clemency, expressly cautions the abbat to deal tenderly with offenders (c. 27); allowing readmission for penitents into the monastery, even after relapses; and, as though aware how much he is entrusting to the abbat's discretion, begins, and almost ends, his Rule with grave and earnest cautions against abusing his authority.

Benedict's constitution was no mere democracy, under the abbat. All ranks and conditions of men were indeed freely admitted, from the highest to the lowest,<sup>b</sup> and on equal terms (c. 51; cf. Aug. *de Op. Mon.* 22): within the monastery all the distinctions of their previous life vanished; the serf and the noble stood there side by side (c. 2). Thus even a priest, whose claims to precedence, being of a spiritual nature, might have been supposed to stand on a different footing, had to take his place simply by order of seniority among the brethren (c. 60), though he might be allowed by the abbat to take a higher place in the chapel (c. 62), and might, as the lay-brothers, be promoted by him above seniors in standing (c. 63; cf. Fleury, *Hist. Ecc.* xxxii. 15). Similarly, a monk from another monastery was to have no especial privileges (c. 61). But, with all this levelling of distinctions belonging to the world without, the gradations of rank for the monks as monks were clearly defined. Every brother had his place assigned him in the monastic hierarchy. Such offices as those of the hebdomadarius or weekly cook, of the lector or reader-aloud in the refectory, were to be held by each in turn, unless by special exemption (cc. 35, 38), and the younger monks were enjoined to address the elder as "nonni," or fathers, in token of affectionate reverence (c. 63). Benedict seems to have had an equal dread of tyranny and of insubordination.

Indeed, the strict obedience exacted by the Rule is tempered throughout by an elasticity, and considerateness, which contrast strongly with the inflexible rigour of similar institutions.

<sup>a</sup> V. Martene, note in *Reg. Comm.* ad loc.; cf. *Conc. Mogunt.* c. 11.

<sup>b</sup> The restrictions and limitations in Martene's *Reg. Comm.* are not in the Rule.

Like the Evangelic Sermon on the Mount, which he makes his model (*Prolog. Reg.*; cf. c. 4), Benedict often lays down a principle, without shaping it into details. Thus he enjoins silence, as a wholesome discipline, without prescribing the times and places for it, beyond specifying the refectory and the dormitory (c. 6). Like Lycurgus, he wishes to bequeath to his followers a law which shall never be broken (c. 64); and yet, in the closing words of his Rule, he reminds them that the Rule, after all, is imperfect in itself (c. 73). More than once he seems to anticipate the day when his order shall have assumed larger dimensions, and provides for monasteries on a grander scale than existed when he was writing his Rule (cc. 31, 32, 53). Thus, about dress, as if foreseeing the varying requirements of various climes, he leaves a discretionary power to the abbat, affirming merely the unvarying principle that it is to be cheap and homely (c. 55); and that there are to be two dresses, the "scapulare," or sort of cape, for field-work, and the "cucullus," or hood, for study and prayer (cf. Fleury, *Hist. Ecc.* xxxii. 16). The colour of the tunic or toga, being left undetermined by the founder, has varied at different times: till the 8th century it was usually white (Mab. *Ann.* iii.). Nor is there any Procrustean stiffness in the directions about diet. Temperance, in the strictest sense, is laid down as the principle: but the abbat may relax the ordinary rules of quantity and quality (c. 40); more food is ordered whenever there is more work to be done (c. 39); baths and meat are not allowed merely, but enjoined for the sick (c. 36), for the young or aged (c. 37), as well as for guests who may chance to be lodging in the monastery (c. 42); and even wine, forbidden by Eastern Asiatics, is allowed, sparingly, by Benedict, as if in concession to the national propensities imported into Italy by the barbarians, and to the colder climate of Northern Europe (c. 40). Even those minuter rules, in which Benedict evinces his love of order, proportion, and clocklike regularity, and which show that Benedict, like Wesley, wished to direct everything, originate almost always in a wise and tender consideration for human weaknesses. The day is mapped out in its round of duties, so that no unoccupied moments may invite temptation (c. 48), but the hours allotted for work, prayer, or rest, vary with the seasons. Benedict seems to take especial delight in arranging how the Psalter is to be read through, ordering certain Psalms on certain holy days; but he leaves it open to his followers to make a better distribution if they can (cc. 15, 18). The first Psalm is to be recited slowly; but this is to give the brethren time to assemble in their oratory. The monk who serves as cook is, during his week of office, to take his meals before the rest (c. 35); the cellarer, or steward, is to have fixed hours for attending to the wants of the brethren, that there may be no vexation or disappointment (c. 31); a list is to be kept by the abbat of all the tools and dresses belonging to the monastery, lest there may be any confusion (c. 32); the monks are to sleep only ten or twelve in the same dormitory, with curtains between the beds, and under the charge of a dean, for the sake of order and propriety (c. 22); the Historical Books of the Old Testament were not to be read the last thing before going to bed,

as unedifying to weak brethren (c. 42); and, last and least, no monk is to take the knife, which was part of his monastic equipment, with him to bed, lest he should hurt himself in his sleep (c. 22). But it is, above all, in its treatment of weaker brethren (the "infirmi" or "pusillanimi"), that the Rule breathes a mildness, and what Aristotle would call "*ἐπιεικεία*," rare indeed in those days. The abbat is to "love the offender, even while hating the offence;" he is to "beware lest he break the vessel in scouring it;" he is to let "mercy prevail over justice" (c. 64). A whole chapter (c. 43) is devoted to meting out the degrees of correction for monks coming late to chapel or refectory; and, in this unlike Wesley, Benedict expressly discourages the public confession of secret faults, a practice inevitably tending to unreality and irreverence (c. 46), as well as loud and demonstrative private prayer in the chapel (c. 52). There is something peculiarly characteristic of Benedict's gentle and courteous spirit in his oft-repeated cautions against murmuring on the one hand (cc. 31, 40, 41, 53), and, on the other, against anything like scurrility (cc. 43, 49, &c.).

Compared with Eastern Rules, the Benedictine Rule is an easy yoke (Sev. Sulp. *Vit. S. Martini*, i. 7; Cass. *Instit.* i. 11); and this may be attributed partly to the more practical temperament of the West, partly to the exigencies of European climates, partly, too, to the personal character of the lawgiver (cc. 39, 40, 46, &c.). Taking the passage in the Psalms, "Seven times a day will I praise Thee," and another, "At midnight I will rise to give thanks unto Thee," as his mottoes, he portioned out day and night into an almost unceasing round of prayer and praise (c. 16). But whereas his predecessors had ordered the whole of the Psalter to be recited daily, Benedict, though with a sigh of regret for the degeneracy of his age, was content that it should be gone through in the week (c. 18). There is a curious direction, too (c. 20), against lengthy private devotions, especially in chapel after service. In harvest time, or if they were far from home, the monks were to say their devotions in the field, to save the time and trouble of returning to the monastery (c. 50; cf. Mab. *Ann.* iii. 8). Whatever ascetic austerities were introduced at a later date into some of the reformed Benedictine orders, we find no trace at all in the original Rule of those ingenious varieties of self-torture which had been so common in Egypt and Syria. Benedict shows no love of self-mortification for its own sake; and, while prizing it in moderation as a discipline, makes it subservient to other practical purposes. Thus he orders some more suitable occupation to be allotted to such of the brethren as may be incapacitated in any way from hard work out of doors (c. 48). The diet allowed by the Benedictine Rule would have seemed luxurious to the monks of the East (c. 39, &c.).

But the great distinction of Benedict's Rule was the substitution of study for the comparative uselessness of mere manual labour. Not that his monks were to be less laborious; rather they were to spend more time in work; but their work was to be less servile, of the head as well as of the hand, beneficial to future ages, not merely furnishing sustenance for the bodily wants of the

community, or for almsgiving (cc. 38, 48: cf. *Cass. Instit.* x. 23; *Hier. Ep. ad Eustoch.* 18, 22). As if conscious of his innovation Benedict seems to restrict the word "labor," as heretofore, to manual occupations; to these he still devoted the larger part of the day: and his range of literature is a narrow one, specifying by name only the Holy Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers (cc. 9, 48). But, by reserving some portion for study, he implanted the principle, which afterwards bore so glorious fruits in the history of his order, that liberal arts and sciences were to be for them not permitted merely, but sanctioned and encouraged (c. 48). It is a question how far Benedict is indebted for this to Cassiodorus, his contemporary, wrongfully claimed by some zealous Benedictines as one of their order (*Mign. Patrol.* lxi. 483). But the "Vivarium" which Cassiodorus founded in Calabria seems to have been more like an university, or even the intellectual and artistic Court over which Frederick II. presided in that part of Italy during the 13th century, more genial in its tone and wider in its range of studies (*Cassiod. de Instit. Div. Litt.* cc. 28, 30, 31). Probably Benedict and his more secular contemporary were both alike affected by the same impulses, inherited from the dying literature of Imperial Rome.

A monk's day, according to the Rule, was an alternation of work, manual or mental, and prayer, in the words of the Rule of the "opus Dei or divinum officium" and "labor et lectio," with the short intervals necessary for food and rest (cf. *Mab. Ann.* iii. 8; *Fleury, Hist. Ecc.* xxxii. 15 et seq.). In winter the middle of the day, and in summer the morning and evening, were for manual labour; for study the heat of the day in summer, and the dusk and darkness of morning and evening in the short days of winter (cc. 8, 48). After the midday meal in summer, the monk might take his siesta, or a book (c. 48). The seven hours for divine service were those called "canonical;" and the services were—matins (afterwards called lauds) at sunrise (in summer), prime, tierce, sext, nones, vespers, compline, separated each from each by three hours, as well as a midnight service, which was to be held a little before the matins, called in the Rule "nocturnae vigiliae" (c. 16). On Sundays the monk was to rise earlier and have longer "vigiliae" (c. 11), and was to substitute reading for manual work (c. 48). Each service was to include a certain number of Psalms, often selected with especial reference to the time of day, as the third for nocturns, of Canticles, and of lections, or readings from Holy Scripture or the Fathers (c. 8, &c.). On Sundays and holy days all the brethren were to receive the Holy Communion (c. 25). The precise times for the several avocations of the monastic day were to vary with the four seasons, both of the natural and of the Christian year (c. 8, &c.). The work or the book for the time was to be assigned to each at the discretion of the abbat (c. 48). The evening meal was to be taken all the year round before dark (c. 41). As the monk had to rise betimes, so his thoughtful legislator would have him retire early to rest.

Chapters 1-7 in the Rule are on the monastic character generally—obedience, humility, &c.;

8-20 on divine service; 21-30 on deans and the correction of offenders; 31-41 on the cellarer and his department, especially the refectory; 42-52 are chiefly on points relating either to the oratory or to labour: the remaining twenty-one rules hardly admit of classification, being miscellaneous and supplementary to those preceding.

On the whole, the Benedictine Rule, as a Rule for Monks, must be pronounced, by all who view it dispassionately, well worthy of the high praise which it has received, not from monks only, but from statesmen and others. "First and foremost in discretion, and clear in style," is the appropriate comment on it of Gregory the Great (*Dial.* ii. 36). In the 7th century the observance of it was enjoined on all monks, by the Council of Augustodunum (c. 15), and by Lewis the Pious (*Exh. ad Eigil. Abb. Fuld.* ap. Migne, *Praef. Reg.*). It is commonly entitled in councils "the holy Rule" (Migne, *Praef. Reg.*); and by one held in the 9th century it is directly attributed to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (*Conc. Duziac.* ii.). By one writer it is contrasted with previous rules as the teaching of Christ with that of Moses (*Gaufr.-Abb. Vindocin. Sermo de S. B.* ap. Migne, *Praef. Reg.*). It was a favourite alike with Thomas Aquinas, as a manual of morality, and with the politic Cosmo de' Medici, as a manual for rulers (*Alb. Butler, Lives of the Saints*, s. voce; cf. *Guéranger, Enchirid. Bened. Praef.*). Granted the very questionable position, that the life of a monk, with its abdication of social and domestic duties, is laudable, Benedict's conception of that life, in principle and in detail, is almost unexceptionable. His monks are indeed treated throughout as simply children of an older growth: they may not even walk abroad (c. 67); nor, if sent outside the precincts, may they stop anywhere to eat, without the abbat's leave (c. 51); nor may they even receive letters from home (c. 51). The prescribed washing of strangers' feet (c. 53), and the very strict prohibition against a monk having anything, however trifling, of any sort to call his own, are all part of this extension into maturer years of a discipline proper for children. But, if treated as children, the followers of Benedict were at any rate under a wise and sympathising Master; and the school where they were to be trained in humility and obedience was not one of needless and vexatious mortifications. Order, proportion, regularity, these are the characteristics of the Rule; with an especial tenderness for the "weaker brethren." As in all monastic institutions, self-love seems to force its way through all the barriers heaped around it; tinging even the holiest actions with a mercenariness of intention (*Prolog.* &c. &c.). Thus the motive proposed for waiting sedulously on the sick is the reward which may be won by so doing (c. 37). But the Rule appeals also, though less expressly, to higher motives than the fear of punishment or the hope of recompense—to the love of God and of man (e. g. *Prolog.*). It cannot be said of Benedict's Rule, as of solitary asceticism, that self is the circumference as well as the centre of the circle. The relations of the brethren to their father, and to one another, tend, in the Rule, to check that isolation of the heart from human sympathies which is the bane of monasticism. If there is a disregard of the claims of the outer world, at all events some-



thing like the ties of family is duly recognised within the order, hallowing even the trivial details of daily life. The monastery is the "House of God;" and even its commonest utensils are "holy things" (c. 31). Benedict disclaims for man either any merit in keeping the divine law, or any power to do so without help from heaven (*Prolog.*).

In style the Rule is clear and concise; largely interspersed with apposite quotations from the Scriptures, especially the Psalms. But its Latinity is very unclassical, not only in syntax, but in single words (e.g. *odire* for *odisse*, c. 4; *solatium*, for "helper," cc. 31, 35; *typus* for "arrogance" or "circumlocution," c. 31). In this respect the Rule contrasts unfavourably with Cassian's comparatively accurate and polished style. The text may have been corrupted; but there seems to have been a serious deterioration in Latin literature during the 5th century.

With the lapse of time, the right meaning of many passages in the Rule gave rise to violent controversies. Its very brevity and conciseness were themselves the occasion of an uncertainty, frequently enhanced by the changes of meaning which the same word often undergoes in successive periods. Whether such phrases as "Communio" and "Missa" are to be taken in their more technical and ritualistic sense, or merely for "charity" and the "termination of divine service;" whether "excommunicatio" means the greater or the lesser sentence of deprivation (cc. 24, 25); whether "clerici" (c. 62) means deacons only, or priests as well; all these have been questions with commentators and reformers. "Matutini" in the Rule is said to correspond with the service afterwards known as "Laudes;" and "Laudes" in the Rule to mean the three last Psalms, all commencing "Laudate" (Fleury, *Hist. Ecc.* xxxii. 15). "Prior" seems in one place (c. 63), where the younger brethren are ordered to salute the "prioras," to mean merely older, at least in precedence; while in another place (c. 68), which treats of obedience, it seems to mean those in office. There is some ambiguity about the several articles of dress prescribed (c. 55); and still more about the diet. "Mixtum" (c. 38) is supposed by some to mean "wine and water," by others "wine and bread;" and it is a vexed question, whether eggs and fish, birds and fowls, as well as "pulse," are included in the word "pulmentum" (Mart. *Comm. in Reg.* cc. 38, 55; Mab. *Ann.* i. 53, xiii. 2, xiv. 46). The enactment that "even a small part" of the brethren may elect the abbat is variously explained, as meaning either a minority, in certain circumstances, or, more probably, "a majority however small" (*Comm. in Reg.* c. 64); and another provision in the next chapter, that "a council of the brethren" is to take part in electing the prior, is vague both as to the size of the council and the extent of its powers (c. 65). A distinction familiar to Roman Catholic casuists has been drawn by some commentators between the "precepts" and "counsels" in the opening words of the Prologue to the Rule; and, however that may be, the opinion has prevailed that the spirit rather than the letter of the Rule is to be observed, and that it is not strictly obligatory in its lesser details (note by Ed. on Fleury, *Hist. Ecc.* xxxii. 12, Aug. Vindel. 1768: cf. Bern. *de Praec. et Dispens.*, *Patrol.* clxxii.; Petr. Clun. *Epp.* i. 28,

iv. 17, *Patrol.* clxxxix.; Hospin. *de Monachatu*, pp. 132-134). But the hottest dispute has been on the permissibility of secular studies for the brethren. In the 17th century Mabillon and others argued against their Trappist opponents, that, though not mentioned expressly, these studies are implied and involved in the Rule; that as the order in time came to consist more and more largely of students, and as Latin became to them a dead language, instead of being one with which they were habitually familiar, such pursuits became for them an absolute necessity (Mab. *Breve Script. de Mon. Stud. Rat.*; cf. Maitland's *Dark Ages*, 158-171).

The Rule of Benedict soon reigned alone in Europe, absorbing into itself the Rule of Columbanus, which had been dominant in Western Europe (Mab. *Ann.* Praef. i. 13, v. 11). In Italy it was accepted generally, before the close of the century in which Benedict died (Joan. Diac. *Vita Greg. M.* iv. 80). It was probably introduced into Gaul during his lifetime by his disciple Maurus, from whom the famous monastery of St. Maur claims its name; and there it soon made its way, its comparative elasticity prevailing over the rigidity of the rival system. Thus Faremoutier transferred itself from the Columban Rule to that of Benedict (A. Butler, *Lives of the Saints* s. S. Fara). The Council of Aachen in 788 A.D. ordered the Benedictine to be observed, and no other, in the Empire of Karl and his son (*Conc. Aquisgran.*; cf. *Conc. Augustod.* c. 15). It won Germany early in the 9th century (*Conc. Mogunt.* c. 11; cf. Pertz *Legg.* I. 166, c. 11), and Spain in the next century (Mab. *Ann.* Praef. iv. saec.). It is a question at what date it was introduced into England; whether by Benedict Biscop, by Wilfrid (Ling. *Ang.-Sax. Church*, ch. 5), or, as Mabillon and other learned writers have asserted (see in A. Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, under Benedict), by Augustine, importing it from the monastery of S. Andrea on the Caelian hill, under the auspices of Gregory. A lax Rule probably prevailed till the time of Dunstan (see Marsham's Praef. to Dugd. *Monastic. Anglic.*; cf. *Conc. Clovesh.* 747 A.D.). [v. BENEDICTUS, in *Dict. Chr. Biog.*] In the 10th century the Benedictine Rule held almost universal sway in Europe (Pellic. *Polit. Ecc. Chr.* I. iii. 1, § 4), and wherever it penetrated, it was the pioneer not of Christianity only, but of civilization and of all humanizing influences. For their labours in clearing forests and draining swamps, in setting an example of good husbandry generally, as well as for having fostered what little there was of learning and refinement in that troublous and dreary period, a debt of gratitude is due to them, which cannot easily be overrated.

For more than three centuries after its institution one Rule sufficed for the Benedictine order generally. Between the 9th and 15th centuries, as the order extended itself more widely, and as reformers, ardent against abuses, arose here and there in its ranks, various "constitutions" were engrafted on the original Rule. For so early as in the 8th century there were symptoms of decay. The rich endowments granted by kings and nobles had brought with them, as was inevitable, the seeds of luxury and self-indulgence, and the very popularity of the "religious" life often gave occasion to unreality



in professing it. Thus, as for instance in England, when it had become the fashion for kings and queens to quit their palaces for a monastery, and to lavish their treasures on it (Bed. *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 19, 23, 24; Ling. *A.-S. C.* i. 211, 214), this fatal munificence served to attract, in the course of years, oppressive taxes, or spoliation of a more downright sort (Bonif. *Ep. ad Cudbert.* c. 11, ap. Bed. *Hist. Ecc.* p. 353, Hussey). Often too the immunity (Pertz, *Legg.* i. 223) and comparative security of the monastic life tempted a noble to assume the name, without the reality, of abbat; in order to escape legal obligations he would get his "folkland" converted into "bocland" on pretence of conveying it to the service of God, and there would live with his family and dependants, an abbat in name and in tonsure, but in nothing more (Bede, *Ep. ad Egb.* ap. *Hist. Ecc.*; Ling. *A.-S. C.* i. 226-7, 230, 407, 413). The need of reformation soon called into existence reformers. Clugni, in the 10th century, was the first separate congregation, with a separate Rule of its own (Mab. *Praef. Ann.*; Thomass. *Vet. et Nova Discipl.* I. iii. 21, 25). The four centuries which followed witnessed the birth of more than twenty "Reformed Orders," all professing to hold the original Rule of Benedict in its pristine purity and integrity, but each superadding its own special exposition of the Rule as binding on its members (Hospin. *de Mon.* p. 132). Monte Casino, the head-quarters at first, if not the birthplace, of the order, retained its supremacy, which, according to some authorities, the founder intended for it (v. note on Fleury, *Hist. Ecc.* xxxiii. 12), for some three centuries; its primacy has never been denied. It was sacked by the Lombards in 591 A.D. (Clint. *Fast. Rom.*), or 580 A.D. (Fleury, *Hist. Ecc.* xxxiii. 10), and the fugitives who escaped founded the Lateran Monastery at Rome (Paul. D. *Hist. Lomb.* iv. 18; cf. Mab. *Ann.* vii.). In the beginning of the 8th century it rose again from its ruins, and received within its walls Carloman, weary of the cares of empire. But Odo, the founder of Clugni, became "General" of his own "congregation," and his example has been followed by others (Mab. *Ann.* i. 19).

Among the most famous Benedictine abbeys (the term is a specialty of the order) were, besides those already mentioned, Bamberg, Fontevraud, Fulda, Sta. Giustina at Padua, including in its jurisdiction Sta. Scholastica (A. Butler, *Lives of Saints*; see St. Bened.), Grotta Ferrata, Marmoutier, S. Paolo fuori near Rome, S. Severino at Naples, &c., and in England, St. Albans, Glastonbury, Malmesbury, &c., with many of our Cathedrals. The preference of the old Benedictines for mountainous sites is proverbial:

"Bernardus valles, colles Benedictus amabat."

It would be endless to enumerate the distinguished members of the order. The list of those belonging to Monte Casino alone, during its first six centuries, fills 25 folio pages of Fabricius' *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, with a brief notice of each (Petr. Diac. *De Vir. Ill. Casin.*; Trithemius, the learned abbat of Spanheim, counts on the roll of the order, in the beginning of the 16th century, 18 popes (Guéranger, A.D. 1862, says "30," *Enchirid. Bened.* Praef.), more than 200 cardinals, 1600 archbishops, about 4000 bishops, and, almost incredible as it sounds

15,700 famous abbats, with an equal number of canonized saints! (v. Fabric. *Bibl. Ecc.* s. v.: cf. Mab. *AA.* Praef. vi.; Ziegelbauer u. Legipont; *Hist. Lit. O. S. B.*). St. Paul is the Patron Saint of the Order.

The original copy of the Rule is said to have been burnt at Teano, near Monte Casino, towards the close of the 9th century (Leo Marsic. ap. Mab. *Ann.* iii. 263). Sigebertus Gemblacensis, in the 12th century, states that it was first made public by Simplicius, third abbat of Monte Casino (Fabric. *Bibl. Ecc.* s. v. Bened.). Hospinian gives no authority for his counter-statement, that many attribute it to Gregory the Great (*De Monach.* p. 116). Mabillon assumes it to have been made by Benedict himself at Monte Casino about 528 A.D. (*Ann.* iii. 8; A. Butler, *Lives of Saints*, see St. Bened.). Wion speaks of more than a hundred editions of the Rule in 1554 A.D. (*Lign. Vit.* i. 7). It is said to have been translated into English by Dunstan (Mign. *Praef. Reg. S. Bened.*).

The best commentaries on it are those of Martene and Calmet. That of Mége is considered lax by stricter Benedictines. The commentaries of Smaragdus, probably abbat of St. Michael's, not Smaragdus Ardo, and of Hildebrandus, a French Benedictine in the 8th century, are commended by Martène, in his preface to the Rule (Mign. *Patrol.* lxvi.); also that of Bernardus, a monk of Lerins, afterwards abbat of Monte Casino in the 13th century, and one, incomplete, by Trithemius lately mentioned. But especially he praises those of Menard, a monk of St. Denys, who afterwards placed himself under the stricter rule of St. Maur; and of Haeften, a Benedictine prior, the author of the prolix *Disquisitiones Monasticae*, in twelve books, epitomized by Stengel or Stengelius. Mabillon seems to have contemplated a Commentary on the Rule, but from want of time to have resigned the task to Martène (*Praef. Reg. S. B.* ap. Mign. *Patrol.* lxvi.; cf. Not. cc. 2, 9). The Rule was harmonized with other monastic rules by Benedictus Anianensis. [See *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.* s. v.]

The following are important works on the Benedictine Rule and Order:

Petr. Diac. *Casin. de Vir. Illustr. Casin.* in Fabric. *Bibl. Ecc.* and *de Ortu et Obit. Just. Casin.* in Maii *Scr. Vet. Nov. Coll.* and *Prolog.* in Vit. S. Placidi, in Martene et Durand, *Ampliss. Coll.*; Leonis Marsic. et Petr. Diac. *Chronic. Casin.* "ed. W. Wattenbach in *Monum. German.*" (Mign. *Patrol.* s. v.); *Reg. S. Bened. C. Comment.* Joan. de Turre Crematâ et Smaragdi Abb.; item *IV. Libri de Vir. Ill. O. S. B.* Joan. Trithemii, Col. Agr. 1575, fol.; Arnold. Wion, *Lignum Vitae*, Venet. 1595; Mége, *Commentaire sur la Règle de St. Benoît*, Jos. Mége (de St. Maur) Paris, 1687, and *Vie de St. Benoît avec une Histoire de son Ordre*, Paris, 1690; Bulteau, *Histoire de l'Ordre de St. Benoît*, Paris, 1691; Menard, *Martyrolog. O. S. B.* Par. 1629. *La Règle de St. Benoît expliquée* par M. de Rancé, Abbé de la Trappe, Paris, 1690; Martene, *de Ant. Monach. Rit.* Lugd. 1690, and *Comment. in Reg. S. B.* Paris, 1690; Mabillonii *Annales O. S. B.* Paris, 1703-39; Dacherii et Mabillonii *AA. SS. O. S. B.* Paris, 1668-1701; Mabillonii *Brev. Scriptum de Monast. Stud. Ratione* in *Bibl. Ascet.* Pezii; Berthelet, *Traité historique et morale sur l'Abstinence*, 1726, Paris, 1731; Calmet, *Comment. Hist. et Morale sur la Règle de S. B.* Par. 1734

Holstenni *Codes Regular. Monast. et Canonic.* a R. P. Mariano Brockie illustratus, &c., Aug. Vindel. 1759; *Hist. Lit. O. S. B.*, Aug. Vind. 1754; Ziegellauer u. Legipont. *Martyrologium des Benedikt. Ordens*, Augsburg, 1855; *St. Benoît et ses Ordres religieux*, Lille, 1855; Guéranger, *Enchiridion Benedictinum*, Andegav. 1862. [I. G. S.]

**BENEDICTION**, the spousal or nuptial. Among the Jews special benedictions were in use both for betrothal and actual marriage, the latter constituted, as with the Romans, by a *deductio* or procession accompanying the bride; which however with the Romans had for its goal the house of the husband, with the Jews the nuptial bed itself. A passage in Tobit (vii. 13, 14) indicates the close connexion of the blessing with what we should term the marriage settlement. Forms of both benedictions will be found in Selden's *Uxor Hebraica*, bk. ii., cc. vii., xii. But Maimonides expressly observes (*Uxor. Ebr.* bk. ii. c. 13) that not the blessing of the betrothed makes marriage, but the leading of the bride to the nuptial bed.

Certain heathen marriages, e.g. the Roman *confarreatio*, being also accompanied with a benediction, it was but natural that the same custom should prevail in reference to Christian ones. A good deal, however, of confusion seems to have arisen on the subject, especially through not distinguishing the legal and spiritual aspects of the benediction. It cannot be too often repeated that for many centuries both betrothal and marriage were in the eyes of the Church primarily civil contracts, valid although celebrated according to heathen rites, if in conformity with the civil law, subject only to certain peculiar Christian restrictions. It is not meant, however, by these expressions that such contracts were looked on as merely "secular," as many would term them now, or "profane," as the middle ages termed them. For Our Lord and His Apostles, human society itself was a sacred thing: the State, which embodied it for all purposes of civil life, was sacred (Rom. xiii., 1, 4, 6); marriage above all, the very keystone of all human society, had a primordial sacredness (Matt. xiv. 4), entirely transcending all enactments of municipal or ceremonial law.

But this view in nowise prevented the Church from claiming spiritual control over such contracts as between the faithful, from recognizing and sealing their unions by its benediction, or even from looking upon such unions with disfavour when this was not solicited. Thus the 5th chapter of the Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp (admitted by Dr. Cureton as genuine into his 'Corpus Ignatianum') says: "It is meet that men and women who are marrying should unite with the approval of the bishop, that the marriage be according to the law and not according to lust." So Tertullian (writing about A.D. 200), in his work *De Pudicitia*, speaks of "secret unions, that is, not first declared before the church" (non prius apud ecclesiam professae) as running the risk of being deemed nigh to adultery and fornication. Another passage of his, (*Ad Uxor.* c. 8), is generally quoted as one of the first distinct authorities in favour of the ecclesiastical benediction on marriage. According to the ordinary reading, it runs thus: "How should we be sufficient to set forth the bliss of that marriage which the Church brings about (cuncti-

CHRIST. ANT.

liat), and the oblation confirms, and the benediction seals, angels proclaim, the Father ratifies?" It must, however, be observed that, if the above reading be correct, the substitution of the benediction for the execution of the *tabulae nuptiales*, which the words "et obsignat benedictio" imply, antedates by many centuries the rule of the Church in the matter. It is remarkable, too, as pointed out by Augusti, that one text, instead of the words "et obsignat benedictio, angeli renuntiant," has simply "et obsignatum angeli renuntiant," 'the angels proclaim when sealed,'—a reading which brings back the passage into accordance with the law and practice of the time, but at the expense of the decisive word "benedictio" itself.\* That such benedictions were pronounced, however, there can be no reason to doubt. Thus Ambrose, writing against mixed marriages, says: "For since marriage itself should be sanctified by the priestly veil (velamine sacerdotali) and by benediction, how can that be called a marriage where there is no agreement of faith?" (Bk. ix. *Ep.* 70). But, as Selden has observed, the like benedictions were often claimed on behalf of many other kinds of contract besides that of marriage,—a sale for instance. The total absence from the Apostolical Constitutions of any liturgical *formulae* relating to marriage, and of any notice of church usages in respect to it, seems a conclusive proof that nothing of the kind formed part of the ritual of the early church during the 3 or 4 centuries (or even more) over which the collection of the materials for the compilation in question probably extended.

There is however extant, under dates ranging as far back as the former half of the 2nd century, a whole series of authorities enforcing the necessity of the ecclesiastical benediction, upon which the Church of Rome has unhesitatingly built its practice as to the ceremonial validity of the rite, and which have been quoted without comment by Bingham and other Protestant writers. But as these are, for the most part, spurious documents of the forged Decretal class, and are only so far important as they shew the points for which it was sought to claim the sanction of an earlier period, and thus to establish the jurisdiction of the clergy in matters connected with marriage, they may be passed over.

Turning to the Eastern Church, we find that Chrysostom in his voluminous works never indicates the existence of a marriage liturgy, or the indispensableness of sacerdotal benediction. Two letters of Gregory Nazianzen show clearly that such benediction was looked upon rather as a seemly accompaniment to Christian marriage than as a condition of it, since the writer, in that graceful tender style of which he is a master, professes to give his by letter. One is to Procopius (*Ep.* 57, otherwise 44), on the marriage of "his golden Olympias." "I join to each other," he writes, "the right hands of the young people, and both to that of God. For it is fitting that like many other good things, so should marriage take place in the best way in all respects, and according to our common prayers." However visible may be

\* It should not be overlooked that the same Tertullian, in his treatise on Idolatry (c. 16), expressly admits the purity of betrothal and marriage in themselves, even when celebrated amongst heathens, and therefore the lawfulness of a Christian's presence at both. See post, art. BETROTHAL.

here the habitual form of Christian marriage, nothing can be more obvious than that the interference of the Church is not treated as indispensable. Another letter to Eusebius (171) is still more conclusive, as shewing that whilst Gregory made it a rule, whenever present at a wedding, to interpose the prayers of the church, the actual rites of marriage he left to be performed by others, and considered that a sufficient consecration of them could be given from afar, since prayers "are not bounded by space."

We must now however notice a singular document, which is included by Labbé and Mansi among those of the 4th century, and appended by them to the Acts of the Nicene Council, as being attributed to the Nicene Fathers by a Vatican codex. It is termed "*Sanctiones et decreta alia ex quatuor regum*"—*quaere*, *regulorum?*—"ad Constantinum libris decerpta" (L. and M., *Councils*, vol. ii. p. 1029 and foll.), and is written in Latin, though evidently representing the practice of the Greek Church. The 2nd chapter of these 'Sanctions and Decrees' forbids marriage with a person's nuptial paranympths, with whom "the benediction of the crowns" is received. Benedictions are mentioned in like manner in c. 6 and 7, but it is clear that the ceremony of the Greek ritual known as the benediction of the crowns, and not the Latin benediction of the marriage itself, is what the above passages refer to. But when we attempt to fix a date for the work which contains them, we shall be compelled to carry this to the second half of the 6th century at earliest. For it is a remarkable fact that Justinian's legislation, minutely occupied as it is with Church matters, never once refers to the ecclesiastical benediction of marriage: it requires a will to see it, as some have done, in the mere expression "*vota nuptialia*;" and this although it will be seen (CONTRACT of marriage) that a kind of church-registration of marriages was provided for.

It is however by no means improbable that between the 6th and 7th centuries the regular practice of an ecclesiastical benediction upon marriage, and the Greek ritual of marriage itself, became established. And it is a well-known Greek name which now carries us back to the next Western authority on the subject,—that of the canons of a Council, held in England towards the end of the 7th century, under Archbishop Theodore, which enact that "in a first marriage the priest should perform the mass and bless both" parties (c. 59); implying, it would seem, the practice set forth by the 'Sanctions and Decrees,' of confining the blessing to the as yet unmarried party only, where the other has been married already.

In the Carolingian era, finally—to which belong the head springs of the great stream of church forgeries,—forgeries which, amongst other authorities, have so dealt with the Capitularies themselves that it is frequently impossible to determine the precise age of a given text—the priestly benediction entered into the civil law as an essential requisite of marriage; and the various spurious authorities from the annals of the Western Church above commented on were apparently invented for the purpose of carrying back to a remote period the ecclesiastical recognition of its necessity. And it may be ob-

served that the mention of it almost invariably occurs in connexion with the subject of consanguinity,—another great source of clerical influence and income in its relation to marriage, which has been even more prolific in suggestions of pious fraud. By the 35th article of the first Capitulary of 802, none are to be married before inquiry be made as to whether they are related; "and then let them be united with a benediction." (Comp. also vi. 130, vii. 179, viii. 408.) The 473rd article (vii. 473), "on lawful marriage" is almost exactly identical in its wording with the supposed letter of Pope Evaristus, and may, it is submitted, be fairly deemed its original.

We may briefly refer to certain canons of the patriarch Nicephorus, recorded by Cotelierius, and perhaps enacted at the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 814, which indicate that at this period at least the benediction was by the Church decreed to constitute the marriage. If any having a concubine would neither leave her nor allow her to receive the benediction, and have her with the sacramental rite, his offerings were not to be received (can. xxxiv.). And lastly, the well-known document known as the reply of Pope Nicolas to the Bulgarians, though belonging only to the latter half of the 9th century, preserves to us probably the practice of the Roman Church on this subject from an earlier period. It indicates evidently a different ceremonial from that of the Greek Church, and although dwelling on the formalities of betrothal, speaks of no blessing but the nuptial one.

To sum up the conclusions of this inquiry: 1st. There never was a period when the Christian Church did not rejoice to sanction the nuptial rite by its benedictions, and did not exhort the faithful to obtain them for their unions. 2nd. But having a profound faith in the primordial sanctity of marriage in itself, many centuries elapsed before the pronouncing of such a benediction was held essential to the validity of marriage, when duly contracted according to the municipal law, and not contrary to the special ethical rules of the Church in reference to marriage. 3rd. Hence the total absence of marriage liturgies from the early Christian rituals, extending to about the beginning of the 7th century; the genuineness of the one in the Gelasian Missal (end of the 5th century) being confessedly impugned by the absence of any in the Gregorian, a century later. 4th. It may however be admitted that by the end of the 7th century the priestly benediction of marriage had probably become the rule in both great branches (divisions not yet) of the Church; and in the course of the 8th and 9th centuries it hardened into a legal institution within the domains of the great usurpers of the West, the Carolingians, being now largely supported by supposititious church authorities, carried back as far as the beginning of the 2nd century. 5th. It is also possible that about this period a practice of sacerdotally blessing betrothals likewise grew up, and promising to open a new source of income to the clergy and above all to the Roman pontiffs, was in like manner sought to be maintained by spurious authorities; but the date of this cannot be fixed earlier than A.D. 860, since Pope Nicolas, in his reply to the Bulgarians, clearly, speaks only of the nuptial benediction. [J. M. L.]



BENEDICTIONS. (*Benedictio, εὐλογία.*)

I. *Definition, &c.*—Like many other points of ritual, the practice of benediction passed from the Jewish to the Christian Church. In the infancy of the former, under Aaron, we discover the existence of the blessing of the congregation by the priest after the morning and the evening sacrifice (Lev. ix. 22); and later notices may be seen in 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, Ecclus. xxxvi. 17, xlv. 15, l. 20. The actual form is prescribed in Num. vi. 22 sqq.; cf. Ps. lxxvii. 1.

The benediction, ordinarily pronounced by priests (as *e.g.* in the case of Zacharias, for whose blessing the people waited, Luke i. 21), would on occasions of special solemnity be reserved for the high priest. Even the king, as the viceroy of the Most High, might give the blessing (cf. 2 Sam. vi. 18, 1 Kings viii. 55, 1 Chron. xvi. 2). It would appear that Levites had ordinarily, though not invariably, the power of giving the blessing. Cf. perh. 2 Chron. xxx. 27.

The actual formula referred to above does not occur in the New Testament, though our Lord is spoken of as blessing little children and His disciples (Mark x. 16, Luke xxiv. 50), besides the blessing on the occasion of the institution of the Eucharist (Matt. xxvi. 26). Still, the general tenor and form of the blessing, must have been similar, and the familiar "peace" of the benediction is probably a relic of the old Aaronitic form.

Before proceeding to consider the various occasions of benediction in the Christian Church, attention may be called to the strict definition of the term, in contradistinction from the allied expressions, *consecration, dedication*, although the distinction is not unfrequently lost sight of. *Benediction*, then, may be defined to be a certain holy action which, combined with prayer, seeks for God's grace for persons, and, in a lower degree, a blessing upon things, with a view whether to their efficiency or safety. We may add St. Ambrose's definition (*De Benedictionibus Patriarcharum*, c. 2), "*Benedictio est sanctificationis et gratiarum votiva collatio.*" On this point the following extracts may be cited from Gillebert (bishop of Limerick in the 12th century), *De Usu Ecclesiastico*, in Du Cange's *Glossary*, s. vv. "*Consecrare,*" "*Benedictio.*" "*Dedicat pontifex atrium, templum, altare, tabulam altaris. Dedicare enim est locum Deo offerre, benedicere et sanctificare. Consecrat autem episcopus utensilia ecclesiae, quae fere omnibus sacerdotibus sunt communia, vestimenta videlicet sacerdotalia et pontificalia, altaris velamina, calicem, patenam et corporalia et vasculum Eucharistiae, chrisma, oleum, vas chrismale, thus et thuribulum, baptisterium, arcam vel scrinium reliquiarum, ciborium, id est altaris umbraculum, crucem, tintinnabulum et ferrum judiciale. Ea enim tantum consecrat quae a communi usu in cultum divinum separantur.*" . . . "*Benedicere autem dico praesulem ea quae non sunt utensilia ecclesiae, consecrare vero ipsa utensilia. Benedicit ergo pontifex reginam, et virginem cum velatur, et quemlibet fidelem benedici postulantem et totum populum ante pacem.*" These benedictions may not be conferred by a priest in the presence of a bishop. Gillebert had previously said, "*Benedicere potest praesente episcopo aquam et sal in Dominicis sacerdos et prandium et sponsum et aquam judicii vel panem et caetera. In absentia*

vero episcopi potest benedicere coronam clerici et velum viduae, novos fructus, candelas in Purificatione S. Mariae, cineres in capite jejunii, ramos in Dominica Palmarum, et peregrinatos et lecturum Evangelium, et populum cum dimittitur, aquam benedictam aspergit ad benedicendas novas domos et caetera nova."

II. *Minister of Benediction.*—It will be obvious from the nature of the case, that a benediction is imparted by a superior to an inferior (cf. Heb. vii. 7, where this is explicitly stated). Hence it is laid down in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 28) that a bishop may bestow the blessing, and receive it from other bishops, but not from priests; so too a priest may bless his fellow-priests and receive the blessing from them or from a bishop; the deacon merely receives and cannot impart the blessing. Thus if a bishop be present, to him does the *Benedictio super plebem* appertain, and only in the absence of a bishop, unless special authority be given, is it permitted to the priest, whose blessing, however, is not held as of the same solemn import as that of the bishop.

The ancient Sacramentaries do not distinguish between Episcopal and Sacerdotal blessings; while in later times a minutely developed system has been formed, as may be seen, for example, from the extracts from Gillebert given above. To enter, however, at any length into these accretions is foreign to our present scope. It will suffice to allude to one or two general points. Here will appertain the division of Benedictions into *solemnes* and *communes, magnae* and *parvae*, and the like, although these distinctions are by no means uniformly explained. The *benedictio solennis* appears to belong strictly to the bishop, and, in his absence, to the priest acting as his representative: other benedictions, it has been seen, the priest may confer in the presence of the bishop. In no case, however, can they be imparted by a deacon or layman (cf. *Apostolic Constitutions*, viii. 48, iii. 10).

The distinction between the *b. parva* and the *b. magna* is variously explained: by some they are held to be the blessings conferred by priest and bishop respectively; by others, that the former implies a private benediction, the latter a public and solemn one (cf. Cotelier's note, *Patres Apost.* i. 284. ed. 1698).

Here may be added a remark as to special powers of blessing possessed by abbots. Their pre-eminence above priests in general consists in a superiority of jurisdiction, not in a higher order of consecration. From the 8th century, however, abbots who were priests have possessed sundry episcopal rights both of benediction within the limits of their own cloisters and even of several lower forms of consecration, the latter of which indeed was specially allowed by the second General Council of Nicea, A.D. 787, can. 14 (Labbe and Cossart, *Concilia* vii. 909). This example seems to have been further acted on, for in the time of Charlemagne we find abbesses assuming to themselves the right of conferring benedictions even upon men, with laying on of hands and the sign of the cross, although this was distinctly prohibited. (Baluzius, *Capitularia Reg. Franc.* [anno 789] i. 238, ed. Paris, 1677.)

III. *Objects of Benediction.*—It will be readily seen that Benedictions may be divided into Liturgical and non-Liturgical, that is, into such as

are in immediate connection with various holy offices, and those which may be viewed as independent offices. Those of the former class specially regard persons, those of the latter may regard either persons or things. We shall touch briefly on each class of objects separately.

(A.) *Benedictions of Persons*.—Here may be reckoned in the first place all Liturgical blessings, whether (a) *general*, the blessing communicated to the whole congregation in the dismissal-formula (ἀπόλυσις), as *Dominus vobiscum*, *pax vobiscum*, &c., in the ordinary services of the Church, as those of the Canonical Hours, of which the Benediction is an essential element in both Eastern and Western ritual, varying however in the former according to the day of the week: or —(β) *special*, as those at the Eucharist, Baptism, Ordination, Marriage, Penance, Extreme Unction, Burial. We shall briefly comment here on the Benedictions entering with the first of these offices, for the others reference may be made to the several articles on these rites.

The old Latin Sacramentaries agree in placing a Benediction in the Mass after the Lord's Prayer and before the Communion, a custom which, in the Romish ritual, appears to have been introduced from the Gallican and Mozarabic Liturgies (Daniel, *Cod. Liturg.* i. 141). Up to this point the congregation was prohibited from leaving, as e.g. by the Council of Agde (506 A.D.) and the First and Third Councils of Orleans (511 and 538 A.D.). "Missas die Dominico a saecularibus totas teneri speciali ordinatione praecipimus, ita ut ante benedictionem sacerdotis populus egredi non praesumat." (*Conc. Agath. can. 47*; Labbé, iv. 1391.) Menard (*Greg. Sacram.* p. 297; but cf. Mabillon, *De Liturgia Gallicana*, i. 4, § 13, 14) refers this to the benediction at the end of the Mass. "Populus non ante discedat quam Missae solennitas compleatur, et ubi episcopus fuerit, benedictionem accipiat sacerdotis." (*Conc. Aurel. I. can. 26*; Labbé, iv. 1408. Sirmond remarks that the edd. have no MS. authority for prefixing a negative to *fuerit*, and that the error is apparently due to its not being perceived that *episcopus* and *sacerdos* are used synonymously.) "De Missis nullus laicorum ante discedat quam Dominica dicatur oratio; et si episcopus praesens fuerit ejus benedictio expectetur." (*Conc. Aur. III. can. 29*; Labbé, v. 302.) The Mass in one sense was now over, and thus those who did not communicate might leave. (Cf. e.g. Greg. Tur., *De Miraculis S. Martini*, ii. 47: "Cumque expletis Missis populus coepisset sacrosanctum corpus Redemptoris accipere.") We may further cite the injunction laid down by the Fourth Council of Toledo (633 A.D.), which, after finding fault with those priests who "post dictam orationem Dominicam statim communicant et postea benedictionem in populo dant," proceeds "post or. Dom. et conjunctionem panis et calicis benedictio in populum sequatur, et tum demum corporis et sanguinis Domini sacramentum sumatur" (can. 18; Labbé, v. 1711). This may be further illustrated by a remark of Caesarius of Arles, to the effect that he who wishes "Missas ad integrum cum lucro animae suae celebrare" must remain in the church "usquequo or. Dom. dicatur et benedictio populo detur." (*Serm.* 281, § 2; Migne, xxxix. 2277.) This benediction, which is properly the prerogative of the bishop,

is uttered generally in three, sometimes however in four and even five or more divisions, at the end of each of which is responded, *Amen*.

The following is the manner in which this Benediction is ordinarily introduced. The deacon, if one be present, having called with a loud voice, *Humiliate vos benedictioni* (cf. Caesarius, *Serm.* 286, § 7), the imparter of the blessing follows with *Dominus sit semper vobiscum*, to which is responded *Et cum spiritu tuo*; then follows the benediction. As showing the nature of this, we subjoin the benediction for the festival of St. Stephen, from three old Latin Liturgies, the Gallican, the Gregorian, and the Mozarabic respectively (Migne, lxxii. 232; lxxviii. 33; lxxxv. 199). "Deus, qui tuos martyres ita vinxisti caritate ut pro te etiam mori cuperent, ne perirent, *Amen*; et beatum Stephanum in confessione ita succendisti fide, ut imbrem lapidum non timeret, *Amen*. Exaudi precem familiae tuae amatoris inter festa plaudentem, *Amen*. Accedat ad te vox illa intercedens pro populo, pro inimicis quae orabat in ipso martyrio, *Amen*. Ut se obtinente et te remunerante, perveniat illuc plebs adquaesita per gratiam, ubi te, caelie apertis, ipse vidit in gloriam, *Amen*. Quod Ipse praestare digneris, qui cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto vivis et regnas in saecula saeculorum." "Deus qui beatum Stephanum Protomartyrem coronavit, et confessione fidei et agone martyrii mentes vestras circumdet, et in praesenti saeculo corona justitiae, et in futuro perducatur vos ad coronam gloriae, *Amen*. Illius obtentu tribuat vobis Dei et proximi charitate semper exuberare, qui hanc studuit etiam inter lapidantium impetus obtinere, *Amen*. Quo ejus exemplo roborati, et intercessione muniti, ab eo quem ille a dextris Dei vidit stantem, mereamini benedici, *Amen*. Quod Ipse . . ." "Christus Dei Filius, pro cujus nomine Stephanus martyr lapidatus est innocens, contra incursantium daemonum ictus vos efficiat fortiores, *Amen*. Quique eum pro inimicis orantem consummato martyrio provexit ad caelum, conferat in vobis ut sine confusione ad eum veniatis post transitum, *Amen*. Ut illic laetatura post istud saeculum accedat anima vestra, quo praedictus martyr spiritum suum suscipi exorabat, *Amen*."

Besides the above, there was here also a short benediction at the end of the service, such as "Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum," or the two following taken from Saxon offices, "Benedictio Dei Patris Omnipotentis et Filii et Spiritus Sancti maneat semper vobiscum." "B. Dei Patris et Fil. et S. S. et pax Domini sit semper vobiscum." (Palmer, *Orig. Lit.* iv. § 24.)

By way of illustration of this last we may cite Amalarius (*De Eccl. Off.* iii. 36), "Hunc morem tenet sacerdos, ut post omnia Sacramenta consummata benedicat populo;" and Rabanus Maurus (*De Inst. Cleric.* i. 33), "Post communionem ergo, et post ejusdem nominis canticum, data Benedictione a sacerdote ad plebem, diaconus praedicat Missae officium esse peractum, dans licentiam abeundi."

In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (lib. viii.), it is ordained that before the Missa Fidelium a solemn dismissal-blessing should be pronounced over catechumens, energumens, and penitents (cc. 6-8). The solemn blessing over the congregation is to be found later (c. 15) after the communion, the deacon having first uttered the



usual form, Τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ κλίνατε καὶ εὐλογεῖσθε.

The blessings entering into Eastern liturgies are frequent; and we find them at various points of the service introduced by the formula εὐλόγησον δέσποτα. It has been remarked as in some degree significant of the characters of the two great divisions of Christendom that when such a request as the above has been made by the deacon to the priest, in the Western Church the latter proceeds to invoke God's blessing on the congregation and himself, in the Eastern Church he answers it as a rule by an ascription of praise to God. Thus at the beginning of the *Prothesis* (or introductory part of the Eucharistic Service) in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, the deacon's request to bless is answered by εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν πάντοτε νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν. (Daniel, iv. 329, and often.) Or again, we may cite the form as used at the beginning of the proanaphoral part of the Liturgy (i.e., the continuation of the service up to the *Sursum corda*) εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, κ.τ.λ. (ib. 340).

The long benediction we have spoken of as occurring in Latin liturgies after the Lord's Prayer, is not found in the Eastern ritual, at the corresponding part of which occurs what is known as the "Prayer of Inclination," answering in character to the "prayer of humble access" of our own church. (Neale, *Holy Eastern Church*, Intro. p. 515.)

A further enumeration of the benedictions of Greek liturgies appertains rather to a description of the Eastern Eucharistic offices; it may, however, be mentioned that in addition to the final dismissal-blessing, universal here as in the Latin ritual, some of the Eastern liturgies (as those of St. Mark and the Coptic so-called liturgy of St. Basil) give a long benediction after the post-communion prayers of thanksgiving (see e.g. Neale, ib. pp. 688, 694); also the Nestorian liturgy of Theodore the interpreter closes with a similar benediction (Daniel, iv. 193). The above are too long for quotation here, but we may cite as an example of a Greek benediction the final blessing from the liturgy of St. Mark (Daniel, iv. 170): εὐλογεῖτω ὁ Θεὸς ὁ εὐλογῶν καὶ ἁγιάζων καὶ σκέπων καὶ διατηρῶν πάντας ὑμᾶς διὰ τῆς μεθέξεως τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ μυστηρίων, ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. It may be mentioned as a curious peculiarity that in the Constantinopolitan rite the priest does not give the final blessing till he has disrobed (Daniel, iv. 372).

At the end of the Ethiopic liturgy is a prayer of the people, of the nature of a benediction, spoken after the blessing of the bishop or priest has been pronounced, preluded too by the call of the deacon to kneel: "May the Lord bless us His servants . . ."

Besides the above, there was another solemn benediction, the special prerogative of the bishop, the *b. matutinalis et vespertinalis*, said, as its name implies, at the end of matins and vespers. For this we may again refer to the Council of Agde (can. 30), "Plebs collecta oratione ad vespem ab episcopo cum benedictione dimittatur." (Labbé, iv. 1388; cf. also Conc. Barcell. [540 A.D.] can. 2; ib. v. 378.)

Of non-liturgical blessings appertaining to per-

sons, we may briefly speak here of the general blessing, properly though not exclusively the episcopal prerogative, as may be seen from e.g. Basil, *Ep.* 199, § 27 [iv. 724, ed. Migne], and Athanasius, *Vita S. Anton.* c. 67. It would seem that, especially on the entrance of a bishop into a place, his blessing was reverently besought by the people. Cf. Chrys. *Hom. Encom. in Mel.* § 2; Aug. *Ep.* 33, § 5 [ii. 131, ed. Migne]; and Greg. Nyss. *Vita Macrinae* [iii. 976, Migne]. This blessing was eagerly sought for even by princes, as by Clodoveus from Remigius, or by the Empress Eudoxia from the Bishop Porphyrius (*Acta Sanctorum*, i. 154 Oct.; iii. 653 Feb.). This may be further illustrated by a statement of Philostorgius (see Valesius' note on Theodoret iv. 5) to the effect that when all the other bishops went to pay homage to Eusebia, wife of the Emperor Constans, Leontius, Bishop of Tripoli, refused to do so save on the condition that the empress should rise at his approach, and with bowed head ask his blessing. It was allowed by the Council of Epao [517 A.D.] for people of rank (*cives superiorum natalium*) to invite the bishop to themselves to receive his blessing at Christmas and Easter.

(B.) *Benedictions of things.* Before proceeding to enumerate some of the more striking cases of benedictions of things, we may once more call attention to the distinction already dwelt on between *benediction* and the stronger term *consecration*, in that in the one regard is had but to the bestowal of certain grace or efficacy, whereas in the other, a thing is not only destined for a holy use, but is viewed as changed into a holy thing. Augusti (*Denkwürdigk.* x. 192) brings out this distinction by a comparison of the phrases *panis benedictus* and *panis consecratus*; and so the Greek Church recognizes the difference between εὐλογία on the one hand and ἁγιασμός or καθιέρωσις on the other. Similar is the distinction between *benedictiones invocativae* and *b. constitutivae, sacramentivae, destinativae*, the names of which show that the one invoke God's grace, the other dedicate permanently to His service.

We shall now enumerate some of the more frequent instances of special benedictions of things, for detailed information respecting which reference may be made to the separate articles. (1) *B. fontis*, the blessing of the baptismal water, &c. [BAPTISM]. (2) *b. aquae lustralis* [HOLY WATER]. (3) *b. panis et vini*, which substances when blessed bore the name of the saint on whose festival the benediction took place, as St. John's wine, St. Mark's bread, &c. (4) *b. salis* [SALT], whether for admixture with holy water or otherwise. (5) *b. lactis et mellis* [MILK AND HONEY]. (6) *b. olei*, whether for the catechumens at baptism or confirmation, or for the Chrisma, or for the sick (εὐχέλαιον) [CHRISM; OIL]. (7) *b. incensi*. (8) *b. cereorum*, as for the special feast of Candlemas Day, Feb. 2. (9) *b. cinerum*, of Ash Wednesday [LENT]. (10) *b. palmarum*, of Palm Sunday processions. (11) *b. paschales*, whether of Easter eggs or the paschal lamb or the Easter candles; and to these may be added an immense number of varieties of benedictions for almost every imaginable occasion, wherein the pious of past ages deemed that the church could draw forth on their behalf from a rich store of blessing. Thus we may

mention, in addition to those already cited, the following benedictions of things, occurring, unless the contrary be specified, in the Gregorian Sacramentary. (1) *b. domus*. (2) *uvae vel fabae* (= *fabae*). (3) *ad fructus novos*. (4) *ad omnia quas volueris*. (5) *carnis*. (6) *putei* (Gall.). (7) *casei et ovorum* (Euch. Graec.). (8) *ignis* (Pontif. Egb.). (9) *librorum* (ib.).

IV. *Mode of imparting Benediction*. However various the objects for which blessings are sought, and however different therefore the formulae in which they are conferred, still there are certain accompaniments which are as a rule always present, and as to which the directions, simple enough in the earliest Church, have been in process of time rendered more and more definite, to leave as little as possible to individual will. (a) As showing how the Christian Ritual on these points is foreshadowed in the Jewish, we have thought it well to prefix a brief note as to the laws of blessing in the latter. The priests, to whom the power of imparting blessings was committed, were to do so standing (cf. Deut. x. 8; xxvii. 12), with outstretched hands. We cite here a passage from the Mishna, the earliest authority to which we can appeal next to the Bible. "In what way is the sacerdotal blessing performed? In the provinces [*i.e.* away from the temple] they say it in three blessings [*i.e.* the formula of Numbers vi. 24-26 is divided into three clauses, and *Amen* responded at the end of each], but in the temple in one. In the temple they say the Name as it is written [*i.e.* the *tetragrammaton*], in the provinces with the substituted name [*i.e.* *Adonai*]. In the provinces the priests raise their hands on a level with their shoulders, but in the temple above their heads, except the high-priest, who does not raise up his hands above the diadem." [Or perhaps rather a plate of gold worn upon the forehead of the high-priest. The reason of the prohibition in his case was because of the presence of the Sacred Name upon the plate.] *Mishn. Sota*, vii. 6. In a somewhat later authority, the commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy known as *Sifree*, we have further directions given: (1) the blessing is to be pronounced in the Hebrew language; (2) the imparter of the blessing is to stand, and (3) with outstretched hands. (4) The sacred name *יהוה* is to be used; (5) the priest must face the people, and (6) speak in a loud voice. (*Sifree* on Numb. vi. 22-27.) Reference may also be made to a still later authority, the Babylonian Talmud itself (*Sota*, fol. 38 a).

During the conferring of the blessing the people must not look at the priest, for for the time the glory of God is supposed to rest upon him (*vide infra*). Also, his hands are disposed so that the fingers go in pairs, forefingers with middle fingers, ring fingers with little fingers, with the tips of the two thumbs and of the two forefingers respectively touching each other, thus arranging the whole ten fingers in six divisions. We shall quote in illustration of this from the *Lekach Tob* of R. Eleazar b. Tobiah (the so-called *Pesikta Zotarta*) on Numbers, l. c. "It is forbidden to look at the priests at the moment that they lift up their hands,—and he divides his hands into six parts, as it is said, 'Every one had six wings.' Isa. vi. 2."

One more extract will suffice, which we take from the ancient commentary on Numbers (*in*

*loc.*), the *Bammidbar Rabba* (c. 11). "Therefore it is said (Cant. ii. 9), 'Behold he stands behind our wall,' that is, synagogues and colleges. 'He looks from the windows':—At the time when the Holy One, Blessed be He, said to Aaron and his sons 'Thus shall ye bless' &c., Israel said to the Holy One, 'Lord of the Universe, thou tellest the priests to bless us, we want only Thy blessing and to be blessed from Thy mouth; according as it is said, Look from the abode of Thy holiness, from heaven' (Deut. xvi. 15). The Holy One said, 'Although I commanded the priests to bless you, I am standing with them and blessing you.' Therefore the priests stretch forth their hands to indicate that the Holy One stands behind us, and therefore it says, 'He looks from the windows' [*i.e.* from between the shoulders of the priests], 'He peeps from the lattice work' [*i.e.* from between the fingers of the priests]."

(β) The foregoing points afford a very close parallel to the usages of the Christian church. That the imparter of the blessing should stand is but in accordance with the natural order of things, and thus is a point universally observed, so that the Latin church does but stereotype usage, when in the ritual of Paul V. it is laid down as a Rubric *stando semper benedicat*. As to the kneeling of the recipients of the blessing, we may find ancient evidence in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 6), where the injunction is prefixed to the Benediction, "... and let the deacon say, *κλίνετε καὶ εὐλογεῖσθε*."

The order of the Jewish ritual that the priest should face the people is paralleled (to say nothing of unvarying custom) by the Rubric before the benediction in the mass in ancient Sacramentaries, (thus *e.g.* "Postea dicat episcopus convertens ad populum," in an ancient mass for Easter. *Greg. Sacram.* p. 248); and that to pronounce the blessing in a loud voice by the equivalent command constantly met with in Greek service books (*e.g.* *ἐπεύχεται ὁ ἱερεὺς μεγαλόφωνος*, *Goar, Euchol.* p. 42).

The lifting up of hands (*ἐπαρσις τῶν χειρῶν*) is an inseparable adjunct of benedictions. It is constantly associated in the Bible with actions of a more solemn character, as oaths (*e.g.* Gen. xiv. 22; Rev. x. 5), or prayer (*e.g.* Psalm xxviii. 2; xlv. 21 [20, E.V.]; lxiii. 5 [4, E.V.]; 1 Tim. ii. 8), or benediction (*e.g.* Lev. ix. 22; Luke xxiv. 50). An occasional addition is that of the *laying on of hands*: of this we find traces in Gen. xlviii. 14, 18; Matt. xix. 13, 15; Mark x. 16: and we may again refer to the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 9), where the benediction upon penitents is associated with the laying on of hands (*χειροθεσία*). The feeling of the greater worth and power of the right hand is shown in patriarchal times (Gen. l. c.); and in later times it is either taken for granted or is expressly commanded that the right hand should be used.

(γ) With this natural and almost universal gesture, the act of benediction is constantly represented in ancient art. Thus, the Lord extends His open hand over the demoniac, in the bas-reliefs of a sarcophagus at Verona (Maffei, *Verona Illustrata*, pars iii. p. 54); and also over a kneeling figure in an ARCOSOLIUM of the cemetery of St. Hermes (Bottari, *Pitture e Sculture*, clxxxvii. No. 2).

In process of time, as in the Jewish so in the

Christian ritual, a particular disposition of the fingers in the act of blessing became usual. In the Greek church, and in Greek paintings for the most part, the hand outstretched in blessing has



the thumb touching the tip of the ring-finger, while the forefinger, the middle, and the little finger are erected. According to a view mentioned by Ciampini (*De Sacris Aedif. Const.* p. 42, from Theoph. Raynaud, *De Attributis Christi*, 4. 9. 733, who cites it from some fragments of a Greek writer of uncertain date, Nicolaus Malaxus), the erect forefinger with the curved middle finger make IC, i.e. 'Ιησοῦς, while the crossing of the thumb and ring-finger and the curving of the little finger make XC, i.e. Χριστός. One cannot but agree here with the remark in the *Acta Sanctorum* (June, vol. vii. p. 135) that this is rather an ingenious speculation of Malaxus than a received doctrine of the Greek church. According to Goar (*Euchologion*, p. 923) the thumb and ring-finger crossed made a X, the other fingers erect with the fore and middle fingers slightly separated were supposed to represent ν, I, the whole standing for 'Ιησοῦς Χριστός νικῶ. He also gives (pp. 114, 115) pictures of St. Methodius and St. Germanus, with the fingers disposed as above, save that the fore and middle fingers are united. Evidence, however, is not forthcoming as to the date of these representations. (Cf. Leo Allatius, *De Cons. Eccl. Occid. et Orient.* pp. 1358 sqq., who describes as used by the Greeks a disposition of the fingers akin to that spoken of by Malaxus, and considers it as indicating the doctrines of the Trinity and of the twofold nature of our Lord.) Neale (*ib.* 352, n.) thus describes the eastern method, "The priest joins his thumb and third finger, and erects and joins the other three; and is thus supposed to symbolize the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone; and, according to others, to form the sacred name IHC by the position of his fingers."

In the Latin manner of benediction the erected fingers are the thumb, the forefinger and the



middle finger, while the other two are doubled down on the palm of the hand. The hand of the Lord is thus represented in some monuments, when He works a miracle, not holding a rod in the hand: for instance, in the healing of the man born blind (Bottari, tav. xix.), that of the woman with an issue of blood (xxi.), and in the representation of Christ's entry into Jerusalem (cxxxiii.): see also the illustrations of BLIND, HEALING OF, and BETHESDA. The same arrangement of the fingers is observed in the bas-relief of an ancient sarcophagus, representing the Good Shepherd blessing His sheep. In some cases the representation of the natural gesture of an orator or teacher resembles the act of blessing; as, for instance, in the representation of Christ in the midst of the doctors, given by Bottari (liv.).

This arrangement of the fingers is said to be found in the most ancient pictorial representations of the Popes (Molanus, *Hist. SS. Imaginum*, p. 468 n.; ed. Louvain, 1771). Pope Leo IV.

(*Hom. de Cura Pastoralis*, Migne's *Patrol.* cxv. 678) seems to enjoin a somewhat different arrangement, still for the purpose of symbolizing the Trinity; "districtis duobus digitis et pollice intus recluso, per quod Trinitas annuitur." These words, however, though given by Labbé, are wanting in many authorities.

But it seems certain, that it is only in comparatively modern times that the rite of benediction has constituted a distinction between the Greek and Latin Churches. For instance, in the most Roman of monuments, the Vatican confession (or crypt) of St. Peter (see the frontispiece to Borgia's *Vaticana Confessio B. Petri*), the Lord gives the blessing in the Greek manner; in the triumphal arch of St. Mark's Church, in the Latin manner; in the tribune of the same church, after the Greek manner; so also in a mosaic of the ancient Vatican (Ciampini, *De Sacris Aedif.* p. 43), executed under the direction of Innocent III. (1198-1216), who, treating expressly of this matter (*De Sacro Altaris Myst.* ii. 44), prescribes the elevation of three fingers, without indicating which. On the other hand, the bas-relief of a Greek diptych given by Foggini (*De Rom. Itin. Petri*, p. 471), represents St. Peter giving the blessing in the Latin manner, while St. Andrew, the reputed founder of the Church of Constantinople, blesses in the Greek manner; a circumstance which may perhaps indicate that different gestures of blessing were regarded as characteristic of East and West respectively (see Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chrét.* p. 84).

(δ) The SIGN OF THE CROSS (see the article) constantly accompanies benedictions both in the Eastern and the Western rites, and was thought to impart validity to the act; "quod signum nisi adhibeatur . . nihil horum rite perficitur," says St. Augustine (*Tract. in Joannem*, 118, § 5).

(ε) INCENSE is a frequent accompaniment of Benedictions; and the employment of Holy Water to be sprinkled on persons or things may be regarded as a form of Benediction [HOLY WATER]. The modern Romish Ritual makes a special vestment incumbent on the priest who gives a blessing. This, however, is beside our present purpose.

V. *Benedictionals*.—It has been already shown that various early forms of benedictions are found interspersed in ancient Sacramentaries. In that attributed to Pope Leo are found forms of blessing "ascendentibus a fonte," and "lactis et mellis," as well as a "benedictio fontis," which is possibly a later addition. It is, however, in the somewhat later Sacramentary of Gregory the Great that we meet with specimens of benedictions on a more extended scale, in some MSS. variously interspersed through the book, and in some given separately, forming the so-called *Benedictionale*. This is the case with the very ancient MS. of the Caesarean Library, edited by Lambecius, not knowing that the greater part of it had, under a different arrangement, already been edited by Ménard. Another of somewhat different form has been edited by Pamelius (*Liturgg.* vol. ii.) from two MSS. of the time of Charlemagne now in the Vatican. The *Liber Sacramentorum* of Ratoldus, of the tenth century, also contains numerous benedictions, but the fullest *Benedictional* is that found in two MSS. of the Monastery of St. Theodoric, near Rheims, written about the year 900. Ménard has also edited a *Benedictional* from a MS. in the abbey



of St. Eligius, and Angelus Rocca another from a MS. in the Vatican. A large collection of benedictions is also to be found in the *Pontifical* of Egbert (Archbishop of York, A.D. 732-766), published by the Surtees Society in 1853. It will be observed that all the above are merely recensions, more or less added to, of the benedictions in the Gregorian Sacramentary; it will suffice to mention, in addition to those, the benedictions of the Gothic Missal, first edited by Joseph Thomasius and then by Mabillon (*Museum Italicum*, vol. ii.), which are numerous, but of very different form.

VI. *Literature*.—For the matter of the present article we have to express considerable obligations to the essay *Segen und Fluch* in Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten* (vol. vii. part 2), and to Augusti's *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archäologie*, vol. x. pp. 165 seqq. We have also consulted the articles *Benedictionen* and *Segnungen* in Herzog's *Realencyklopädie*, and in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchen-Lexicon*. See also Gerhard, *De Benedictione Ecclesiastica*, and Haener, *De Ritu Benedictionis Sacerdotalis*. A vast mine of information is to be found in Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, and in Gretser, *De Benedictionibus*. [R. S.]

**BENEDIOTUS**, of Nursia, abbot of Monte Cassino, born A.D. 480, and died probably 542. [See *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.* s. v.] His festivals are as follows:—

Under March 21, the *Mart. Rom. Vet.* has "In Cassino Castro, Benedicti Abbatis;" *Mart. Hieron.*, "Depositio Benedicti Abbatis;" *Mart. Bedae*, "Natale Benedicti Abbatis."

Under July 11, *Mart. Bedae* has, "Floriaco adventus S. B. A.;" *Mart. Adonis*, "Translatio S. B. A.;" while *M. Hieron.* has again "Depositio S. B. A."

Under Dec. 4, the *M. Hieron.* has "Floriaco adventus Corporis S. B. A."

The *Cal. Byzant.* celebrates "Benedict of Nursia, Holy Father," on March 14.

We see that the festival of March 21 commemorates the death (or burial) of the saint; that of July 11, the translation of his relics to Fleury (St. Benoit sur Loire), in 653. The *Mart. Hieron.*, here as in some other places, is inexplicable.

The name of St. Benedict is recited in the prayer *Communicantes* of the Gregorian canon, and in the ancient canon of Milan (Ménard's *Greg. Sacram.*, p. 546). The Corbey MS. of the *Sacram. Greg.* has on vi. Idus Julii (July 10) "Vigilia S. Benedicti Abbatis," with proper collect, &c., and on v. Id. Jul. (July 11) "Natale S. B. A.," with proper collect, &c., for the mass. The MSS. of Reims and of Ratold have also the *Natale* on this day, but the office is simply *de communi unius abbatis* (Ménard, u. s. p. 407). Antiphon in *Lib. Antiph.* p. 703. Compare *Liber Responsalis*, p. 810.

Stephen of Tournai (*Epist.* 105) tells us that the ancient church of St. Benedict at Paris was built so that the sanctuary was towards the west, an arrangement which was afterwards altered (in Ménard, u. s. p. 329). [C.]

**BENEDIOTUS**. The song of Zacharias contained in S. Luke i. 68-79, so called from its first word. This canticle has been said at lauds in the Western Church from early times every day throughout the year, whatever be the service. The introduction of the custom is attributed to S. Benedict. It is said with a varying

antiphon which is doubled, i. e., said entire both before and after the canticle, on double feasts; in the Roman, Monastic, and other offices derived from a Gregorian or Benedictine origin, at the end of lauds, immediately before the *oratio* or collect, and occupies the same position at lauds which the *Magnificat* occupies at vespers. In the Ambrosian office it occurs on the contrary at the very beginning of the office, after the opening versicles. The Ambrosian rules too for the duplication of antiphons are different from the Roman. The *Benedictus* is also found elsewhere, e. g., in the Mozarabic lauds for the nativity of S. John Baptist. In the Greek rite, the *Benedictus* called *προσευχὴ Ζαχαρίου, τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Προδρόμου*, forms together with and following the *Magnificat* the last of the nine odes [ODE] appointed for lauds.

The introductory part of the *Song of the Three Children*, which precedes the *Benedictiones*, or *Benedicite* proper, is also known as the *Benedictus*: from its opening, "Benedictus es Domine Deus patrum nostrorum, &c. . . ." This is said daily in the Ambrosian rite at matins before the psalms, in the place the Venite occurs in other western rites. The whole of the *Song of the Three Children* is also called the *Benedictus* in the Mozarabic breviary, and said daily at lauds, as has been already stated. [H. J. H.]

**BENEFICE**. This subject occupies a larger space in the writings of Canonists than almost any other question within the cognisance of ecclesiastical law; but its history prior to the year 814 may be compressed into a small compass.

The term *benefice* is thus defined—the perpetual right of receiving profits from real property established, by authority of the Church in favour of a spiritual person in respect of the performance of a spiritual office.

The expression seems to have originated in the practice of granting the right of occupation in Church lands to laymen in exchange for protection afforded to the Church. These were called *benefices*, and the property, when restored to the Church, retained the name.

The custom of assigning to ecclesiastics a life interest in Church property appears to have commenced about the beginning of the 6th century, and is referred to in the 22nd canon of the Council of Agde (A.D. 506) and in the 23rd canon of the first Council of Orleans (A.D. 511), also in a letter of Pope Symmachus to Caesarius, Bishop of Arles (A.D. 513).

But the grant was not larger than a life interest to the beneficiary; and it therefore lacked the condition of perpetuity, which was an essential characteristic of a *benefice* in later ecclesiastical law (Ducange, *Glossarium*, sub voce; Ferraris, *Bibliotheca Canonica*, sub voce; Thomassinus, *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina*, ii. 3, 13, 5; Boehmer, *Jus Ecclesiasticum*, iii. 5, 492). [PROPERTY OF THE CHURCH.] [I. B.]

**BENIGNUS**. (1) Martyr at Tomi in Scythia; commemorated April 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(2) Presbyter, martyr at Dijon under M. Aurelius; commemorated Nov. 1 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis*).

**BERGHAMSTEDENSE CONCILIUM**. [BERSTED, COUNCIL OF.] [C.]

**BERGHFORDENSE CONCILIUM**. [BURFORD COUNCIL OF.]

**BERONICUS**, martyr at Antioch in Syria; commemorated Oct. 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vat., Adonis*). [C.]

**BERSTED, COUNCIL OF** (BERHAMSTEDENSE CONCILIUM), or rather WITENAGEMOT, of Kent, at Bersted near Maidstone, A.D. 696, at which the ecclesiastical laws of Wihtred, king of Kent, were passed. The date is uncertain, Gebmund, bishop of Rochester (who was present), living until 696 according to the *Textus Roffensis* (whence the laws are taken), but dying as early as at least 694 according to the *Saxon Chronicle*. "To the Church, freedom from imposts," or, more probably, "freedom in jurisdiction and revenue," is the beginning of the first law (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc. iii.* 233-238; Thorpe, *Anc. Laws and Institutes*, ii. 16-19). [A. W. H.]

**BERYTUS, COUNCIL OF**, A.D. 448, as Mansi thinks (vi. 501-2), in September, to hear a charge preferred against Ibas, bishop of Edessa, by nine of his clergy, which was twofold: first, that he had said, "I envy not Christ being made God, having been made so myself as much as He," which he denied indignantly; and next, that he had called St. Cyril a heretic, which he avowed he never had after the reconciliation between John of Antioch, his own superior, and St. Cyril. To refute this, his celebrated letter to Maria, of subsequent date, was adduced in evidence, containing a narrative of the whole controversy between Nestorius and St. Cyril. He rejoined by producing a testimonial in his favour addressed to Eustathius, bishop of Berytus, and Photius, bishop of Tyre, two of his judges, and signed by upwards of sixty presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons of his diocese. His acquittal followed: which, having been reversed at Ephesus by Dioscorus of Alexandria the year following, was confirmed in the tenth session of the Council of Chalcedon, where the acts of this Council are preserved (Mansi vii. 211-72). His epistle to Maria, indeed, was afterwards condemned at the fifth General Council. [E. S. Ft.]

**BETHERDA, MIRACLE OF (IN ART)**. Of this miracle there is an ancient representation on a sarcophagus from the Vatican cemetery, engraved in Bottari (*Sculture e Pitture*, tav. xxxix.; see woodcut). The subject occupies the centre of the tomb. A wavy line, representing water, divides the composition horizontally into two compartments: on the lower, the impotent man is seen lying on his couch, which is covered by a *stragulum* or overlet; on the upper, he is seen healed and carrying his couch, while the Lord stretches forth His hand towards him; another figure raises his hand, the fingers arranged as in the Latin form of benediction. The background is

formed by an arcade of three arches supported by columns, intended, no doubt, to represent one of the "five porches" (St. John v. 2) in which the impotent folk were laid (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Christ.* p. 542). The same miracle is represented, in a very different style, in the great Laurentian MS. See Assemani, *Bibliotheca Mediceo-Catal.* tab. xix., and Westwood's *Palaeographia Sacra*. [C.]



Miracle of Bethesda, from an ancient Sarcophagus.

**BETHLEHEM (ARCHITECTURAL)**. In the Ethioptic churches, a small building is thrown out from the east end of the sanctuary, where the bread for use in the eucharist is prepared by the Deacon alone, and baked in the oven with which the place is furnished. This building is called the *Bethlehem*, or "house of bread" (Noble, *Eastern Church*, *Introd.* 190). [C.]

**BETHLEHEM (SYMBOL)**. In an ancient mosaic of the church of SS. Cosmes and Damian, in the Via Sacra at Rome (Ciampini, *Vetus Monumenta*, ii. tab. xvi.; see woodcut) two flocks, each of six sheep, pass from cities labelled respectively **HIERUSALEM** and **BETHLEHEM** towards the figure of a lamb, representing the Lord, which stands on a mound in the centre. Similar representations are found in Buonarroti (*Fragmenti di Vasi*, tav. vi. 1) and Perret (*Catacombes de Rome*, v. pl. iii.). The Abbé Martigny (*Dict. des Antiq. Christ.* p. 225) supposes Jerusalem and Bethlehem to symbolize respectively the Jewish and Gentile Churches; but this scarcely seems a probable opinion. It



Bethlehem and Jerusalem in Synopsi.



is difficult to see how Bethlehem could represent the *Gentile* church, and the twelve sheep are generally supposed to represent the Apostles, none of whom came forth from the Gentiles. On the whole, it seems more probable that the issuing forth of the flock of Christ from Jerusalem and Bethlehem symbolises the fact that the church is founded on the Nativity, the Passion, and the Resurrection of the Lord. Bethlehem was the scene of the former, Jerusalem of the two latter. See Ciampini (*Vet. Mon.* i. 189). [C.]

#### BETHPHANIA. [EPIPHANY.]

BETHURIUS, martyr at Carthage under Saturninus; commemorated July 17 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**BETROTHAL.** Under this head we shall consider only the ordinary contract of that name, reserving for the head of ESPOUSALS the specially religious applications of the idea.

The two influences which must have chiefly built up the earliest practice of the Church must have been the Jewish and the Roman, as embodied in the civil law of the Empire. But as respects marriage, these influences were different in character. The Jewish law of marriage embodied much of the old and to this day widely prevalent custom among uncivilized races, of treating it as the purchase of a wife; with this remarkable feature indeed, that the woman was at a very early age (*i. e.* within her 12th year, see Selden's *Uxor Hebraica*, bk. ii. c. iii.) held fit to dispose of herself. Under this system, betrothal, if not the actual marriage, which was held to consist in the leading of the bride to the nuptial bed, was yet really, for most purposes, the marriage contract, the violation of which by connexion with another was deemed adultery, and punishable as such, the dissolution of which could only take place by a "writing of divorcement" (Selden, quoting Maimonides, *u. s.*, c. i.). The contract was made by persons held to be of full age (*i. e.* speaking generally, and neglecting some exceptional *minutiae*, males in the last day of their 13th year, women in the second half of their 12th) at their own will; but girls under age might be betrothed by their fathers or guardians (though only by money or writing), with power, however, at 10 to repudiate the engagement; it could also be entered into through go-betweens,—those *proxenetici* of the Greeks and Romans,—whose name has, in ordinary parlance, been shortened in form and widened in meaning into that of our "proxies," but who represent a still recognised function and calling in the Jewish communities of our day. Where the contract was in writing, with or without the giving of earnest money, it was to be written out by the man in the presence of witnesses, and handed over to the woman, who must know its purport, otherwise there was no contract. Selden gives the form of such a writing, specifying the man's pronouncing of the words of betrothal, the assent of the girl, and his promise of a jointure.

The Roman looked upon the marriage contract with different eyes from the Jew. At the time when the Christian Church grew up, the idea of it as the purchase of a wife had quite died out from men's minds. Marriage, and still more betrothal, was (with one exception) a purely civil contract, verbally concluded. Under the

later Roman law (we need not here go in detail into the enactments of the *Lex Julia*, or *Papia-Poppaea*), which forms the second and main basis of church practice on the subject, betrothal is viewed simply as a contract for future marriage. It was of more weight indeed than our "engagement," since it was held as much a note of infamy to enter into two contracts of betrothal as of marriage (*Dig.* 3, tit. 2, s. 1, 13), so that Tacitus says of the younger Agrippina, when thinking of marrying her son Domitius to Octavia, daughter of Claudius, that it could not be done "without crime," since Octavia was already betrothed to Silanus (*Ann.* bk. xii. c. 3), but it was a compact for which mere consent without writing, even of absent parties, was sufficient (*Dig.* 23, tit. 1, s. 4), although for its full validity the consent of all parties was required whose consent would be necessary to marriage (s. 7). The consent of a daughter, however, to her father's betrothal of her was implied, in default of proof to the contrary (s. 12); and Julianus held that the like consent of a father was to be implied, in default of proof of his dissent, to his daughter's betrothal of herself.

No forms were requisite for the early Roman betrothal, and there seems no reason for supposing that the stage betrothals which are so frequent in Plautus would not have been strictly legal. (*Aulul.* ii. 2, vv. 77-9; *Poenul.* v. 3, vv. 37, 8; *Trinumm.* ii. 4, vv. 98-103.) In these the essence of the contract lies evidently in the question and reply (the interrogatory form being a characteristic of the early Roman law): "Spondesne?"—"Spondeo." At the same time, the early Roman betrothal was generally accompanied with the sending to the woman of the iron BRIDAL RING (see this head).

We may infer from the much larger space assigned to betrothal and its incidents in the Code (5, tit. 1-3.) than in the Digest that with the growth of the empire the contract both assumed greater importance, and was at the same time more frequently broken. The practice of giving earnest-money [ARRHAE] becomes now prominent; whilst gifts on betrothal are also largely dwelt upon. Under Constantine we see that the passing of a kiss between the betrothed had come to have a legal value. (Code 5, tit. 3, s. 16.)

A glimpse at the forms usual in the later Roman betrothals, towards the beginning of the 3rd century, is given to us by Tertullian. In his treatise *de Veland. Virgin.* c. ii., he observes that even among the Gentiles girls are brought veiled to betrothal, "because they are united both in body and spirit to the man by the kiss and the joining of right hands." This passage evidently shows that in his time Gentile betrothal had grown to be a ceremony, of which the veil, the kiss and the clasped hands were among the elements; his mention of the kiss illustrating the before quoted constitution by Constantine, later indeed by nearly a century and a half. He does not indeed name the ring; but the use of it [BRIDAL RING] is testified to by himself in another passage, and by several other authorities.

The greater prominence of the betrothal contract under the later emperors—say from the 3rd century inclusively—is best explained through the gradual permeation of the Roman empire

by the barbarian races, the main source from which all the most energetic elements of its population were recruited, long before any collective invasion. For when we turn to the barbaric Codes, we generally find betrothal in a position of prominence quite unlike anything in the earlier Roman law—the ruling idea being almost invariably that of wife-buying. The Salic law deals with the subject, after its wont, only through money-payments. If any one carries off a betrothed girl and marries her, he is to pay 62½ solidi, and 15 to her betrothed. (*Pactus antiquior*, t. xiv. arts. 8, 9.) If any, whilst the bridesman is conducting the betrothed to her husband, falls on her in wrath and with violence commits adultery with her, he shall pay 200 solidi (art. 10). Amongst our forefathers of the Anglo-Saxon period, we find the laws of Ethelbert (597–616) decreeing that “if a man carry off a maiden betrothed to another man in money,” he is to “make bot with 20 shillings” (83). The laws of Ina (688–725), though a century later, do not any more than those of Ethelbert seem to distinguish betrothal from purchase: “If a man buy a wife and the marriage take not place, let him give the money,” &c. (31).

But it is in the Wisigothic and Lombardic laws that we find most matter under this head. The former attribute almost absolute authority in the betrothals of women to the father or his representative. One of the more ancient enactments bears that “if any have had a girl betrothed to him with the will of her father or of the other near relations to whom by law this power is given,” the girl may not marry another against her parents’ (or relatives’) will; but if she do, both parties shall be handed over to the power of him who had had her betrothed to him with her parents’ will, and any relatives abetting the marriage shall pay 1 pound of gold.

The betrothal contract is by the Wisigothic law treated as so far equivalent to marriage, that the term adultery is freely used of its violation by the parties. A husband or betrothed are moreover declared not to be responsible for killing those who commit adultery with their wives or betrothed (l. 4). Again, the same title of the law embraces the rupture of both contracts (*De divortio Nuptiarum et discidio Sponsorum*, t. vi.).

The Wisigothic Code has been always held to have been drawn up under priestly influence. The Lombards were never looked on with favour by the Church. Yet between the two systems of legislation there is less difference on the head which occupies us than might be expected. The Lombard law, like the Wisigothic, adopts from Rome the two years’ maximum for delay in carrying out a betrothal contract. (Laws of Nothar, A.D. 638 or 643, c. 178.)

The laws of Luitprand (A.D. 717) are very severe against too early marriages of girls. If any betroth to himself or carry away [as his wife] a girl under 12, he is to compound as for rape.

The forms of betrothal among the barbarian conquerors of the Roman Empire must have been infinitely varied. The Salic betrothal was by the offer of a *solidus* and *denarius*, and the contract could be made between absent parties; as when Chlodowig (Clovis) espoused Chlotildi through his envoys (Nedegarius, *Epit.* c. 18).

Canciani, from the Euphemian Codex of Verona, has published two *formulae*, one apparently of a Lombard, the other of a Salic betrothal (vol. ii. pp. 467, 476), which, although the text of them may be somewhat later than the period to which this work relates, no doubt, like most written *formulae*, exhibit with some faithfulness the usages of an earlier period. In both of them the betrothal has palpably become a judicial act. A sword and a glove are the main features of the former: “For this cometh M., for that he willeth to espouse D., daughter of P. Camest thou because of this?” “I came.” “Give pledge, that thou wilt make unto her a fourth part of whatever thou hast; and by this sword and this glove I betroth to thee M., my daughter, and thou, receive her by title of betrothal.” “Thou, father of the woman, give pledges to him that thou givest her to him to wife, and sendest her under his *mundium*. And thou, give [pledge] that thou receivest her; and whoever shall withdraw, let him compound in a thousand solidi.” The Salic formula is confined to the case of the second marriage of a “Salic widow;” it belongs self-evidently to the Carolingian era, and in it the ideas of betrothal and of marriage seem to run into each other.

We come now to the legislation of the Church itself on the subject of betrothal. Tertullian in his treatise on Idolatry (c. 16), seeking to determine what actions and matters a Christian is not to meddle with on account of their idolatrous character, says: “But as concerning the offices of private and common solemnities, as these . . . of betrothal or marriage, I think no danger is to be apprehended from any breath of idolatry which may intervene. For the objects must be considered for which the office is performed. I deem those pure in themselves, for neither . . . the ring nor the marriage bond flows from the worship of any idol.” It may be fairly concluded from this passage that towards the end of the 2nd or beginning of the 3rd century, betrothal was considered by the Church as being in itself a perfectly valid and lawful contract, and even when celebrated between heathens, involving no contamination for the Christian who should take part in the proceedings connected with it.

It is unnecessary to notice the forgeries which support sacerdotal claims. The first unimpeachable authority on the subject is found in Basil’s Canonical Epistle to Amphilochus, bishop of Iconium. It will be seen that he treats of betrothal in a quite incidental manner. In one passage (c. xxii.) he takes the case of men who have violently carried away the betrothed of another; these are not to be received to communion until they put their wives away, and submit to the will of those to whom these were at first betrothed. Yet he views betrothal as so far approximating to marriage that he allows (c. 69) a reader or subdeacon seducing his betrothed before marriage to be admitted to communion after a year’s penance, without loss of office, but so that he cannot be promoted; but in case of his misconducting himself without betrothal with a woman he is to be deprived of his office itself.

Of more interest, both in itself, and as being, probably, the first genuine utterance of a Pope which suffices to dispose of a whole mass of antedated forgeries, is a letter of Pope Bene-

dict I. (A.D. 573-7) to the Patriarch of Gran. The Pope had been asked whether, where a girl had been betrothed by word of mouth only, and died before marriage, her sister could marry the same man. The Pope replied that it was consubstantial intercourse that made two one; "how by bare words of betrothal they can be made one we can in nowise see. Do not therefore deny that which you can show no reason for denying."

It is indeed evident, from the application itself, that the question whether the contract of betrothal did not of itself create a consanguinity between the parties, sufficient to render the subsequent marriage of either with a kinsman or kinswoman of the other unlawful, was already a moot one. We might not be surprised if Gregory the Great (A.D. 590-603), in whose powerful mind a strong vein of ascetic feeling is discoverable—should have taken the opposite side to Benedict. He remains indeed quite within the law in allowing a betrothed woman to dissolve her engagement in order to enter a convent; writing (bk. vi. *Ep.* 20) to the bishop and *defensor* of Naples, where one Stephen, betrothed to a girl who had been "converted" in one of the monasteries of the city, was alleged to detain her and her property, that after due examination he was to be exhorted to restore the girl herself and her things, and if he did not, then to be compelled to do so.

The Council (3) of Constantinople in Trullo (A.D. 680-1) is the first oecumenical authority for assimilating betrothal to marriage, so far as to make it adultery to marry a betrothed woman in the life-time of her first betrothed. Now about this period indeed betrothal becomes a very frequent subject of church legislation or church jurisprudence. One of the canons (105) of a Council held in England, under Archbishop Theodore, towards the end of the 7th century, provides that if a man after betrothing to himself a wife, will not live with her, he shall restore the money given to him and add a third to it. Another (129) forbids parents to give a betrothed girl to another "if she resist altogether," but they may send her to a convent (for this seems the cruel sense of the enactment). A collection of canons of the Irish Church, supposed to be also of the end of this century, enacts, somewhat singularly, that when betrothed girls have been dishonoured by other men, they are to be *bought* and given back to their first betrothed (bk. xli. c. 37). The "Excerpt" of Pope Gregory III. (A.D. 731-41) mentions five years, "or more humanely three," as the penance for attempting to seduce another's betrothed. In the case (which is that mentioned in the 25th canon of the Council of Ancyra) of a man seducing the sister of his betrothed, and of his victim killing herself, all who are implicated in the deed must do ten years' penance, or some say seven (c. 18). The first Council of Rome under Pope Zacharias, A.D. 743, anathematizes those who rashly presume to steal a maid or widow for their wife, unless betrothed to them (can. 7). The Carolingian Capitularies enact that a betrothed girl ravished by another man is to be given back to her former betrothed, but that in case of his refusing to take her she may marry a stranger, but not her ravisher, under pain of anathema (c. 124), and follow generally in the tracts of the spurious letters of Evaristus and Siricius

Finally, the reply of Pope Nicolas to the Bulgarians in 860, shows that at the end of the 9th century the form of betrothal had become confined to the placing of the ring, by way of earnest, on the woman's finger, and her endowment by the man in the presence of invited witnesses, a greater or less interval separating betrothal from marriage.

If we are not mistaken, the history of the 8 or 9 first centuries shows in the Church a gradual recession from the freedom both of the Jewish and of the Roman law upon the subject of betrothal. Two causes seem to have operated to produce this result,—on the one hand, the influence of the barbarian codes, which generally look upon the woman more or less as the property of her father, if not of her family generally,—on the other, that of the growing spirit of asceticism in reference to the relations between the sexes, leading to the encroachment of the Church upon the domain of the civil power as respects the whole subject of marriage, and thereby again fostering restrictive church legislation with all its attendant covetousnesses and corruptions. The Carolingian era, with which we break off, is that of the first establishment of this system. [J. M. L.]

**BEZIERS, COUNCIL OF** (BITERRENSIS CONCILIUM), provincial, A.D. 356, summoned by command of the Emperor Constantius, under Saturninus, Bishop of Arles; one of those minor Councils of the West, at which an attempt was made to condemn St. Athanasius. St. Hilary of Poitiers, who defended the orthodox cause, was shortly afterwards banished to Phrygia by the emperor through the false dealing of Saturninus (S. Hilar. Pictav., *De Synod.* § 2, *Ad Constant.* § 2, *Opp.* ii. 460, 563; Hieron. *De Scriptt. Eccl.* c.; Sulp. Sever. *H. E.* ii.; Labb. v. 783). [A. W. H.]

**BIBIANA**, martyr at Rome; commemorated Dec. 2 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); as **VIVIANA** (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**BIBLE, USE OF IN SERVICES.** [CANONICAL BOOKS; EPISTLE; GOSPEL; LECTIONARY; PROPHECY.]

**BIBLIOTHECA.** [LIBRARY.]

**BIDDING-PRAYER.** This term is used by Bingham to designate a prayer of a particular form uttered by the Deacon in the Liturgy. As, however, the modern English Bidding-Prayer appears to be of mediæval origin, it seems best to treat of the ancient prayer under its proper designation [PROSPHONESIS]. [C.]

**BIGAMY.** Under this head we shall designate only, according to modern usage, the case of matrimonial union to two persons at the same time; premising that until the beginning of the 17th century, at least, the term was applied to all cases of second marriage, whether during the existence of a prior union or after its dissolution; the word "polygamy" being applied to the former case. Thus Sir E. Coke in his 3rd Institute (p. 88) writes: "The difference between bigamy or trigamy and polygamy, is *quia bigamus seu trigamus, etc., est qui diversis temporibus et successive duas seu tres, etc., uxores habuit: polygamus qui duas vel plures simul duxit uxores;*" the distinction being thus made entirely to turn on the simultaneous or successive nature of the marriage relations. [DIGAMY.]

It is of course not from Jewish precedent that Christendom has borrowed its condemnation of bigamy. The foundation of the Church's law in this matter lies in the teaching of our Lord, Matt. xix. 4 and foll.; Mark x. 5 and foll., and in the developments of that teaching by St. Paul. (Compare also, as an early and quite consonant authority, *Hermas*, Bk. ii. Mand. 4; likewise *Apost. Const.* Bk. vi. c. 14.) In church practice indeed it has been always contested whether the expressions in 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6, which our version renders "husband" or "husbands of one wife," apply to simultaneous marriages only, or to successive marriages as well. The ordinary Protestant interpretation assigns to them the more restricted meaning; but this conclusion will probably appear the more doubtful, the more Christian antiquity and the usages of the time are studied. Whatever might be Jewish theory on the subject, there is no hint whatever in the New Testament at either bigamy or polygamy as a Jewish practice, and neither was certainly legal in either Ephesus or in Crete, when the Epistles above referred to were written to the respective bishops of those churches. Monogamy was the law both of Greece and of Rome. So long therefore as the Roman power subsisted, the monogamy inculcated by the Church was also enforced by the law. The influence upon this state of things of the barbarian invasions must have been very various. Tacitus notes of the ancient Germans that "almost alone among the barbarians they content themselves with one wife, except a very few, who not through lust but for honour's sake enter into several marriages" (*German.* 18). His words, however, appear to have applied more or less to all the Teutonic races. On the other hand, among the Celtic races, or those mixed with them, *e.g.* the Britons, Scots, and Hibernians of our own islands,—a community of wives or something closely equivalent to it is testified to by Caesar, Jerome, and Strabo. Subjection to Rome, the preaching of Christianity, did not suffice to introduce monogamic habits, and we find Gildas lamenting that his countrymen were not restrained by polygamy from frequenting harlots (*quam plurimas uxores habentes, sed scortantes*). Monogamy seems to have been equally unknown to the Slavonic races, as well as to the Tartar; Attila's harem is well known. It is also to be presumed that the weakening of the Roman power in Asia allowed old polygamic practices, familiar to Orientals, to revive. With these preliminary observations we shall endeavour to trace briefly the course of Church legislation on the subject.

The first authority we find is a doubtful one—that of those Canons attributed to the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325), which are only to be found in the Arabic version. The 24th of these (26th in the version of the Maronite Abraham Echellensis) bears that "none ought to marry two wives at once, nor to bring in to his wife another woman for pleasure and fleshly desire." If a priest, such person is to be forbidden to officiate and excluded from communion, until such time as he cast out the second, whilst he ought to retain the first; and so of a layman. The 66th Canon (71st of the Echellensian version) enters in still more detail into the case of a priest or deacon taking another wife, whether free or slave, without having dismissed the first, the penalty being

deposition; or for a layman in the same sin, excommunication. The 67th Canon again (22nd Echellensian) enacts that whosoever shall have accepted two women at once in marriage shall himself be excommunicated with his second wife. It is difficult to attribute Nicene authority to these Canons, which show so vividly the corruptions that grew up in the more distant Oriental churches. But whether illustrative of the degeneracy of Arabian Christendom before the rise of Mohammedanism in the 7th century, or of the influence of Mohammedan polygamy itself upon it at a later period, they are not the less valuable. The tradition of a condemnation of bigamy by the Nicene fathers appears also from the singular collection attributed to them, from a Vatican Codex, intitled by Labbe and Mansi (see vol. ii. p. 1029 and foll.), "*Sanctiones et decreta alia ex quatuor regum ad Constantinum libris excerpta*." The 5th chapter of the 1st book bears that "to no Christian is it lawful to have two or more wives at once, after the manner of the Gentiles, who marry three or four at once; but one is to be married after the other, that is, the contract is to be made with a second after the death of the first." If any dares to go counter to this prohibition, he is to be excommunicated. Reference is made to the holy fathers assembled in the Council, and the enactment is declared to be binding on all Christians, whether laymen or clerics, priests, deacons, princes, kings and emperors.

The "*Sanctions and Decrees*," whatever be their authority, belong evidently to the Eastern Church. But from the canonical epistle of Basil to Bishop Amphilochius of Iconium, the spuriousness both of the above quoted canons from the Arabic, and of the "*Sanctions and Decrees*," so far as they claim Nicene authority, may be inferred, since he says that the subject of polygamy has been pretermitted by the fathers, assigning a four years' penance for it before the offender can be admitted to communion (C. lxxx.).

The practice of the West, except in far outlying provinces, seems to have been generally more strict than in the East, and we have thus to infer the spirit of the Western Church towards bigamy chiefly from enactments against concubinage. The first Council of Toledo (A.D. 400) excludes from communion a man having a faithful wife and a concubine, but not one who has a concubine and no wife, so long as he contents himself with one woman (c. 17). Passing over an alleged decree of Pope Celestin (A.D. 423–32), which declares that a second wife married against church forbiddance is not a wife, although the first should not have been betrothed (c. 4, Gratian); we should notice a letter (12) of Leo the Great (A.D. 440–61), addressed to the African bishops of the province of Mauritania Caesariensis, which speaks of an actual case of bigamy in the priesthood of that province. Neither apostolic nor legal authority, it says, allow the husband of a second wife to be raised to the pastoral office, much less him who, "as it has been related to us, is the husband of two wives at once" (c. 5). Another letter of Leo's (dated 458 or 9), to Rusticus Bishop of Narbonne, is probably the first authority for the lower modern view of the concubinate. Not every woman united to a man is the man's wife, for neither is every son his father's heir. . . . Therefore a wife is one



thing, a concubine another; as a handmaid is one thing, a freewoman another. . . Wherefore if a clerk of any place give his daughter in marriage to a man having a concubine, it is not to be taken as if he gave her to a married man; unless haply the woman appear to have been made free, and lawfully jointured and restored to honour by a public marriage (c. 4). Those who by their father's will are married to men are not in fault if the women which such men had were not had in marriage (c. 5). Since a wife is one thing, a concubine another, to cast from one's bed the bondmaid and to receive a wife of ascertained free birth is not a doubling of marriage, but a progress in honourable conduct (c. 6).—The Council of Angers in 453 enacts excommunication against those who abuse the name of marriage with other men's wives in the lifetime of their husbands (c. 6). That of Vannes (A.D. 465) deals in the same way with those who having wives, except by reason of fornication, and without proof of adultery, marry others,—both enactments, however, pointing perhaps rather to marriage after separation.

Towards the same period, however (latter half of the 5th century), we must notice a Nestorian Synod held in Persia, under the presidency of Barsumas Archbishop of Nisibis, as affording probably the first instance of what may be called the modern Protestant interpretation of the Pauline *μίας γυναῖκος ἀνήρ*. A priest, its canons declare, "should be one who has one wife, as it is said in the Apostle's Epistle to Timothy, 'Whoever marries, let him have one wife;' if he transgresses, he is to be separated from the Church and the priestly order. But if a priest not knowing marriage, or whose wife is dead, should wish for lawful marriage, let him not be forbidden by the bishop, whether he have wished to marry before or after his priesthood." Any one who contravenes these canons is anathematized, and if a priest, to be deposed (see Labbe and Mansi, *Conc.*, vol. viii. pp. 143–4). It is clear that the Nestorians in this case interpreted St. Paul as speaking not of successive but of simultaneous marriage. That this was not however the view of the Greek Church generally is evident from many authorities; see, for instance, the Canons of the Council of Constantinople in Trullo, A.D. 691 and following years.

If Burchard's collection is to be credited, a canon (16) was adopted by the 4th or 5th Council of Arles (A.D. 524 or 554) forbidding any man to have two wives at once, or a concubine at any time (*sed neque unquam concubinam*). A collection of Irish Canons, supposed to belong to the close of the 7th century, shows that the Celtic kings of Ireland must, as in Britain in the days of Gildas, have had regular harems. The barbarous Latin title of one of its chapters (bk. xxiv., c. vii.) is, "De rege non habente uxores plurimas," and the Synod is represented as enacting (if the term can be used) as follows: "According as is the dignity which the king receives, so great should be his fear; for many women deprave his soul, and his mind, divided by the multitude of his wives, falls greatly into sin."

To the 8th century belongs one of the most curious incidents in the treatment of this question by the Church. In a letter of Pope Gregory II. (A.D. 714–30) to Boniface, the Apostle of Ger-

many, written in answer to a series of questions put to him by the latter, we find the Pope treating the case of a wife, who through bodily infirmity becomes incapable of fulfilling the conjugal duty. Can the husband in such an event take a second wife? The Pope replies, that it is good for him to remain united to her. "But he who cannot contain" (referring evidently to 1 Cor. vii. 9), "let him marry rather;" but without withdrawing maintenance "from her whom infirmity hinders, but no detestable fault excludes" from his bed—a decision closely akin to that of Luther and the Protestant theologians in the case of the Landgrave of Hesse. Further on (c. 6) the Pope condemns bigamy generally, "since that is not rightly to be deemed marriage which exceeds the number of two, for the yoke is not borne except by two" (*quia nisi in duobus non geritur jugum*)—not a very complimentary argument in favour of monogamy (*S. Bonif. Epistt.* ed. Würdtwein, No. 24).

We find the question of the lawfulness of a second marriage in case of a wife's bodily infirmity recurring in a work not of much later date than Pope Gregory's letter to Boniface, Archbishop Egbert of York's Dialogue on Church Government (*Dialogus per interrogationes et responsiones de institutione ecclesiasticâ*). The archbishop is however more cautious than the Pope. He puts the case (c. 13) only in the shape of a dissolution of the marriage tie by agreement of both parties (*ex convenientiâ amborum*), because of the infirmity of one of them; can the healthy one marry again, the infirm one consenting, and promising continence? The archbishop implies that he may: "By change of times necessity breaks the law . . . in doubtful cases one should not judge (*in ambiguis non est ferenda sententia*)."

Another example in the 8th century, though bearing rather on concubinage than on bigamy, is to be found in certain replies reported to have been given by Pope Stephen III., whilst he was in France, in the town of Kierzy, at the Breton monastery (in Carisiaco villa Britannico monasterio), to various questions addressed to him A.D. 754. He expressed his approval of Pope Leo's view as to the propriety of dismissing a bondmaid concubine and marrying a freewoman, and (c. 3) in further reply to a case put to him of a man marrying a bondmaid in a foreign country, then returning to his own and marrying a freewoman, then again going back to the former country and finding his bondmaid wife married to another, gave it as his opinion that "such a one may take another bondmaid (*is potest aliam accipere*)," but not in the lifetime of the free wife.

The relaxation of the sanctity of the marriage tie in the Carolingian era seems indeed to have become extreme. This may be inferred, for instance, from the frequency of enactments forbidding married men to have concubines, for which see Ansegis, bk. vi. cc. 230, 433, and again bk. vii. c. 338, the last garnished with the somewhat naïf argument, "lest love of the concubine detach the man from his wife." A contemporary capitulary (A.D. 774) by Arechis Prince of Benevento, forbids a man having a lawful wife to give aught by any device to his sons or daughters born during her life of another unlawful wife (c. 8), an enactment which seemingly points at



practices avowedly bigamous. The dismissal of wives by the Carolingian sovereigns, in order to marry others, becomes likewise so common that it is almost impossible to distinguish between patent bigamy and bigamy veiled under the name of divorce. At the summit of the Carolingian world the great emperor, besides actual and divorced wives, sets the law at defiance by keeping concubines. The East was even below the West in servility towards the vices of the sovereign. In the year 809 a Council of Constantinople pronounced a second marriage of the reigning emperor Constantine, after sending his first wife to a convent, lawful, on the ground that "the Divine law can do nothing against kings."

The reader is referred to the head DIGAMY for the further consideration of this subject; in the meanwhile we may conclude that, whilst the church of the eight or nine first centuries never formally sanctioned simultaneous marriage relations with two persons, it yet sometimes indirectly permitted them in outlying provinces in the case of a wife's infirmity, and certainly was not powerful enough to check them among the great of the ruder races, nor probably generally in the Carolingian era. [J. M. L.]

BIOTHANATOS (*βιοθάνατος*), "Qui morte violenta perit," says Suicer, *sub v.*: as if it had been contracted from "*biaiothanatos*," which is the definition of "*οι βιοθανατοῦντες*" given by St. Chrysostom in disputing against the opinion that the souls of such after death become demons (*De Lazaro Serm.* ii. § 1; *Op.* vol. i. p. 727; *Ed. Montf.* *Comp. Tertull. De Animâ*, c. 57). According to Baronius, A.D. 138, n. 4-5, it was one of the terms applied to Christians generally by way of reproach for preferring to lose their lives sooner than deny Christ: an application that would have been unmeaning had not the prominent notion attached to the word all along been that of people laying violent hands upon themselves; and hence, according to the story told by Cassein (*Collat.* iii. 6; *comp. Ins.* viii. 14), a monk who had thrown himself into a well under temptation of the devil, and been drowned, was all but reckoned by his abbot among such, as being unworthy to be commemorated among those who had gone to their rest in peace. Pagan moralists, we are told by Mr. Lecky (*Europ. Mor.* ii. 46, et seq.), condemned suicide upon four grounds. "Christian theologians," he adds, "were the first to maintain dogmatically that a man who destroys his own life has committed a crime similar both in kind and in magnitude to that of an ordinary murderer. . . . On the other hand, the high position assigned to resignation in the moral scale, . . . and, above all, the Christian doctrine of the remedial and providential character of suffering, have proved sufficient protection against despair. Enthusiasm, in early times, indeed, animated many to court martyrdom; and Christian women were honoured, or at least excused, for committing suicide to guard their chastity. But this feeling died away with the occasions which evoked it, and even asceticism was gradually subjected to rule, when experience had shown the extreme limits to which it could be carried without injury to the constitution." The "*Circumcelliones*," a wild sect of the Donatists, are frequently reproached for looking upon

suicide in the light of a virtue by St. Augustine (*Cont. Ep. Parm.* iii. 6; *Brev. Coll. cum Don.* Die iii. c. 8, § 13, &c.). By the 16th canon of the first Council of Braga, A.D. 560 (*Mansi ix.* 774-84, and Pagi, *ibid.*), those who committed it in any way "were neither to be commemorated at the oblation, nor to be carried to the grave with psalm-singing." *Comp. Gratian, Decret.* Part ii. cause 23, 9. 5: where this canon and other passages in point are cited. [E. S. Ff.]

BIRD (AS SYMBOL). The birds represented in the earliest Christian art are generally distinguished by their species [see DOVE, EAGLE, PHOENIX, &c.]. This is not only the case in the early sarcophaguses and frescoes of the catacombs, but it is specially remarkable in the first gothic works of the Lombard churches in the North of Italy. See Ruskin (*Stones of Venice, Appendix*, vol. i., *Byzantine and Lombard Carvings*) where early Lombard work is contrasted with Byzantine. But in the very earliest tombs (see Aringhi, ii. 324, and De Rossi almost *passim*, Bottari t. 178 viii. tav. 174, &c.) birds assignable to no particular species are introduced, apparently with symbolic purpose. In De Rossi they occur so often on tombs, with or without the palm branch, that they may clearly be taken as images of the released soul seeking its home in heaven. Aringhi recognizes this in a passage of some beauty (ii. 324); he takes the lightness and aerial nature of the Bird as a symbol of the aspiration of faithful spirits "*quorum jugis potissimum conversatio, ut Apostolus ait, in coelis est*" (see also Ps. cxxiii. 6 of the released soul). He refers to Bede who says "*Volucres sunt qui sursum cor habent, et coelestia concupiscunt*;" and who looks on the bird also as a sign of the resurrection. The faithful, like birds "*obviam Xti in aëre ex mortuis sunt ituri*." [Note the curious analogy of the Psyche-butterfly, and compare with it Hadrian's "*Animula vagula, blandula*," &c., as if addressed to a thing of uncertain flight.] Caged birds are occasionally found in paintings or other representations (Boldetti, p. 154, tav. vi.). They are supposed to represent the human soul in the prison of the flesh, or they may be emblems of the imprisonment of a martyr. Martigny describes a mosaic in the tribune of Sta. Maria in Transtevere, in Rome, where one of these cages is placed near the prophet Jeremiah, with inscription "*Christus Dominus captus est in peccatis nostris*;" and another by Isaiah, with the words "*Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium*"—referring thus to the Passion and the Incarnation of our Lord.

The symbolism of the cross by a bird's outspread wings is Tertullian's (*De Oratione*, c. 29 [al. 24]): Herzog conjectures that the pictures or carvings of birds with flowers and fruits combined are symbolic of Paradise. In the illustrations to Le Blant's *MSS. Chrétiennes de la Gaule* nondescript birds are found almost *passim*, generally in pairs on each side of the monogram of Christ, and almost always with the letters A α, which appear more frequently in the ancient documents of Christian France.

Pairs of drinking birds, peacocks (see a. v.), and also of conventional shape, are still to be seen among the most ancient fragments of Byzantine domestic sculpture in Venice (*Stones of Venice*, ii. 138, plate xi.). They may be carried back to the 11th or 12th century, perhaps: at

all events they are clearly decorative repetitions of the bird-symbols in the catacombs and earlier monuments. [R. St. J. T.]

**BIRRUS, al. BYRRHUS.** (Βῆρος, Βηρίον.) The word Birrus or Burrus was an old Latin word (Festus in voc.) equivalent to "rufus" or red, and identical probably with the Greek πυρρός. So St. Isidore seems to have thought, though late copyists, ignorant as most of them were of Greek, have made nonsense of his text. "Birrus a Graeco vocabulum trahit: illi enim birrum bibrium (? πυρρόν or Βηρίον) dicunt." (Orig. lib. xx. cap. 24.) No traces of the word, as the name of a garment, are to be found before the Christian era. The earliest known instance of such an use is in Artemidorus (early in 2nd century). Speaking of the significance of various articles of dress, when seen in dreams, he says that the Chlamys (a short military cloak), "which some call Mandyas, others Ephestris, others βηρίον, portends trouble and difficulty, and to prisoners under trial portends condemnation, by reason that it compasses about and confines the body" (Oneirocritica, lib. ii. cap. 3). Other writers identify it with the "amphibalus" (q. v.). "Birrus: amphibalus villosus," says Papias. And the author of the life of St. Deicolus (Acta SS. Ord. Bened. saec. 2, p. 105), "Birrum . . . quem Graeci amphibalum vocant." A fresco in the cemetery of Pontianus (Arimgh, Roma Sotterranea, tom. i. p. 383), in which are represented three laymen, SS. Milix, Abdon, and Sennes, and one ecclesiastic, St. Vicentius, will probably give a good idea of the difference between the Chlamys, the Birrus, and the Casula (or Planeta). St. Milix is represented wearing a Chlamys; Abdon and Sennes a heavy cloak reaching from the shoulders to the back of the knee, and in form differing but little from the Chlamys (see woodcut, p. 8). But the Birrus (if such be the garment intended) is provided with a hood, or cowl, for wearing over the head, as were most such outer garments when intended, as was the Birrus, for out-door use. And this hood is here represented as worn on the head. Such a rough Birrus as this was allowed to be worn by slaves under the provisions of the Theodosian Code (Lex 1, de Habitu, speaking of them as viles birri). And hence some have inferred, though wrongly, that the Birrus was at that time regarded as a garment suitable only for persons of the lowest class. This was not so. There were "viles birri," cheap cloaks, such as those here allowed as a privilege to slaves; there were "pretiosi birri," costly cloaks, such as those of which St. Augustine says that they might perhaps be fitting for a bishop, but not fitting for Augustine, "a poor man, as his parents had been poor before him" (Sermo de Diversis, 356, tom. v. p. 1579). From the 4th century onward the mention of the Birrus is not unfrequent, as of an out-door dress used alike by laymen (St. Augustin. De Verbis Apost. Serm. xviii. cap. 10) and by ecclesiastics.\* And in these later notices it is almost always

\* More particularly we hear of bishops wearing them (as an out-door dress), St. Augustine, above cited, and De vita Clericorum, Serm. ii.; Palladius, Hist. Lausac. c. 135; Gregor. Turon. Hist. Franc. lib. ii. c. 1. Many centuries later we read of St. Thomas of Canterbury wearing a Birrus (Anonymus de Miraculis S. Thomae Cantuariensis, apud Ducange).

referred to as being either a somewhat expensive dress, or as having a certain secular character attaching to it as compared with the dress worn by monks. Thus Cassianus (circ. 418 A.D.) describing the dress of monks, says (De Habitu Monach. lib. i. cap. 7) that they avoid the costliness and the pretence to dignity implied in the Planeta and the Birrus (Planetarum simul atque birrorum pretia simul et ambitionem declinant). And St. Isidore in like manner couples together the Planeta and the Birrus as garments which are not allowable to monks (Linteo non licet Monachum indui. Orarium, birros, planetas, non est fas uti, Regula, cap. 13). And this will account for the peculiar language of the 12th Canon of the Council of Gangra (a. 319), warning men against attributing too much importance to the monastic dress for its own sake, and despising those who wore "birri" (τοὺς βήρους φοροῦντας). Towards the close of the 6th century we find St. Gregory the Great using the term "Birrus albus" in speaking of the white "Christening-Cloak" worn by the newly baptized (Lib. vii. Indict. i. Epist. 5). And the word has many descendants in mediaeval Latin, such as Birettum, Birreta, Birrati (the Carmelite Monks, "Les Frères Barrez," were so called); and in old French, as "Bure" coarse cloth, Bureau (Fr. and Eng.), a table covered with coarse cloth, such as was used for official business (Menage). [W. B. M.]

## BIRTHDAYS OF SAINTS. [FESTIVALS.]

**BISHOP.** Names and titles. Origin of the office.

### I. Appointment.

1. Election.
  - a. Who elected. β. Who were eligible. γ. Time, mode, and place of election.
2. Confirmation.
3. Ordination.
  - a. Matter and form. β. Ordainers. γ. Place and time of ordination. δ. Register of ordinations.
4. Enthronization.
5. Oaths.
  - a. Profession of obedience to metropolitan. β. Oath of allegiance to the emperor or king. γ. Oath against simony.

### II. Removal.

1. By translation.
2. By resignation.
  - a. Simply. β. In favour of a successor. γ. So far as to obtain a coadjutor.
3. By deposition, absolute or temporary.
  - A. For what cause.
    - a. Of irregularities which vitiated the consecration ab initio. β. Of such as entailed deposition from the office already conferred. γ. Of such as also entailed excommunication. δ. Of such as entailed only suspension.
  - B. By what authority.

### III. Offices and Functions, in relation to the Church.

1. Spiritual, arising from his office as bishop.
  - a. Singly, in respect to his own diocese.
    - i. Ordination. ii. Confirmation. iii. Administration of sacraments. iv. Preaching. v. Discipline. vi. Creeds, liturgy, church worship, &c., and church affairs generally. vii. Visitation of Diocese. viii. Was the representative of the diocese: 1. in issuing *litterae formatae*; 2. in communicating with other dioceses. ix. Alms and church property. x. Patronage of benefices in the diocese. xi. Arbitration of lawsuits. xii. How far allowed to act out of his own diocese. xiii. A single bishop to each diocese.

and a single diocese to each bishop.  
xiv. Size of dioceses, their union, subdivision, &c. xv. Residence.

β. Jointly, in synod, in respect to his province.

γ. Collectively, in general council, in respect to the Church at large.

## 2. Temporal, conferred by the state.

i. Judicial authority in secular causes. ii. Became a member of state councils, witenagemots, &c. iii. Authority over subordinate civil magistrates. iv. Protection of minors, widows, prisoners, &c. v. Office of crowning emperor or king. vi. Not sworn in a court of justice. vii. Intercession for criminals. viii. Special legal protection of his life and property. ix. Exemption from jurisdiction of civil courts. x. Legal force of synodical decisions and canons. xi. But restricted also by law or canon in various ways: as, 1. In the disposing of his property by will; 2. In the reading of heathen or of heretical books; 3. in ways of living; 4. in the matter of fiscal burdens, military service, &c. xii. Of the education given in the bishop's house.

## 3. Social and honorary privileges.

i. Of bowing the head, kissing the hands and the feet, &c. ii. Mitre, ring, pastoral staff, and other vestments and insignia. iii. Of singing Hosannas before him. iv. Of the phrase "Corona tua." v. Of the bishop's throne, &c. vi. Bishops attended by two presbyters, &c.

## IV. Position, in relation to other bishops.

1. All in their inherent office equal—*litteras communicatorias*—order of precedence.
2. Archbishop, primate, metropolitan, exarch, patriarch, pope. (See under the several articles.)
3. Special cases, as in Africa and at Alexandria.
4. *Ἀρχιεπίσκοποι*.
5. *Chorepiscopi*.
6. *Suffragani*.
7. *Coadjutores*.
8. *Intercessores* and *inter-ventores*.
9. *Commendatarii*.

(See under the several articles.)

## V. Anomalous cases.

1. *Episcopi vagantes*, *σχαλίζοντες*, *ambulantes*, &c.
2. Monastic bishops.
3. *Antistes palatii*.
4. *Episcopus cardinalis*.
5. *Episcopus regionarius*.
6. Titular bishops, and in *partibus infidelium*.
7. *Episcopus ordinum*.
8. *Libra*, as the collective name of the suffragans of the see of Rome.
9. Lay holders of bishoprics.
10. *Episcopi Fatuorum—Innocentium—Puerorum*. (Authorities.)

BISHOP (*Ἐπίσκοπος*, a term adopted by the Christian Church through the LXX. usage of it, and first by the Hellenic portion of the Church, *ἐπισκοπή* [Acts i. 20] being formed from it to express the office) = in the Acts, in St. Paul's Epistles, and in the contemporary St. Clement of Rome (but wrongly so interpreted in the spurious Epist. of St. Ignatius to *Hero*, cc. iii. viii.), first an appellative (Acts xx. 28), and then an interchangeable title, of the *πρεσβύτεροι*, who ministered to the several Churches under the Apostles: but from the earliest years of the 2nd century, and from St. Ignatius onwards, the distinctive name, adopted as such in every language used

by Christians, Eastern (Syriac, ܐܡܪܝܬܐ);

Arabic, ٱسقف; Ethiopic, ܐܪܝܬܐ; Coptic,

ΠΙΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ) as well as Western (Scandinavian and Teutonic, as well as Latinized), of the single president of a diocese (*παρoικία*, *διοίκησις*), who came in the room of the Apostles, having presbyters, deacons, and laity under him, and possessing exclusive power of ordination, and primarily of confirmation, with primary authority in the administration of the sacraments and of

CHRIST. ANT.

discipline (St. Ignat. *ad Polycarp.* init. and v. vi. viii.; *ad Ephes.* i. ii.; *Martyr. S. Ignat.* § iii. *Martyr. S. Polycarp.* § xvi.; Polycrates ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24; Hadrian. Imper. *Epist.* ap. Vopisc. in *V. Saturnin.*; Hermas Pastor, *Vis.* iii. 5 *Murator. Canon.* p. 20, ed. Tregelles [of Pius, bishop of Rome]; Hegesipp. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23 [of St. James of Jerusalem], and iv. 22 [of Symeon of Jerusalem, A.D. 69]; Dion. Cor. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23 [of Dionysius (appointed by St. Paul), Publius, Quadratus, of Athens]; St. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 13, and ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 1; &c. &c. &c.):—"Episcopi" being thenceforth occasionally still called "presbyteri," but not *vice versa* [see, however, St. Clem. Alex. *Quis Dives Salvetur*, xlii. and Tertull. *de Praescript.* iii.]; see Pearson, *Vindic. Ignat.* ii. 13, pp. 547, sq. ed. Churton:—Τότε γὰρ τῶς ἐκοινώνουν ὀνόματι· λοιπὸν δὲ τὸ ἰδίᾳ ζῶν ἐκάστῳ ἀπονενέμῃται ὄνομα, Ἐπισκόπου Ἐπισκόπου, πρεσβυτέρου πρεσβυτέρου (St. Chrys. in *Phil.* 1, *Hom.* i.).

Called also *Apostolus* at first, but for so short a time as to leave little more than a tradition of the fact (Theodor. Mopsuest. in 1 *Tim.* iii. 1, ap. Rab. Maur. vi. 604; Theodoret in 1 *Tim.* iii. 1, in *Phil.* i. 1, ii. 25; Ambrosiast. in *Ephes.* iv. 12, and ap. Amalar. *de Off. Eccl.* ii. 13—N. T. usage, as in Rom. xvi. 7, 2 Cor. viii. 23, *Phil.* ii. 25, is indecisive).

Called likewise, but rarely after the fourth century, by names applied also to presbyters (cf. *προϊστάμενοι*, 1 *Thess.* v. 12 and see Herm. Past. *Vis.* ii. 4; ἡγούμενοι, Heb. xiii. 7, 17, and see Herm. Past. *Vis.* ii. 2, iii. 9, St. Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 21); as, e.g. *Προεστῶς* or *Προεστῶς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας* (of bishops, in Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23, vi. 3, 8, vii. 13, viii. 18, &c.; and probably in St. Greg. Nyss. *de Scopo Christian.* Opp. iii. 306; of presbyters, in St. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* i.; St. Basil. M. *Reg. Moral.* lxx. 36; of bishops and presbyters together, in *Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, can. 1; the word is ambiguous in St. Justin Mart. *Apol.* i. 67); *Προϊστάμενος* (of bishops, in Eusebius; or again, *προστάς*, Euseb. vi. 10, and so *ὁ προστάτης Ἀγγελος*, Oecum. et Areth. in *Apoc.* ii. 1; and *προστασία* of a bishopric, Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 4, vi. 35; and of the presbyterate in St. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 1; and St. Chrys. *Hom.* xi. in 1 *Tim.* iii.); *Πρόεδρος* (of bishops, in Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 2, &c.; *Conc. Trull.* cap. xxxvii.; and *προεδρία ἀποστολική* = a bishopric, Theodoret, iii. 14; of presbyters in Euseb. *H. E.* x. 4, Synes. *Epist.* xii.); *Praesidens* (Tertull. *de Cor. Mil.* iii., and *Senior* of both, id. *Apol.* 89); *Praepositus* (of bishops in St. Cypr. *Epist.* iii. ix. xiii., &c.; St. Aug. *de Trin.* xv. 26, *Epist.* xlii.; of presbyters, in St. Cypr. *Epist.* 3, 21); *Antistes* (of bishops repeatedly, as in Justinian's Code, St. Gregory the Great, &c. &c.; and so expressly Isidor. Hispal. *Etymol.* VII. xii. § 16; of presbyters, as in Ambrosiast. in 1 *Tim.* v.; of both bishop and presbyter, in St. Aug. *Serm.* 251 *de Poenit.*; but "antistes ordine in secundo" of a presbyter, by the time of Sidon. Apollin. *Epist.* iv. 11); and sometimes at first by the name itself of *Πρεσβύτερος* (St. Iren. *adv. Haer.* III. ii. 2, IV. xxvi. 2, and ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24; St. Clem. Alex., *Quis Dives Salvetur*, xlii., who calls the same person both *ἐπίσκοπος* and *πρεσβύτερος*); while St. Cyprian and St. Augustin, after 1 *Pet.* v. 1, call presbyters "com-presbyteri nostri;" and 4th century writers, as Ambrosiast. in 1 *Tim.* iii. 10, and the *Qu. Vet.*

et Nov. Test. ci. in Append. to St. Aug. III. ii. 93, describe the bishop as "primus presbyter" or "inter presbyteros," and speak of "compresbyteri" and "consacerdotes" (the use of "praelatus" for bishop exclusively is altogether modern; but "De Praelatorum Simplicitate" was a title of St. Cypr. *de Unit. Eccl.*; and the word is used for bishops and presbyters together in St. Greg. M. *Reg. Pastoral.*; it is used also of an abbat, as in *Conc. Suess.* ii. A.D. 853).

Called also, and from an early date, by names exclusively belonging to bishops specifically such, as Ἀρχων, or *Princeps, Ecclesiae, or Populi* (Origen, *cont. Cels.* iii.; Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 28, viii. 1; St. Chrys. *de Sacerd.* iii. 14; St. Jerome repeatedly; Paulinus, *Epist. ad Alys.* xlv.; Optat. i. p. 15, ed. 1679; and so ἀρχή for bishopric, as e. g. in Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 29); or *Princeps* simply (St. Jerome in *Ps.* xlv. and in *Esai.* lx. 17, &c.; and so in the 5th century [or more prob. the 6th or 7th] St. Patrick's canons so styled, in D'Achery, and in Haddan and Stubbs. *Counc.* ii.); *Rector*, as in Hilary the Deacon, in *Ephes.* iv., and Greg. M. *Reg. Pastor.*; *Praesul* (Pope Julius, *Epist. ad Euseb.* ap. Constant, i. 382 [see Du Cange], and so *Praesulatus* = *Episcopate* in e. g. Cassiodor.); Προηγούμενος and Πρωτοκαθεδρῆτης (Herm. Past. *Vis.* iii. 9); Πάπας or *Papa* (especially, at first, in Africa, Dion. Alex. *ad Philem.* in Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 7; Tertull. *de Pudic.* xiii.; Letters of St. Cyprian, St. Augustin, Sidon. Apollin. &c., and in St. Jerome, Prudentius, Sulp. Severus, &c.—compare also *Abuna*, in the Church of Abyssinia), used down to a period later than Charlemagne (e. g. in Walafr. Strab. *de Reb. Eccl.* vii., about A.D. 840, and *Eulog. Cordub.* about A.D. 850) of all bishops (Bingh. II. ii. 7; Casaubon, *Exercit.* xiv. § 4; Thomassin, I. i. 4, 50; Suicer; Du Cange); and in the East (as still in the Greek and Russian Churches) of presbyters also, and especially of abbats (but Goar's distinction, πάπας = a bishop, and παπᾶς = one of the lower orders of clergy, seems a refinement), but gradually restricted by usage in the West to the bishop of Rome (see *Conc. Tolet.* A.D. 400, Labbe, ii. 1227; *Conc. Rom. Palm.* A.D. 503; and Ennodius, *Lib. Apologet.*, of the same date; *Conc. Constantin.* A.D. 681, Act. 1 and 2; Gieseler refers to Jo. Dieckmann, *de Vocis Papae Aetatibus*, Viteberg. 1671), and finally and absolutely so limited by Greg. VII. in a Council of Rome, A.D. 1073 (Baron. *Martyrol.* Jan. 10); and in the East to the bishop of Alexandria (Thomassin, I. i. 50, § 14, Du Cange; but that it was granted formally to St. Cyril of Alexandria by Pope Celestine [Niceph. xiv. 34] is a manifest and confessed [Baron. as above] fiction);—sometimes, again, in the 5th century, Ἀγγελος (St. Aug. *Epist.* 142; St. Ambrose in 1 *Cor.* xi.; St. Jerome in 1 *Cor.* xi.; Socrat. iv. 23; from Rev. i. ii., and compare Gal. i. 8, iv. 14, and possibly 1 *Cor.* xi. 10); and so, in Saxon England, God's "Bydels," or messengers ("Bydelas," *Laws of Ethelred*, vii. 19, and of *Canute*, 26);—and Ἐφοπος, and the office Ἐφορεία (Philostorg. iii. 4, 15); and, in the 8th and later centuries, Latinized into *Speculator* (in *Conc. Suess.* iii. A.D. 862); and varied by Anglo-Saxon "pompositas," in episcopal signatures to charters, into *Inspector, Superspector, Visitator, Inspector Plebis Dei, Katascopus Legis Dei*, &c. &c. (Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* passim);—called also *Patriarcha* (so

Dupin, *Dissert.* i. § 5; and Suicer; the name being first confined to the higher bishops, acc. to Suicer, by Socrates v. 8, c. A.D. 440), yet only rhetorically so called in St. Greg. Naz. (*Orat.* 20, 30, 41) and St. Greg. Nyssa. (*Orat. Funer. in Malet.*; and see Bingh. II. ii. 9), but as an ordinary name under the Gothic kings of Italy (Athalaric, *Epist. ad Joan. Pap.* in Cassiodor. ix. 15).

Called also by names indicative of their functions; as, ἱεράρχης (Pseudo-Dion. Areop. *Eccl. Hierarch.* c. v.; &c.);—*Sacerdos* or *Pontifex*, often of bishops exclusively (Taylor, *Episc. Assert.* § 27); and so Ἀειroupύλα for bishopric, e. g. in Euseb. vi. 29:—*Summus* or *Maximus Pontifex*, or *Summus Sacerdos* (ironically in Tertull. *de Pudicit.* i., but seriously, *de Bapt.* xvii.; and of all bishops as such, in St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustin, Sidon. Apollin. *Qu. in Vet. et Nov. Test.* ci. &c.; *Conc. Agath.* A.D. 506, can. 35, and down to the 11th century [see Du Cange], the analogy of the Jewish Ἀρχιερεὺς occurring as early as St. Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i.);—*Pater Patrum* and *Episcopus Episcoporum*, but rhetorically only (Sidon. Apollin. *Epist.* vi. 1, after Pseudo-Clem. *ad Jacob. Epist.* 1); while in Africa, where the power of the metropolitan developed more slowly, St. Cyprian (p. 158, Fell) in *Conc. Carth.* declares that no one in Africa "Episcopum se Episcoporum constituit;" and *Conc. Carth.* A.D. 256 (in St. Cyprian), and *Conc. Hippon. Reg.* A.D. 393, can. 39, in *Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric.*, forbid expressly the assumption of such titles as "Princeps Sacerdotum, aut Summus Sacerdos, aut aliquid hujusmodi," and command even the Primate of Africa to be called by no other title than that of "primae sedis Episcopus;"—or again from the 4th century (but the terms are in substance in St. Ignatius, *ad Ephes.* vi. Ἐπίσκοπον ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν Κύριον, *ad Trall.* i. Τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς Χριστῷ; and St. Cypr. *Epist.* 55, 63; and cf. 2 *Cor.* v. 20), *Vicarius Christi—Domini—Dei* (St. Basil. M. *Constit. Monast.* 22; Opp. ii. 792 [ὁ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ὑπέχων πρόσωπον]; St. Ambrose in 1 *Cor.* xi. 10; Pseudo-Dion. Areop. *Eccl. Hier.* ii. 2; *Qu. Vet. et Nov. Test.* 127, in App. ad Opp. St. Aug. iii.);—and from a considerably earlier date, *Vicarius* or *Successor Apostolorum* (Hippolyt. *Haer. Proem.* p. 3; St. Iren. *adv. Haer.* iii. 3; St. Cypr. *Epist.* 62, 69; Firmilian in St. Cypr. *Epist.* 55, 75; *Conc. Carth.* iii. in St. Cyprian, A.D. 256, can. lxxix.; St. Jerome, *Epist.* liv. al. lvii.; Pseud. Dion. Areop. *Eccl. Hier.* ii. 2; and in substance St. Aug. in *Ps.* xlv. 16, *De Bapt. c. Donat.* vii. 43, *Serm.* cii. c. 1, *De Util. Credendi*, § 35, *Epist.* 42, &c.);—also Μεσίτης (Origen, St. Basil M., St. Chrys., *Apost. Constit.* iv. 26, &c., in Cotel. *ad Constit. Apost.* vol. i. p. 237; and μεσίτην Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, τοῦτο γὰρ ἴσως ὁ ἱερεὺς, St. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* i.); but by St. Augustin's time it had become expedient to condemn the calling a bishop by the name of "Mediator" (*Cont. Parmen.* ii. 8, Opp. ix. 35);—Ποιμὴν, *Pastor* (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 36, St. Greg. Naz. and St. Hilar. passim; *Conc. Sardic.* A.D. 347, can. vi.; Theodoret, iv. 8, &c. &c.; so in the English Prayer-book, "The bishops and pastors of Thy flock;" "pastores ovium," in St. Cypr. of presbyters, but not *pastor* simply: so Taylor, *Episcop. Asserted*, § 25: see, however, the use of ποιμαίνειν, in Acts xx. 28):—extravagantly denominated Θεὸς Ἐπίγειος μετὰ Θεὸν, and by other extreme designations, in *Apost.*



*Constit.* ii. 26; and at a later date, *Thronus Dei* (*Conc. Tolet.* xi. A.D. 675, can. 5, and *Curloving. Capitul.*, quoted by Du Cange).

Designated also by the titles of,—1. *Apostolicus*, applied to all bishops (and their sees called “*sedes Apostolicæ*”) as late as Charlemagne (*St. Aug. Epist.* 42; *Greg. Tur. H. F.* ix. 42; *Venant. Fortun. Poem.* iii.; *Formulae* in Marculfus; Gunthram in *Conc. Matic.* ii. A.D. 585; and see Casaubon, *Exercit.* xiv. § 4; and Thomassin, I. i. 4); restricted at one time to metropolitans (Siricius, A.D. 384–398, *Epist.* iv. c. 1; Alcuin, *de Div. Off.* xxxvii.); but gradually turned into a substantive appellation of the bishop of Rome (as in *Rup. Tuit. de Div. Off.* i. 27, A.D. 1111); while a council of the 11th century is said to have excommunicated an archbishop of Gallicia for so styling himself [APOSTOLICUS]; and used in the 12th and following centuries as the Pope’s ordinary designation (*e. g.* in the English Year-books, “*L’Apostole*,” or “*L’Apostole*”; Spelman’s further statement—that he was called also *Apostolus*—seems a mistake);—2. *Beatissimus*—*Sanctissimus*—*Reverendissimus*—*Deo Amabilis*—*Θεοφιλέστατος*—*Ἀγιότατος*—*Μακαριώτατος*—*Ὁσιώτατος*—*Αἰδεσιμώτατος* (in the Councils, Justinian’s Laws, superscriptions to letters, as *St. Cyprian’s*, *St. Augustin’s*, &c. &c.; and *Socrates [H. E. vi. Proem.]* apologizes for not calling the bishops, his contemporaries, *Θεοφιλεστάτους ἢ ἁγιωτάτους ἢ τὰ τοιαῦτα*);—3. *Dominus*—*Δεσπότης*—*Sanctitas Tua*—*Ἡ Σὴ Χρηστότης, Μακαριότης, Ἀγιότης* (like authorities);—4. “*Dei gratia Archiepiscopus*” first occurs in England of Archbishop Theodore (*Counc. of Hatfield*, A.D. 680, in *Baed. H. E.* iv. 17), and so on in general of his successors (*e. g.* of Nothelm, in *Kemble, Cod. Dipl.* 65), &c.;—5. Lastly, “*Servus Servorum Dei*” is found as early as *Desiderius*, bishop of Cahors, A.D. 650, who so styles himself (*Thomassin*, I. i. 4, § 4).

For the nature and institution of the Christian ministry as such—in so far as it is common to bishops and presbyters—see ORDERS, PRIEST. The special episcopal office as above described,—consisting in a presidency over the clergy and laity of a particular diocese, with a veto, and with a sole power of ordination,—and whether regarded (with later schoolmen) as one order with the presbyterate, on the ground of the powers of the ministry common to both, differenced only by peculiar and additional powers belonging to bishops, or (according to the earlier and more common view) as a distinct order, on the ground of those additional powers,—finds its actual institution implied and recorded in the N. T.: 1. in the position of *St. James of Jerusalem* (*Acts* xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18, *Gal.* ii. 9), affirmed also by all antiquity to have been bishop of Jerusalem;—2. in the appointment by *St. Paul*, when his “measure” (*1 Cor.* x. 16) grew too large for his own personal supervision, of single officers, with powers of ordination (*1 Tim.* iii. 13, *Tit.* i. 5) and jurisdiction (both in church worship, *1 Tim.* ii. 1–12, and over all church members, including presbyters, *1 Tim.* v. 1–22, *Tit.* i. 5, ii.), and probably of confirmation (*1 Tim.* v. 22), in the Apostle’s stead (*1 Tim.* i. 3, *Tit.* i. 5), *i. e.* of bishops in the later sense of the term (removeable, like later bishops, and, as it seems, actually removed, when the needs of the Church in the particular cases required it),—viz. Timothy

at Ephesus, and Titus in Crete, certainly (and so the Fathers with one accord); and, not improbably, Epaphroditus at Philippi (*Phil.* ii. 25, and so *Theodoret* in *1 Tim.* vi. 1), and Archippus at Colossae (*Col.* iv. 17, *Philem.* 2; and so *Ambrose* in *Col.* iv. 17); to whom the Fathers add a great many more (see a list in *Apost. Constit.* vii. 47, and among moderns in *Andrewes, Epist. i. ad Pet. Molin., Opp. Posth.* pp. 185, 186);—3. in the “*Ἀγγελοι* of *Rev.* i.–iii. [ANGELS OF CHURCHES], who were real individual persons, although symbolized as stars (*Rev.* i. 20), just as the Churches they governed were real Churches, which are symbolized likewise as candlesticks; and who are proved to have been bishops, (i.) by the analogy of *Gal.* i. 8, iv. 14; (ii.) by their standing for and representing their several Churches; (iii.) by the fact (see further on) that *St. John* is expressly and specially stated to have appointed bishops from city to city in these very regions; (iv.) by the current interpretation of the term from early times, as in *St. Jerome*, *St. Ambrose*, *St. Aug.*, *Oecumen.* and *Arethas* in *Apocalyp.* &c.; to which may be added the probable mention (the reading of *Rev.* ii. 20 being not altogether certain) of the wife of one of them. And these intimations find their counterpart and confirmation, (1) in express statements of early Fathers, as (i.) *St. Clem. Rom. ad Cor.* i. 44, that the Apostles, having appointed presbyter-bishops and deacons in the several Churches in the first instance, proceeded, as a further and distinct step, in order to provide for the continuance of the ministry without schisms or quarrels, to appoint some further institution, whereby the succession of such presbyters and deacons might be kept up, as first by the Apostles themselves, so after them by other chosen men; *i. e.* in other words, instituted the order of bishops: *Κατέστησαν [οἱ Ἀπόστολοι] τοὺς προειρημένους [ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους], καὶ μετὰ ἐπινομήν δεδοκασιν, ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ’ ἐκείνων [i. e. the Apostles themselves] ἢ μετὰ ὑφ’ ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, κ.τ.λ.* (ii.) The *Muratorian Canon* (p. 17, ed. Tregelles), “*Quarti Evangeliorum Johannis ex decipolis*” [*John the Apostle as distinguished from John Baptist*], “*cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis*”;—*Tertullian* (*adv. Marc.* iv. 5), “*Ordo episcoporum ad originem recens in Joannem stabit auctorem*”;—*St. Clement Alex.* (*Quis Dives Salvetur*, xlii. *Opp.* p. 959, and in *Euseb. H. E.* iii. 25), “*Ἀπῆει [sc. St. John when returned from Patmos to Ephesus] παρακαλούμενος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ πλησιόχωρα τῶν ἔθνων, ὅπου μὲν Ἐπισκόπους καταστήσων, ὅπου δὲ ὅλας Ἐκκλησίας ἀρμόσων, ὅπου δὲ κλήρω ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος σημαινόμενων*”;—*St. Jerome* (*Catal. Scriptt. Eccl.* ix.), “*Novissimus omnium scripsit [Joannes] Evangelium, rogatus ab Asiae Episcopis*”;—testifying to the appointment by *St. John* of bishops from city to city, and to their existence as a settled and established order from his time. (2) In the fact, that bishops in the later sense are actually found in every Church whatsoever, from the moment that any evidence exists at all; and that such evidence exists, either simply to an actual bishop at the time, or more commonly to such a bishop as in succession to a line of predecessors traced up to



Apostles, and with no intimation of such episcopate being anything else but the original, appointed, and unbroken order: and this, in the case of Antioch, and of Asia Minor generally, as early as the first decade of the 2nd century, in other cases within the first forty years of that century; in others, as *e. g.* Ephesus, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Athens, within the last quarter of the first—*i. e.* either close upon the death of the last Apostle, or within about a quarter of a century of it, or long before it happened—a space of time within which, taken at the longest, it is historically impossible that so great a revolution (if it had been one) should have been not only accomplished but forgotten. A detailed list of these cases may be found in an *Excursus* by Professor Lightfoot *On the Philippians*. The only discoverable exceptions,—that of the Church of Corinth when St. Clement wrote to it, and that of Philippi when St. Polycarp wrote to it,—are so few and so temporary, as to prove merely that the whole of the needs of a rapidly growing Church could not be supplied at once, and that circumstances (as *e. g.* the martyrdom perhaps, or the deportation, of an Apostle) might leave this or that Church temporarily unprovided with a bishop. In the words of Ambrosiaster (*i. e.* Hilary the Deacon), it so happened, “quia adhuc rectores Ecclesiis non omnibus locis fuerant constituti” (in 1 *Cor.* xi. 2). And there certainly were bishops in both the places named immediately afterwards. Nor, further, (3) was there any substantial difference in the office itself from that subsequently so styled. St. Clement of Rome, for instance, so absolutely represented his Church as to write in the name of that Church; and is described by Hermas Pastor (*Vis.* ii. 4) as officially communicating in its name with foreign Churches; and is placed by St. Irenaeus and others as one in a series of bishops, all so called in the same sense. And although the succession of the heads of the school at Alexandria (for which see Bing. III. x. 5) may well have been more important in point of influence than that of the bishops of that see, it did not interfere with the office and succession of those bishops, which is carefully recorded (as is that of all the principal sees) by Eusebius. Nor again does St. Irenaeus, who speaks of a “succession” also of “presbyters,” and indeed calls bishops themselves occasionally “presbyters,” know of any difference between the bishop of Rome of his own time (assuredly a bishop in the later sense) and the succession of single heads of the Church of Rome, whom he names in order from Apostolic times down to that same bishop.

The Episcopate then is historically the continuation, in its permanent elements, of the Apostolate. And, accordingly, the reasons assigned for the actual appointment of the episcopate are: (1) as given by St. Paul himself, to take the place of the Apostles (*Tim.* i. 3; *Tit.* i. 5), and for the better maintenance of the faith (*ib.*), and in order to a due ordination of the ministry (*Tit.* i. 5). To these the Fathers add, (2) other reasons, drawn apparently from their own experience of the benefits of the episcopate: as St. Clem. Rom. and St. Jerome, who allege it to have been instituted as a preventive of schisms; and St. Irenaeus and Tertullian, a little later than the first named, who regard it as a safeguard of the faith (and see 1 *Tim.*

i. 3; *Tit.* ii. 1); and St. Cyprian, a little later still, who chiefly dwells upon it as a bond of unity; in which point of view St. Ignatius also had regarded it at the beginning. The further suggestion hazarded by St. Jerome—that it was an afterthought of the Apostles, suggested to them by the schisms at Corinth—is inconsistent with the fact that bishops existed before those schisms. And the gradual spread of the institution is best explained by the sensible and natural remark of Epiphanius, that *Οὐ πάντα εὐθὺς ἡδυνήθησαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι καταστήσαι*, and that presbyters and deacons could administer a church for a while, until *χρεῖα γέγονε* (*Haer.* lxxv. § 5; *Opp.* i. 908). Bishops, who came in place of Apostles, could not, indeed, have existed both coincidentally and contemporaneously with those in whose place they came, but only as the growth of the Church, and the removal of the Apostles, required and made room for them. A theory started recently (by Rothe, *Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche*, 354–392, quoted by Lightfoot) of a special and formal Council of the Apostles, which among other things instituted episcopacy, as one among a series of “second ordinances,” seems to rest upon insufficient grounds (see Lightfoot’s *Excursus* to the Philippians, before quoted), and to transform a really apostolic origin into a single definite and formal apostolic act: like the parallel but ancient tradition respecting the composition of the Creed. On the other hand, space of time literally shuts out the much older theory, viz. that there was a period at the beginning when each Church was governed by a college of presbyters, until “ecclesiastical authority” established a bishop over each college, in order to put an end to schisms, and notably to those at Corinth; unless, with St. Jerome, the originator of it, we take the “ecclesiastical authority” to mean the Apostles themselves, and the period in question to be reduced therefore so as to fall within the lifetime of the Apostles, and so refer it simply to the colleges of presbyters, who during such lifetime did undoubtedly govern the several Churches under the Apostles: thus rendering the hypothesis at once very true and equally innocent, and in effect identifying it with the contemporary statement of St. Clem. Rom. before quoted. Later repetitions of St. Jerome’s theory, and often of his words, may be found in writers of the Western Church (see quotations in Morinus, *de Sac. Ord.* III. ii. 11 sq.) down to the 10th or 11th century. But these are of course simply St. Jerome over again. Contemporaneously however with him,—yet (as it should seem) chiefly with the view of repressing the presumption (not of bishops but) of deacons, or (as in Augustin’s case) in order to turn a courteous compliment to a presbyter (viz. St. Jerome),—the original identity both of the names, and of the offices, of bishop and presbyter, became a current topic: *e. g.* in St. Aug. *Epist.* 19 *ad S. Hieron.*; Ambrosiast. in 1 *Tim.* iii., and in *Ephes.* iv.; *Qu. Vet. et Nov. Test.* ci.; Anon. in 1 *Tim.* iii. 17, in App. ad *Opp.* S. Hieron.; *Lib. ad Rustic. de VII. Grad. Eccl.* in the same Append.; *Sedul. Scot. in Epist. ad Tit.* i.; *Isid. Hispal. de Offic. Eccl.* vii.; and of course St. Jerome himself. And while St. Augustin assigns the “*usus Ecclesiae*” as the ground for the subsequent appropriation of the names (“*honorum vocabula*”), St. Jerome (as already said) affirms of the office itself, as li-

tinct from that of presbyter, that it arose "ex Ecclesiae consuetudine magis quam dispositionis Dominicae veritate" (which means, apparently, that it rests upon no written words of our Lord Himself); asserting, at the same time, that it was the one absolutely necessary preventive of schism, and in effect that the Apostles had established it as such; and also (in common with all the others above quoted) that presbyters, whatever else they could do, could not ordain. Another view, of a like date with St. Jerome's, probably represents the general facts of the case with very fair accuracy, viz. that contained in Hilary the Deacon, in *Ephes.* iv.: "Ut cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est et evangelizare et baptizare et Scripturas in ecclesia explanare: ubi autem omnia loca circumamplexa est Ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt et rectores et cetera officia in Ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de clero auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, praesumere officium quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum." In other words, under pressure of necessity, before the Church could be fully organized, and before a longer duration had stiffened it into orderly system and regular law, acts were allowed and held good to any one, which were properly and primarily the office of particular officers, viz. of "Rectores," i. e. bishops, and of an ordained clergy; those acts being done of course not against—but owing to circumstances, not by—the clergy. And those which are here specified, moreover, are such only as the Church has ever held to be capable of being discharged by any Christian man, so that they are done in unity with the Church. Even Tertullian's well-known words do not make it plain, whether he meant to affirm that, in case of absolute necessity, laymen might formally administer the Eucharist, or whether not rather that in such a case the will would be accepted for the deed. For this, however, and like questions, see BAPTISM, LAITY.

1. The first step towards making a bishop was his

#### 1. Election.

a. *Who elected.*—The election of bishops [*χειροτονία* sometimes, commonly *ἐκλογή*] pertained from the beginning to the neighbouring bishops, and (except in the obviously special cases of a bishop sent to the heathen [as e. g. Frumentius by St. Athanasius to the Abyssinians,—Socrat. i. 19, Theodoret, i. 23,—or St. Augustine to the Saxons by St. Gregory], or of one sent to a diocese overrun with heresy or schism), to the clergy and laity of the particular Church. But the relative rights of each class of electors were apparently determined, not by express enactment, but by Apostolic practice, defended in the first instance by Jewish precedent—"Traditione Divina [Num. xx. 25, 26] et Apostolica observatione" [Acts i. 15, vi. 2] (St. Cypr. *Epist.* lxxvii. Fell),—and subsequently upon grounds of common sense and equity,—as that, "Deligatur episcopus praesente plebe, quae singulorum vitam plenissime novit" (*id. ib.*); or that, "Nullus invitis detur episcopus" (Caelestin. *Epist.* ii. 5); or that, "Qui praefuturus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur" (Leo M. *Epist.* lxxxix); or again, Παρὰ πάντων τῶν μελλόντων ποιμαίνεσθαι ψηφισμένοις (*Conc. Chalc.* A.D. 451; Act. xi. Labbe, iv. 698). The judgment [*κρίσις*, *judicium*] i. e. commonly the choice, and the ratification [*κύρος*],

naturally inclined to the bishops, so that for the first 500 years such elections were ordinarily ruled by them. The approval [*συνευδόκησις*, *consensus*] and the testimony to character [*μαρτύριον*, *testimonium*] were the more proper office of the clergy and laity of the diocese itself. While the formal appointment [*κατάστασις*, which included the ordination] belonged exclusively, as to the Apostles at first, so to the *ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες* (St. Clem. Rom. *ad Corinth.* i. xlv.) who succeeded them, i. e. the bishops. But both classes of electors are found (so soon as we have any evidence to the point, i. e. from the middle of the 3rd century) taking the initiative in different cases. And the clergy, and the people, alike, possessed the right of giving a "suffragium de personâ," as well as a "testimonium de vitâ" (Andrewes, *Resp. ad Bellarm.* xiii.); a right, however, alternating in point of fact between a choice and a veto, and fluctuating with circumstances.

The germ of such a mode of election is found in the N. T. The *κατάστασις* (Acts vi. 3, Tit. i. 5, and compare Heb. v. 1, viii. 3, and St. Matt. xxiv. 45, &c.) was throughout reserved to the Apostles or their successors; but the "choice" of the persons and the "testimony" to their character pertained to the people in the case of the seven deacons (Acts vi. 2, 3); the former to St. Paul and the latter to "the brethren," in that of Timothy (Acts xvi. 2, 3); St. Paul alone (unless so far as the "presbytery" joined in the act) both chose and sent Timothy and Titus respectively to Ephesus and to Crete (1 Tim. i. 3, 18; Tit. i. 5); the whole of the disciples appear to have chosen the two between whom lots were to be cast in the case of St. Matthias (Acts i. 23), which is however an exceptional case; while the word *χειροτονία* (Acts xiv. 23) leaves it undetermined whether St. Paul and Barnabas only ordained, or did not also choose, the Pisidian presbyters. The earliest non-Scriptural witness, writing however before the N. T. canon was closed, St. Clement of Rome (as above), agrees precisely with the N. T., in terms as well as substance. He reserves the *κατάστασις*, as by express Apostolic appointment, to the Apostles and their successors, but *συνευδοκησάσης τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πᾶσης*: speaking, it is true, of the case of *ἐπίσκοποι* who were presbyters, but in language which must almost certainly apply also to that of bishops properly so called. In conformity also with this, we find, after A.D. 69, and upon the martyrdom of St. James, the remaining Apostles and personal disciples of Christ and His surviving relatives, meeting together and joining in the appointment of Symeon the son of Clopas to the bishopric of Jerusalem (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 11). The theory, that at first the "senior presbyter" succeeded as of right to the episcopate, and that at some early time a change was effected, "prospiciente concilio," such that thenceforth "meritum, non ordo," should select the bishop, seems to be only a 4th century hypothesis, based upon what no doubt was a frequent practice, of Ambrosiaster, i. e. Hilary the Deacon, in *Eph.* iv. 12; who however is thinking of the election, not of the consecration, of a bishop, whose specific office also he distinctly recognizes in the passage itself.

The natural course of things, and the increasingly fixed and detailed organization of the Church, gradually defined and modified the ori-

ginal practice thus inaugurated: 1. by introducing the metropolitan (and, further on, the patriarch), as a power more and more preponderant in such elections; and 2. by regulating the rights of the comprovincial bishops; both points formalized into canons by the great Nicene Council; 3. by substituting for the unavoidable disorder and evil of a strictly popular suffrage (*ὄχλοις*), an election by the chief only of the laity (a change begun by the Councils of Sardica, A.D. 347, and Laodicea, A.D. 365, and finally established by Justinian); still further restricted in practice in important cases to a nomination by the emperor alone; and changed from the middle of the 6th century into a general right of royal consent, converted commonly, and as circumstances allowed, in the case of the European kingdoms, and partially in that of the Eastern emperors also, into a right of royal nomination, concurrent with, but gradually and in ordinary cases reducing to a mere form, the old canonical mode of election. The substitution, further, in the West, of the clergy of the cathedral as the electoral body, and in the East of the comprovincial bishops solely, in place of the old "plebs et clerus" of the diocese, or at the least of the cathedral town, hardly dates before the 9th and 10th centuries.

The classical passages for ante-Nicene times are principally from St. Cyprian, and belong to Africa, A.D. 252–254.—"Diligenter de traditione Divina et Apostolica observatione servandum est et tenendum (quod apud nos quoque et fere per provincias totas tenetur), ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem cui praepositus ordinatur, episcopi ejusdem provinciae proximi quique convenient, et episcopus deligatur plebe praesente, quae singulorum vitam plenissime novit, et uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversatione prospexit" (*Epist.* lxvii. addressed to the Spanish Churches).—"Instruit et ostendit (Deus) ordinationes sacerdotales nonnisi sub populi assistentis conscientia fieri oportere" [scil. Num. xv. 25, 26; Acts i. 15, vi. 2]; "ut plebe praesente vel detegantur malorum crimina vel bonorum merita praedicentur; et sit ordinatio justa et legitima, quae omnium suffragio et judicio fuerit examinata" (*id.* *ib.*).—"De universae fraternitatis suffragio, de episcoporum qui in praesentia convenerant judicio" (*id.* *ib.*).—"Episcopo semel facto, et collegarum et plebis testimonio et judicio comprobato" (*id.* *Epist.* xlv.).—"Cornelius factus est episcopus [Romae] de Dei et Christi Ejus judicio, de clericorum pene omnium testimonio, de plebis quae tunc affuit suffragio, et de sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio" (*id.* *Epist.* lv.).—"Post Divinum judicium, post populi suffragium, post co-episcoporum consensum" (*id.* *Epist.* lix.).—"Episcopo Cornelio in Catholica Ecclesia de Dei judicio, de cleri ac plebis suffragio, ordinato" (*id.* *Epist.* lxviii.).—In which passages, *suffragium*, *judicium*, *testimonium*, *consensus*, appear to be used without precise discrimination, either in regard to meaning, or to the several classes of electors and their respective functions, and to express little more than St. Clement of Rome's vaguer term, *συνευδόκησις*.

The same rule is testified in the East by the joint evidence of Origen,—"*Requiritur in ordinando sacerdote praesentia populi, ut sciant omnes et certi sint, quia qui praestantior est ex omni*

populo, qui doctior, qui sanctior, qui in omni virtute eminentior, ille eligatur ad sacerdotium; et hoc, adstante populo, ne qua postmodum retractatio cuipiam, ne quis scrupulus resideret" (*Hom.* vi. in *Levit.*, Opp. ii. 216, ed. Delarue);—and of the cases mentioned by Eusebius; as, e. g., Δόξαν τοῖς τῶν δμῶρων Ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶσω, to elect Dios bishop of Jerusalem, c. A.D. 190 (*H. E.* vi. 10);—Alexander, ordained bishop of Jerusalem, A.D. 214, μετὰ κοινῆς τῶν Ἐπισκόπων οἱ τὰς πέριξ διεῖπον Ἐκκλησίας γνώμης (*ib.* 11):—Τὸν πάντα λαὸν . . . Ἀξίον ἐπιβοῆσαι [cried out that Fabian was worthy to be bishop of Rome], τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀπάντων χειροτονίας ἕνεκεν τῆς τοῦ μέλλοντος διαδέχεσθαι τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας συγκεκροτημένων (*ib.* vi. 29, A.D. 236):—and, similarly, the neighbouring "bishops, presbyters, deacons, and the Churches," assembled at Antioch A.D. 269 or 270, deposed Paul of Samosata, and appointed Domnus bishop of Antioch in his place. The *Apostolic Canons* (can. i.), and *Apostolic Constitutions*, viii. 27, require three or at least two bishops to the χειροτονία, which at least involves the election, of a bishop. The former (can. xxxiv.) take also the further step of requiring reciprocally the γνώμη τοῦ πρώτου (the metropolitan), and the γνώμη πάντων, to all church acts. And the latter (viii. 4) enjoin that the people shall be thrice asked if the candidate is worthy. *Apostolic Canon* lxxvi. further enjoins, that no bishop, in order to gratify a brother or any other relative, shall εἰς τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, ὃν βούλεται, χειροτονεῖν. And the Council of Ancyra (A.D. 314, can. xviii.) proves the power of the people, as the last quoted canon does that of the bishops, by providing for the case of one "constituted" (κατασταθεὶς) a bishop, but rejected by the diocese (παροικία) to which he had been consecrated, such rejection being apparently assumed to be conclusive as regarded the particular diocese; although in *Apost. Can.* xxxvi. it is ordered, on the contrary, that the bishop in such a case shall "remain." The case of Alexandria in early times was confessedly exceptional, and arose from the seditious character of the Alexandrians (Epiphan. *Haer.* lxi. 11). The presbyters of that city by themselves chose one of their own number (acc. to the well-known words of St. Jerome), and that immediately, i. e., as it should seem, without waiting for the voice of the people, or for that of the bishops of the patriarchate (see also the strange story in Liberatus, *Breviar.* xx.). The Christian (and Jewish) practice, "in praedicandis sacerdotibus qui ordinandi sunt," was also recognized, and copied, in the case of provincial governors, by the emperor Alexander Severus (Lamprid. in *V. Alex. Severi*).

The Council of Nice (A.D. 325) recognized and established the power of the comprovincial bishops, and the authority of the metropolitan, by requiring (can. iv.), if it can be had [*προσῆκει μάλιστα*], the personal presence of "all the bishops of the province (ἐπαρχία)," in order to the appointment (καθίστασθαι) of a bishop; but if this cannot be had, then of at least three, συμψήφων γινομένων καὶ τῶν ἀπόντων καὶ συντιθεμένων διὰ γράμματα, the ratification (κύρος) being reserved to the metropolitan; and (can. vi.) by voiding elections made χωρὶς γνώμης μητροπολίτου. The Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, recognizes also both people, provincial bishops, and metropolitan, by voiding (can. xvi.) an elec-



tion made *δίχα τελείας συνόδου* (defined to be one "at which the metropolitan is present"), *καὶ εἰ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἔλοιτο*. It repeats also in substance (can. xix.) the 4th Nicene canon; while (in can. xviii.), providing for the case of a bishop refused by his diocese, it refers the final decision to the synod. And it voids (can. xxiii.) an appointment by a single bishop of his own successor, referring such election, according to *τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν θέσμον*, to the synod and judgment of the bishops, whose right it was. The Council of Sardica, A.D. 347 (can. ii.), cancels an election made by the "clamour" of the people, with suspicion of bribery or undue influence; and (can. vi.) also requires the consent of the metropolitan [*τοῦ ἐξάρχου τῆς ἐπαρχίας*]. That of Laodicea, A.D. 365, assigns the choice (*κρίσις*) to the metropolitan and *οἱ περίξ Ἐπίσκοποι* (can. xii.); and, on the other side, takes the first step against popular elections by forbidding (can. xix.) *τοῖς ὕχλοις ἐπιτρέπειν τὰς ἐκλογὰς ποιεῖσθαι τῶν μελλόντων καθίστασθαι εἰς τὴν ἱερατεῖαν*. The Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, informs Pope Damasus of the validity of the election of Nectarius to the see of Constantinople, as having been made "by the common consent of all, in the presence of the emperor, with the applause of clergy and people:"—of the like validity of that of Flavian to Antioch, because "canonically elected by the assembled bishops" *τῆς ἐπαρχίας καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως, πάσης συμφήφου τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*:—and of that of Cyril to Jerusalem, because, similarly, *παρὰ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας χειροτονηθέντα* (*Epist. Synod. ap. Theodoret. v. 9*). Of the Councils of Carthage, the Second (so called), A.D. 390 (can. xii.), requires the consent of the primate; the Third, A.D. 397 (can. xxxix.), three bishops at least, appointed by the primate; the Fourth, A.D. 398 (can. i.), the "consensus clericorum et laicorum," and the "conventus totius provinciae episcoporum, maximeque metropolitani auctoritas vel praesentia." The Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431 (can. xix.), secures their right to the bishops of Cyprus as against the patriarch of Antioch, but as not being within his patriarchate. And that of Chalcedon, A.D. 451 (Act. xvi. Labbe, iv. 817), requires the consent of all or the major part of the bishops of the province, *τὸ κύριον ἔχοντος τοῦ μητροπολίτου*; and affirms the authority of the metropolitan also in Act. xiii. (ib. 713), and in can. xxv. (ib. 768). Similar testimony to the necessity of the metropolitan's consent is borne by Pope Innocent I., "Extra conscientiam metropolitani episcopi nullus audeat ordinare episcopum" (*Epist. i. c. 2, A.D. 402 x 417*); by Boniface I. (*Epist. iii. A.D. 418 x 422*); by Leo the Great (*Epistt. lxxxix. xcii.*); by Pope Hilary (*Epist. ii. A.D. 461 x 468*): by *Conc. Taurin.* can. i. A.D. 401; and by *Conc. Arrelat.* ii. can. v. A.D. 452.

On the other hand, these enactments respecting the comprovincial bishops, and the growing power of the metropolitans, did not extinguish the rights of the clergy and people; who remained a real power for many centuries still, and continued so in name (in the West) down to the 12th century. The Council of Nice itself, in dealing with the Meletian schism, required the choice of the people (*εἰ ὁ λαὸς αἰροῖτο*), as well as the sanction of the Alexandrian metropolitan (*συνηψυφίζοντος καὶ ἐπισφραγίζοντος τοῦ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας Ἐπισκόπου*), in case a reconciled

Meletian bishop was appointed to a see (*Epist. Synod. ap. Theodoret. i. 9, Socrat. i. 9*). St. Athanasius, immediately after the council, was elected bishop of Alexandria, *ψήφῳ τοῦ λαοῦ πάντος* (St. Greg. Naz. *Orat. xxi.*), and by the acclamation and demand of *πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς τῆς καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας* (*Epist. Synod. Alex. ap. Athanas. Apol. ii.*); and Peter, who succeeded him, was chosen first by the priests and magistrates, and then accepted by the people (*ὁ λαὸς ἅπας ταῖς εὐφημίαις ἐδηλοῦν τὴν ἡδονήν*, Theodoret, iv. 20); statements which indicate that Alexandrian elections did not then at any rate possess any exceptional character. So also Pope Julius (in S. Athan. *Apol.*) condemns the intrusion of Gregory into the see of Alexandria, as being, 1. A stranger; 2. Not baptized there; 3. Unknown to most; 4. Not asked for by either presbyters, bishops, or people. Later still, the rights of the "clerus" and "plebs" are testified by a continuous chain of witnesses: as, *e. g.* by the Councils of Antioch, A.D. 341, can. xviii., and the 4th Council of Carthage, A.D. 398, can. i. (both above quoted), and *Cod. Eccl. African.* can. xiii., *ὅπῃ πολλῶν*—a multis—*χειροτονεῖσθαι*: and again, (1) in the West, by Pope Siricius (A.D. 394 x 398, *Epist. i. c. 10*, "Si eum cleri ac plebis evocaverit electio," and this either to presbyterate or episcopate); Pope Zosimus (A.D. 417, *Epist. iii.*); Pope Caelestinus (A.D. 422 x 432, *Epist. ii. c. 5*, "Cleri, plebis, et ordinis"); Leo the Great (A.D. 440 x 461, *Epist. lxxxiv.* "Cleri plebisque," and the metropolitan to decide a disputed election;—*Epist. lxxxix.* "Vota civium, testimonia populorum, honoratorum arbitrium, electio clericorum;"—*Epist. xcii.* "A clericis electi, a plebibus expetiti, a provincialibus episcopis cum metropolitani iudicio consecrati"); Pope Symmachus (A.D. 498 x 514, *Epist. v. c. 6*): Gregory the Great (*passim*, see quotations in Thomassin, II. ii. 10); by the form itself of election in the *Ordo Romanus* (*Bibl. PP. x. 104*); by the system of *Episcopi Interventores* or *Intercessores*, or, later, *Visitatores*, sent down to the vacant see to superintend the election, and not only existing in Africa, but repeatedly mentioned in the letters of Gregory the Great, of Hincmar, &c. &c. [INTERVENTORES; VISITATORES]; by St. Jerome ("Speculator Ecclesiae vel episcopus vel presbyter, qui a populo electus est," in *Ezech.* lib. x. c. 33; *Opp.* iii. 935); Optatus ("Suffragio totius populi," lib. i.); Sulpic. Severus (*de V. B. Martini*, c. vii. of the election of St. Martin of Tours, A.D. 371); Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist. lib. viii. Ep. 5, 8, 9*, of the election of the metropolitan of Bourges, A.D. 472); St. Augustin (*Epist. cx. Opp. ii. 601*, of the election of his own successor); by Council of Orleans II. A.D. 533, can. vii.,—of Clermont in Auvergne, A.D. 535, can. ii.,—of Orleans III. A.D. 538, can. iii.;—and (2) in the East, by the case of Eustathius, compelled to accept the see of Antioch, A.D. 325, by *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ ἱερεῖς καὶ ἅπας ὁ λαὸς ὁ φιλόχριστος, ψήφῳ κοινῇ* (Theodoret, i. 7); by that of Eusebius to the see of Caesarea in Pontus, A.D. 362, *ὁ δῆμος ἅπας . . . ἀκοντα συναρπάσαντες . . . τοῖς Ἐπισκόποις προσήγαγον, τελεσθῆναι τε ἡξίου καὶ κηρυχθῆναι, πειθοῖ βίαν ἀναμίξαντες* (St. Greg. Naz. *Orat. xix.*, condemning also the carrying such elections *κατὰ φρατρίας καὶ συγγενείας*); by that of Nectarius to the see of Constantinople, A.D. 381, *κοινῇ ψήφῳ τῆς συνόδου* (Sozom. vii. 8), but also

ασθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ (Socrat. v. 8); by that of St. Chrysostom, A.D. 397, to Constantinople, whom ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀρκάδιος μεταπέμπεται, to make him archbishop, ψηφίσματι κοινῷ ὁμοῦ πάντων, κληρῶν τε φημι καὶ λαοῦ (Socrat. vi. 2); to which may be added the recognition by Leo the emperor (A.D. 457 × 474) of the κληρὸς καὶ τὸ κοινὸν (Evagr. iii. 12); and abundant other evidence, of which some will occur further on.

The Laodicean Council, however, A.D. 365 (as above quoted), took the first step towards the ultimate practical extinction of really popular elections; although elections by acclamation, held to be not irregular as springing from a kind of supposed Divine inspiration, or again by cries of *Dignus* or Ἀξίος, still occurred: as, e.g. in the cases mentioned by St. Ambrose, St. Augustin, Philostorgius, Photius, cited by Bingham, IV. ii. 6; in the case of St. Ambrose himself (Paulin. in *V. S. Ambros.*; Theodoret, iv. 7; Sozom. vi. 24); in that of Sisinnius at Constantinople, A.D. 426 (Socrat. vii. 26). But a general suffrage was from that time gradually superseded as the ordinary rule by the votes of the rich or high in station. And successive councils recognized the practice, up to the time when Justinian enacted it by express law. In the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, Meinnon, bishop of Ephesus, complains that his opponent sought to be elected by the votes of τὸ σέμνον βουλευτήριον καὶ τοὺς λαμπροτάτους (*Epist. Cathol. in Conc. Ephes.* Labbe iii. 764). Leo the Great and the Roman Council, on occasion of Flavian's condemnation by the *Latrocinium Ephesinum*, A.D. 442, write in his favour, "Clero, honoratis, et plebi, consistenti apud Constantinopolim" (*Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, p. i. c. 22; Labbe, iv. 47). And the same Leo also mentions the "honorati" expressly, although not exclusively, *Epist.* lxxxix. cvi. Stephen of Ephesus (*Conc. Chalced.* Act. xi.; Labbe, iv. 687) claims to have been appointed by forty bishops of Asia, ψήφῳ καὶ τῶν λαμπροτάτων καὶ τῶν λογάδων καὶ τοῦ εὐλαβεστάτου πάντος κληρῶν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν πάντων τῆς πόλεως πόσης. And in Act. xvi. of the same council (Labbe, *ib.* 618), the right of election is said to belong to the clergy, the κληρικοὶ καὶ λαμπρότατοι ἄνδρες, and the bishops, "all or most," of the province. Again (*ib.* p. iii. c. 21, Labbe, *ib.* 890), the people of Alexandria and its "honorati et curiales et naucleri," are said to have demanded Timothy as their bishop; while liberatus (*Breviar.* xiv. xv.) affirms that Proterius, on the other hand, the bishop upon whom Timothy was intruded, was elected by the "nobiles civitatis," which he also expresses as "decreto populi." Finally, Justinian established by direct law that the κληρικοὶ καὶ πρῶτοι τῆς πόλεως should choose three persons, whenever a vacancy occurred, of whom the ordainer [i. e. the metropolitan] should ordain the one who in his judgment was the best qualified (*Novell.* cxxiii. c. 1, cxxvii. c. 2, and *Cod.* lib. i. tit. iii. *De Episcopis*, l. 42). The 2nd Council of Arles, A.D. 452, had previously adopted a different plan for attaining the same end; viz. that the bishops should choose the three candidates, out of whom the "clerici vel cives" were to select one (can. liv.). And the Spanish Council of Barcelona subsequently, A.D. 599, so far varied the rule of Justinian as to enact (after the pattern of St. Matthias' election) that the decision should be made by lot, between two or three,

elected by the "clerus et plebs," and presented to the metropolitan and bishops (can. iii.). The common phrase in St. Gregory the Great's Letters is "clerus, ordo, et plebs;" or, "clerus et nobiles, ordo et plebs."

From the time of Justinian onwards, both in East and West, the chief power in the election of bishops, on the Church side, inclined to the metropolitan, but as choosing with the comprovincial bishops from three candidates elected by the principal people, clergy and laity, of the see; the whole process, however, being summarily overruled upon occasion by the emperors; as also in course of time, and much more continuously and absolutely, by the Frankish, Spanish, and Gothic kings. Before this time, indeed, both Theodosius the Great, and Theodosius the Younger, had interfered by an absolute nomination in three several appointments to the see of Constantinople (Socrat. vii. 8, 29, 40), for obvious political reasons. And Valentinian had interfered in a like manner to enforce the popular demand for the consecration of St. Ambrose to Milan (Theodoret, iv. 6). But such interference was confessedly irregular, had been expressly condemned by *Can. Apostol.* xxx., and was in earlier times protested against, as, e.g. by St. Athanasius (*Epist. ad Solit. V. Agentes*, § 51, Opp. i. 375, demanding, Ποῖος κανὼν ἀπὸ παλατίου πέμπεσθαι τὸν Ἐπίσκοπον). But from the 6th century onwards, in the case of at least important sees, the emperors, although leaving the old forms of election intact, appear to have commonly interfered to make (or at the very least to sanction) nominations themselves. St. Gregory the Great treats the sole imperial nomination in such cases as a matter of course. Instances will also be found, both from him and from later times, down to Heraclius, Justinian II., Philippicus, Constantine Copronymus, A.D. 754, in Thomassin, II. ii. 17; while the 2nd Council of Nice, A.D. 787, protests against such lay interference uncompromisingly (can. iii. Πᾶσαν ψήφον παρὰ ἀρχόντων, Ἐπισκόπου, ἢ πρεσβυτέρου, ἢ διακόνου, ἄκυρον μένειν). Saracen conquerors, as might be expected, interfered in a like manner: as, e.g. in Syria, A.D. 736, in the case of the patriarch of Antioch (Thomassin, II. ii. 17, § 7). But it remained for Nicephorus II., A.D. 963 × 969, to enact as an universal law, that no bishop whatever should be elected or consecrated ἄνευ τῆς αὐτοῦ γνώμης (Cedren. p. 658, and so also Zonaras); a law however which did not last long. Finally, in the East, the custom settled down into an election by the clergy, and ultimately only by the comprovincial bishops, of three, of whom in such cases as the see of Constantinople the emperor, but ordinarily the metropolitan, selected one (Morinus, ii. 193). The ancient form of election however, as modified by Justinian, still held its ground for a considerable time. In the case, e.g., of Epiphanius of Constantinople, A.D. 528, "the emperor (Justin) and empress, the magnates, the bishops, priests, monks, and the most faithful people," concurred (*Epist. Epiphani.* inter *Epistt. Hormisd. Papae* post *Epist.* lxxi., Labbe iv. 1534). In that of Sophronius of Jerusalem, A.D. 634, "the clergy, monks, faithful laics, in a word all the citizens" (Sophron. *Epist. ad Sergium Constantinop.* ap. *Conc. Constantin.* A.D. 680, Act. xi.; Labbe, vi. 854). In that of Stephen of Larissa, who was chosen out of three, elected by the "clerus"



and "populus," and by those "quorum adensus erat actui necessarius," A.D. 531, the "sancta provincia synodus et totius civitatis possessores omneque corpus Ecclesiae"; and (he adds), "communi omnium testimonio ordinatus sum" (Holsten. *Collect. Rom.* pp. 6, 7). While the council in Trullo, A.D. 691, speaks of an election by all the bishops of the province as the "ancient custom" (can. xxxix.): and Joh. Antioch. (*Nomocanon. tit. vii.* in *Bibl. Jur. Can.* p. 610) rules that a bishop must be elected by the metropolitan, and by all the bishops of the province, either present or sending a written consent; and that such elections (*ἐκλογάς*) must not be entrusted to the multitude: and, lastly, Zonaras and Balsamon, glossing the older canons by the custom of their own time, exclude the "clerus et plebs" altogether, and refer the whole matter to the metropolitan and bishop, the former choosing the "dignissimus" out of three, elected by the bishops without the presence of the metropolitan (according to Symeon of Thessalonica), and presented by them to him (see the form at length in *Sym. Thessal.* ap. Morin. ii. 149, sq.). Probably the emperor really determined the choice, wherever his power enabled, and his policy inclined, him to do so; while as a rule he left ordinary cases to the ordinary methods. See, however, Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* i. 136, 169.

In the West, a like retention of the old form of election ran parallel with a gradual increase (less, apparently, through circumstances, in France than elsewhere) of the power of the metropolitan, and with the practical assumption of a sole nomination, especially in France, by the king. In France, the Councils of Orleans II., A.D. 533, canons i. viii., of Clermont, A.D. 535, can. ii., of Orleans III., A.D. 538, can. iii., specify the "clerici, cives," bishops of the province, and metropolitan, but require the consent of *all* the comprovincial bishops only in the election of the metropolitan himself. But in the Council of Orleans V., A.D. 549, canons x. and xi., occurs first the significant phrase, "cum voluntate regis;" although still "juxta electionem cleri ac plebis," and with consecration by the metropolitan and comprovincial bishops, and with a special enactment that "nullus invitis detur episcopus, sed nec per oppressionem potentium personarum . . . cives aut clerici inclinentur;" and although also checked almost immediately by the Council of Paris III., A.D. 557, can. ii., which voids the "principis imperium," if against the will of metropolitan and bishops. Absolute nominations by the kings, however, occur earlier: e.g. under Theodoric of Austrasia, A.D. 511 x 534 (Greg. Tur. *de SS. Patrum VV.* c. iii.). And compare also the appointment to the see of Léon, of Paulus Leonensis, by Childebert (*V. S. Paul. Leon.*), A.D. 512. The issue between royal, and metropolitan or ecclesiastical, nominations was directly raised A.D. 563, in the case of Emerius, bishop of Saintes; whom the king (Charibert) forced upon the see in defiance of the metropolitan, as being his predecessor Lothaire's nominee (Greg. Tur. *H. E.* iv. 26). And Lothaire II.,—in confirming a re-enactment of can. ii. of the second Council of Paris, made by the Council of Paris V. A.D. 615 (can. i.), and again re-enacted at the Council of Rheims, A.D. 625, can. xxv., and at the Council of Chalons, A.D. 649, can. x.,—requires to such elections, made "a clero et populo," the sub-

sequent "ordinatio principis," with no other qualification than that "certe si de palatio eligitur [episcopus], per meritum, &c., ordinetur" (Mansi. x. 543). Thenceforward, the action of the people of the diocese, under the Frankish kings, is commonly termed, not "electio," but "flagitatio" or "petitio," or is expressed as "suppliciter postulamus," addressed to the king. Regular forms for the donation of a bishopric by the king, nominally "cum consilio episcoporum et procerum"—in Marculphus, and in Sirmond (*Conc. Gallic.* ii. Append.; see also the "electio quo modo a clero et a populo eligitur episcopus in propria sede cum consensu regis archipraesulisque omniumque populo" [sic], in Morinus, *de Ordin.* ii. 304)—exhibit the choice, even when made by the clergy and people, and sanctioned by the metropolitan, as ultimately and in effect made by the king. And in point of fact, the bishops were so nominated. Carloman, however, and Pipin (*Conc. Liptin.* A.D. 743, and *Conc. Suess.* A.D. 744), professed to restore liberty of election to the Church. And a new set of "formulae" occurs accordingly (in Baluz. ii. 591, and in Sirmond), as "usurpatae post restitutam electionum libertatem." And Charlemagne, upon the advice of Pope Adrian, that he should leave episcopal elections to the "clerus et plebs" according to the canons (*Conc. Gallic.* ii. 96), issued a capitulary, A.D. 803 (*Conc. Aquisgran.* c. ii., repeated by Louis, A.D. 816, *Capit. Aquisgran.* c. ii.), consenting "ut episcopi per electionem cleri et populi secundum statuta canonum de propria dioecesi eligantur;" but he did so as granting a grace, not as admitting a right. And as the bishops in point of fact continued to be appointed by the emperors (see e.g. Baluz. *ad Conc. Gall. Narbon.* p. 34, and *ad Capit.* ii. 1141), and no choice could be made save by the emperor's special permission (so Gieseler, and this as late as *Conc. Valentin.* A.D. 855, can. vii.), and special privileges of free election were given to particular churches (Baluz. *ib.*), which imply the universality of the opposite practice,—not to add also the much disputed but after all possibly genuine grant by Adrian to Charlemagne (in Gratian, *Dist.* 63, c. 22) of an absolute right to the appointment and investiture of all bishops and archbishops in all provinces of his empire,—it is obvious that the change was more in name than in reality (as indeed the "formulae" themselves, as above in Sirmond, &c., shew), until at least the renewal of the contest after the middle of the 9th century in the time of Hincmar. On the other hand, the power of the metropolitan and the right of free election were continually reasserted, although with little effect (see the councils above quoted, from that of Orleans in 533 to that of Rheims in 649); until under Charlemagne's immediate successors, whose right to nominate is actually recognized at the Council of Paris VI. A.D. 829 (can. xxii.), and that of Thionville in 845 (*Capit. Car. Calv.* tit. ii. c. 2). &c.; and this, although Carloman and Pipin had both of them professedly restored the rights of the metropolitan as well as freedom of election (A.D. 742, *Capit.* c. i., and A.D. 755, can. ii.). See the whole subject carefully treated in Henry C. Lea's *Studies in Church History*, pp. 81-90 (Philad. U. S. 1869).

In Saxon England, king, witan, and metropolitan appear to have predominated, although

the first gradually became as a rule the real nominator. At the same time, the canonical form of election was kept up; and when the king was weak and the Church strong, it occasionally became a reality. The Kentish and Northumbrian kings agreed in choosing Wighard, but accepted Theodore, A.D. 668, as Archbishop of Canterbury, at the hands of the pope, upon Wighard's unexpected death at Rome (Baed. *H. E.* iii. 29, iv. 1). Northumbrian kings and witenagemots adjudicated the various disputes about Wilfrid's sees. And Theodore and a synod of bishops chose and consecrated Cuthbert to the see of Lindisfarne, A.D. 684, but "sub praesentia Regis Ecgrifi" (*ib.* iv. 28). Wihtrid's privilege, A.D. 696 × 716, in its genuine form refers to Kent and to abbats and presbyters, not to England at large, or to bishops (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* iii. 238–247). And Agatho's privilegium to the "congregatio" of the monastery of St. Paul's, A.D. 673 × 681, to elect their own bishop, is a forgery (*ib.* 161). On the other hand (although no doubt contemporary both with the Carolingian nominal restoration of liberty of election in France, and with the breaking up of the Northumbrian kingdom), Alcuin's letters, "ad Fratres Eboracenses," of Aug. 796, before the election of Eanbald to York, distinctly affirm, that "hucusque sancta Eboracensis Ecclesia in electione sua inviolata permansit," adding, "videte ne in diebus vestris maculetur;"—imply that Alcuin himself had a voice in the election;—and urgently exhort the York clergy to elect a proper person, if he himself cannot come in time for the election (*Epist.* 54, 55, Migne; 48, 49, Froben.). "Professiones," also, of a little later date, distinctly assert an election by the diocese: *e. g.* that of Beornmod of Rochester, A.D. 805, or a year or two earlier,—*"electus ab Ethelardo archiepiscopo et a servis Domini in Cantia constitutis"* (in Wharton, *A. S.*)—and that of a bishop of Lichfield (probably Kynferth, A.D. 833 × 836), *"quoniam me tota Ecclesia provinciae nostrae sibi in episcopatus officium elegerunt"* (*Cotton MSS. Cleop. E.* 1),—and that of Helmstan of Winchester, A.D. 838, *"a sancte et Apostolice sedis dignitate et ab congregatione civitatis Wentanae necnon Ethel[wulfi] regis et totius gentis occidentaliū Saxonum ad episcopalis officii gradum electus"* (*ib.*)—and that of Deorlaf of Hereford, A.D. 857 × 866, *"quoniam me tota congregatio Herefordensis Ecclesiae sibi in officium episcopale elegerunt"* (*App. ad Text. Roff.*). In a little later times, we find Odo made archbishop, A.D. 942, by the "regia voluntas," followed by the "assensus episcoporum" (Will. Malm. *G. P. A.* 1.); Dunstan, A.D. 960, made so by Edgar (*ib.*), but with an election also by acclamation according to his *Life*; and Living, A.D. 1013, "suffragio Regis Ethelredi" (W. Malm. *ib.*). And in the time of Eadward the Confessor, Aelfric is elected by the monks of Canterbury, but set aside by the king in favour of Robert, made archbishop "regis munere" (*V. Eadw.* ed. Luard, pp. 399, 400). By that time the election by the "clerus et plebs" of the diocese, so far as it still survived at all, had gradually shrivelled up into an election by the clergy, and by the clergy of the cathedral,—a process materially accelerated by the monastic character of the chapters, coupled with the monastic privilege of choosing their own abbats,—but which was also perpetually set aside

by the necessity of the royal consent, running naturally into a right of royal nomination. See also the evidence collected by Freeman, *Hist. of Norm. Conq.* ii. 61, 117, and 571–577. The case of the see of Rochester was exceptional, the archbishop of Canterbury claiming, and frequently obtaining, the right of nomination to that see, as against the crown, until the days of King John.

In Spain, the power of the bishops in the election of the kings preserved and extended also their own power, and among other things, in episcopal elections. The Council of Toledo X., A.D. 656, for instance, elected a metropolitan of Braga (the former bishop being deposed for incontinence) without consulting the diocese. See however Dunbar, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal*, bk. ii. c. ii., who rather leans towards the royal power in such elections. Ultimately the king and the metropolitan of Toledo seem to have acquired practically a joint power of nomination. *Conc. Tolet.* XII., A.D. 681, empowers the archbishop of Toledo, as primate, to consecrate at Toledo, *"quoscunque regalis potestas elegerit et jam dicti Toletani episcopi iudicium dignos esse probaverit"* (can. vi.). And see also the history of King Witiza, A.D. 701–710. Martin of Braga too, distinctly says that the people are not to elect bishops.

In Italy, also, the royal power gradually overruled without superseding the older canonical form of election. But that the latter continued in all ordinary cases, save that the metropolitan's influence and veto had grown more powerful, is palpable by St. Gregory the Great's letters. On the other hand, Odoacer, A.D. 476–483, with the "advice" of Pope Simplicius, forbade the election of a bishop of Rome without his (the king's) consent. And the interference of (the Arian) Theodoric in the disputed election of Pope Symmachus, A.D. 501, was both asked for and submitted to; although it called forth Ennodius' Apologetic Letter, and also a protest from the *Conc. Palm.* A.D. 502, which declared Odoacer's law invalid. Yet the Gothic kings continued to exercise such a power. Theodoric appointed successive popes during his reign, down to Felix III. A.D. 526 (Greenwood, *Cathed. Pet.* iii. c. 4). And Athalaric issued regulations about papal elections on occasion of the outrageous simony that attended the accession of John II. A.D. 533 (*Cassiod.* ix. 15). And not only so, but the Greek emperors, when they recovered Italy, exercised it likewise; so that, *e. g.* Gregory the Great, A.D. 590, after due election by the "clerus, senatores, populusque Romanus," still required the "praeceptio" of the emperor Maurice to complete his election (Jo. Diac. in *V. Greg. M.* lib. i. ep. 39, 40). And Pipin and Charlemagne fell heirs to the like "jus et potestatem eligendi pontificem:" for all which see details under POPE. The election of the pope indeed remained like other elections of the kind, until the decree of the *Conc. Rom.* of A.D. 1059 under Nicholas II. (for which see Gieseler, ii. 369, Eng. transl.); which itself was a change analogous to the contemporary changes elsewhere.

In brief, then, during this period, the old canonical diocesan election continued throughout the Western Church as the right and proper mode of election; but (1) was in itself gradually absorbed into a vote of the cathedral clergy ("electio

clericorum est, petitio plebis," is the utmost allowed in Gratian, *Decr. i. dist. 62*), and (2) was overruled perpetually by the royal nomination, which itself was concurrent with but commonly superseded the consent of metropolitan and com-provincial bishops.

For special conditions attending the election of metropolitans, and for the relation of the metropolitans to the patriarchs in the matter, see METROPOLITAN, PATRIARCH.

At what times special questions arose respecting the qualifications which gave a right to vote in the election of a bishop—how such questions were determined—in what way votes were actually taken—and other questions of like detail—there remains no evidence to shew: except that we may infer from such accounts as *e. g.* that in Synesius, *Epist. 67*, that where there was a popular assembly ordinarily acting in other and civil matters, such assembly acted also, at first, in the choice of a bishop. Synesius' description also illustrates forcibly the *ἐχλοὶ* of the Laodicean Council, the women being preeminently noisy on the occasion, and even the children.

*B. Who were eligible.*—Such being the electors, it follows next to consider the qualifications of those who were to be elected. The general disqualifications for the clerical office—such as, *e. g.* digamy, clinic baptism, heretical baptism, the having been a demoniac, or done public penance, or lapsed, the occupations of pleader, soldier, play-actor, usurer, the being a slave, or illegitimate, the having any of his own immediate family still unconverted heathens, &c. &c.—will be best treated under the art. ORDERS, HOLY, or the several subjects themselves. The special conditions of eligibility for a bishopric were, (1) that the candidate should be, acc. to *Apost. Constit. ii. 1*, fifty years of age; but acc. to *Conc. Neocaes. A.D. 314* (requiring 30 for a presbyter, on the ground of St. Luke iii. 23—a canon adopted by the Church universal), and acc. to similar later canons (*Arelat. IV. A.D. 475*, can. i., *Agath. A.D. 506*, can. xvii., *Aurelian. III. A.D. 533*, can. vi., *Tolet. IV. A.D. 581*, can. xx.; and again, Justin. *Novell. cxxxiii. 1*; and again, Charlemagne at Aix, A.D. 789, *Capit. i. 49*, and at Frankfort, A.D. 794, can. xlix.), the age of 30 only was insisted on. And so also Balsamon. Photius in one place (ap. Suicer) says 35, which is likewise Justinian's rule in another *Novel* (cxxvii. 1). And Siricius and apparently Zosimus (*Sir. ad Himer. Epist. 1 § 9*, *Zos. ad Hesych. Epist. 1, § 3*, a detailed *lex annalis* in both cases) place the minimum at 45. Special merits, however (St. Chrys. *Hom. in 1 Tim. x. xi.*), and the precedent of Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 12; and see St. Ignat. *ad Magnes. 3*, speaking of νεωτερικὴ τάξις = a youthful appointment), repeatedly set aside the rule in practice (see instances in Bingham, II. x. 1): as *e. g.* in the well-known case of St. Athanasius, apparently not much more than 23 when consecrated bishop. (2) That he should be of the clergy of the church to which he was to be consecrated,—ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπαρκέλου—"de proprio clero" (so Pope Julius, *Epist. ad Orient. ap. S. Athanas. Apol. ii.*; Pope Caelestinus, *Epist. ii. c. 4*; Pope Hilary, *Epist. i. c. 3*; Leo M., *Epist. lxxxiv.*; Gregory the Great repeatedly; and as part of the old canonical rule, the *Capit.* of Charlemagne above quoted, "de propria dioecesi"):—a rule likewise repeatedly broken under pressure

of circumstances, special merit in the candidate, the condition of the diocese itself, &c., and by translations, so far as translations were allowed; but one also enforced by the nature of the case so long as the voice and testimony of the people of the diocese was an important element in the election, and on like grounds disregarded in proportion as metropolitan, or still more royal, nominations became predominant. St. Jerome's well-known statement about Alexandria seems to speak of it as almost a special privilege of that see from early times: which it plainly was not. If the presbyter chosen was not of the diocese itself, the consent of his own bishop was requisite (*Conc. Nicaen. can. xvi. &c. &c.*; and see below, III. 1, a, x.). (3) That he should be a presbyter, or a deacon at the least, and not become a bishop *per saltum*, but go through all the *interstitia* or several stages;—also at first an ecclesiastical custom, grounded on the fitness of the thing (*e. g.* Pope Cornelius "non ad episcopatum subito pervenit sed per omnia ecclesiastica officia," &c., and again, "cunctis religionis gradibus ascendit," St. Cypr. *Epist. 52 al. 55*; and similarly Greg. Naz. *Orat. xx.* of St. Basil; and so repeatedly St. Gregory the Great, objecting to a layman being made bishop), but turned into a canon by *Conc. Sardic. A.D. 347*, can. x. (καθ' ἑκάστον βαθμὸν, κ.τ.λ., and naming reader, deacon, priest; the object being to exclude neophytes), and by some later provincial councils (*Conc. Aurelian. III. A.D. 538*, can. vi.; *Bracar. I. A.D. 563*, can. xxxix.; *Barcinon. II. A.D. 589*, can. iii.): and so Leo the Great (admitting deacons however on the same level with priests), "Ex presbyteris ejusdem Ecclesiae vel ex diaconibus optimus eligatur" (*Epist. lxxxiv. c. 6*):—broken likewise perpetually under special circumstances (see Morin. *de Sacr. Ordin. III. xi. 2*). Instances of deacons, indeed, advanced at once to the episcopate, are numerous, and scarcely regarded as irregular, beginning with St. Athanasius (see a list in Bingham, II. x. 5; but St. Greg. Naz. *Orat. xxi.* speaks of St. Athanasius as πᾶσαν τὴν τῶν βαθμῶν ἀκολουθίαν διεξελθόν). But the case of a reader also is mentioned in St. Aug. (*Epist. cxlii.*), and of a subdeacon in Liberatus (*Breviar. xxii.*). And although expressly forbidden by Justinian (*Novell. vi. 1, cxxiii. 1, cxxxvii. 1*) and by *Conc. Arelat. IV. A.D. 455*, can. ii., yet the well-known cases of St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, St. Martin of Tours, St. Germanus of Auxerre, and others, prove the admissibility of even a layman, if under the circumstances—as, *e. g.* by reason of the sudden acclamation of the people—such a choice was held to be "voluntate" or "judicio Dei" (Hieron. in *Jonam. iii. Opp. iii. 1489*; Pontius, in *V. S. Cypr.*; Paulin. in *V. S. Ambros. iii.*; &c.). Instances may also be found in the Alexandrian church (Renaudot, ap. Denzinger, *Kit. Orient. 145, 146*). And the rubric in the Nestorian Pontifical expressly admits the possibility of a bishop elect being a deacon as well as a presbyter (Denzinger, *ib. 146*). At the same time there is the well-known case of the patriarch Photius, deposed, because ordained on five successive days respectively monk, reader, subdeacon, deacon, priest, and on the sixth day bishop (*Conc. Nicaen. II. A.D. 787*, can. iv.). See also under ADVOCATE OF THE CHURCH. But then (4) such candidate was not to be a neophyte (1 Tim. iii. 6), or a heathen recently baptized, who had not



yet been tried (*Apost. Can.* lxxx.; *Conc. Nicaen.* can. ii.; *Conc. Laodic.* A.D. 365, can. iii.): but one converted at least a year before (*Conc. Aurelian.* III. A.D. 538, can. vi.); or who had been a reader, or a subdeacon, or (acc. to one copy) a deacon for a year (*Conc. Bracar.* II. A.D. 563, can. xx.); or acc. to yet another provincial council (*Epaon.* A.D. 517, can. xxxvii.), at the least "praemissa religione." Yet here too special circumstances were held to justify exceptions; as in the case of St. Cyprian himself, "adhuc neophytus" (*Pont. ib.*); of St. Ambrose and of Eusebius of Caesarea in Pontus, not yet baptized (*Theodoret.* iv. 7, *Socrat.* iv. 30, *Sozom.* vi. 24, *St. Greg. Naz. Orat.* xix.); of Nectarius, τὴν μυστικὴν ἐσθῆτα ἐτι ἡμφιεσμένος, &c. (*Sozom.* vii. 8). And all these are cases of immediate consecration; the later practice of ordaining to each step on successive days, in order to keep the letter while breaking the spirit of the rule, dating no earlier than the case of Photius above mentioned (*Bingh.* II. x. 7). (5) *Apost. Can.* xxi. permits the consecration of one made a eunuch by cruelty, or born so; and (*ib.* lxxvii.) of one maimed or diseased in eye or leg: but (*ib.* lxxviii.) forbids it in the case of a deaf or dumb person. (6) Lastly, the bishop who was appointed *Interventor* to a see during the vacancy was *pro hac vice* ineligible to that see. [INTERVENTORES.] It remains to add (7) that the candidate's own consent was not at first held to be requisite, but that in many cases consecration was forced upon him ἄκωρτα; as in the instances in *Bingh.* IV. vii. 2: to which may be added others, as, e.g. that of Eusebius of Caesarea in Pontus, A.D. 362 (*Greg. Naz. Orat.* xix.). And *Apost. Can.* xxxvi. orders the excommunication of a bishop who refuses the charge of the people assigned to him. But first St. Basil (*ad Amphiloeh.* x.) exempts those who in such a case had "sworn"—ὁμνύοντες μὴ καταδέχεσθαι τὴν χειροτονίαν. And afterwards the emperors Leo and Majorian forbade forced ordinations altogether (*Novel.* ii. in *Append. ad Cod. Theodos.* vi. 34). And similarly Pope Simplicius (*Epist.* ii.), and *Conc. Aurelian.* III. A.D. 538 (can. vii.). At the same time the law of Leo and Anthemius (*Cod. Justin.* lib. i. tit. iii. *De Episcopis*, l. 31) describes the "nolo episcopari" temper proper to one to whom a bishopric is offered—"ut quaeratur cogendus, rogatus recedat, invitatus refugiat, sola illi suffragetur necessitas obsequendi;" and that "profecto indignus est sacerdotio, nisi fuerit ordinatus invitus." And so the Fathers generally (*Thomassin.* II. ii. 65).

γ. *Time, mode, and place of election.*—Further, (1) the election was ordered to be made, and the new bishop consecrated, ἐν τῷς τριῶν μηνῶν, unless delay was unavoidable, by *Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 431, can. xxv. And the alleged practice at Alexandria (doubtless from the special character of the place already mentioned) was to elect immediately after the death of the last bishop, and before he was interred (*Epiphan. Haer.* lxi. § 11, *Liberat. Breviar.* xx., and see *Socrat.* vii. 7); a practice followed in one instance, that of Proclus, A.D. 434–447, at Constantinople also (*Socrat.* vii. 40). The time allowed in Africa, however, was much longer, the *episcopus interventor* being only superseded if he allowed the election to be delayed beyond a year (*Conc. Carthag.* V. A.D. 398, can. iii.; *Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric.* lxxiv.). On the other hand, *Conc. Rom.* A.D. 606, to prevent

bishops nominating their own successors, forbids election until the third day after the last bishop's death. (2) Such election was not to take place ἐπὶ παρουσία ἀκροαμένων—"in the presence of the hearers," i. e. the class of catechumens so called (*Conc. Laodic.* A.D. 365, can. v.); probably because accusations might on such occasions be brought forward against clergy. (3) Later canon law (*Greg. IX. Decretal.* I. vi. *De Elect. et Electi Potest.* c. 42) specifies three modes of electing; scil. by "compromissarii" (delegates by whose act the body of electors bound themselves to abide), by scrutiny of votes, by "inspiration" (if the electors agree in an unanimous and unpremeditated choice). Of these three, *compromissarii* are mentioned by Gregory the Great, although not under that name (*Epist.* iii. 35). And election by acclamation was (as we have seen) not unknown. The other was of course the ordinary way, viz. by some kind or other of scrutiny of votes. (4) The election was properly to take place in the diocese itself (whereas "compromissarii" might be sent elsewhere to perform it), that the people might be able to give their testimony (*St. Cypr. Epist.* lxxvii.). *Conc. Aurelian.* IV. A.D. 541, can. v., &c. &c., refer to the place of ordination, for which see below. So long as it also took place in the diocesan cathedral (see e.g. *St. Aug. Epist.* 261, and below), so long no doubt the election took place there likewise. But even when the ordination came to be transferred to the metropolitan see, the election still remained commonly as to be done on the spot itself. [INTERVENTORES; VISITATORES.]

2. *Confirmation.*—The bishop elect was next to be confirmed, viz. by the metropolitan. And so far as such confirmation merely referred to the metropolitan's share in the election, it would certainly seem to follow from *Conc. Nicaen.* can. vi. (κρατεῖται ἡ τῶν πλειόνων ψῆφος), from *Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, can. xix. (repeating the Nicene canon), and even from so late a witness as *Conc. Arelat.* II. A.D. 452, can. v., that in the first instance and canonically the voice of the majority of bishops was final. At the same time, a certain right of ratification is assigned to the metropolitan, even from the time of the Council of Nice itself. And it certainly seems that the metropolitan in course of time, practically, if not expressly, came to have a veto. So, e.g. Pope Hilary, A.D. 465, *Epist.* ii. c. 1. In the form of election, however, in Sym. of Thessal., the bishops alone vote at all, the metropolitan not being even present. [METROPOLITAN.] So likewise with the patriarch, later still (see, however, for both, *Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, Act. xvi., Labbe, iv. 818, and PATRIARCH). But from no doubt the earliest times, and corresponding to the proof (δοκιμασία) required in 1 Tim. iii. 7, 10, something must have existed like the enactment of *Conc. Carth.* IV. so called: "Qui episcopus ordinandus est, antea examinatur, si natura sit prudens, si docibilis, si moribus temperatus, &c., si litteratus, si in lege Domini instructus, si in Scripturarum sensibus cautus, si in dogmatibus ecclesiasticis exercitatus; et ante omnia, si fidei documenta verbis simplicibus asserat, id est, Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum unum Deum esse confirmans," &c. &c. So also Theodoret (*in 1 Tim.* v. 22),—Ἐξετάζει γὰρ πρότερον χρῆ τοῦ χειροτονουμένου τὸν βίον εἰθ' οὕτως καλεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὴν χάριν τοῦ Πνεύ-

*antepos.* See also the *Apost. Constit.*, and the description in the Greek Pontificals of the bishop to be consecrated, as already *ἐκτερωμένος καὶ ἐστερωμένος*=elect and confirmed. Certainly, from the 4th century onward, the confirmation was a distinct technical act, following upon the election; so far distinct, indeed, that in time (from the 4th century itself according to De Marca, *de Conc. Sacerd. et Imp.* VIII. ii. 1; but Van Espen, *Jur. Eccl. Univ.* I. xiv. 1, § 7, more probably refers it to the 11th or 12th) confirmation was held to confer upon the bishop not yet consecrated the power of jurisdiction, but not that of order. Justinian enacts that a bishop elect shall carefully peruse the "rules laid down by the Catholic and Apostolic Church," and shall then be interrogated by his ordainer (i. e. the metropolitan) whether he is competent to keep them; and upon his solemn profession accordingly, and after a solemn admonition, shall then be ordained. And so we find Gregory the Great, A.D. 596 (*Epist.* vii. 19), desiring the archbishop of Ravenna to summon into his presence the bishop elect of Ariminum (elected by "clerus et plebs"), and to examine him; and if "ea in eo quae in textu Heptatici morte mulctata sunt, minime fuerint reperta, atque fidelium personarum relatione ejus vobis quidem vita placuerit, ad nos eum cum decreti pagina, vestrae quoque addita testificationis epistola, destinate, quatenus a nobis . . . consecratur antistes." So again in Carolingian times, two centuries and a half later, upon the election of Gillebert to the see of Chalons sur Marne, Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, with the other bishops of the province, or their vicars, the abbats, canons, monks, presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons, being assembled at Chiersi (near Laon)—the archbishops of Rouen, Tours, and Sens, being also present—the "clerus, ordo, et plebs" of Chalons presented the decree of election to Hincmar and his fellow-bishops, and (after an explanation respecting a previous election that had been set aside) declared the unanimous consent to it of the "canonici, monachi, parochi, et nobiles" of the diocese. Thereupon Hincmar interrogated the bishop elect respecting his country, condition, literary proficiency, and past ordinations; and ascertained that he had not been "conductor alienarum rerum, nec turpia lucra vel exactiones sive tormenta in hominibus exercens;" and further, as he had held some court office, that his accounts with the king were settled; to the former of which points certain *clerici* and noble laymen bore testimony, while for the latter he produced a royal letter, duly sealed, and containing also an intimation of the royal wish for his consecration. Testimonies of a bishop and certain monks to his good behaviour were then produced; and the consent of the archbishop of Tours was given to the transfer into another province of one born and ordained at Tours. Hincmar, then, with the archbishop of Tours as his assessor, desired the candidate to read, or listen to, and promise to keep, the Pastoral of Gregory the Great, the Canons, and the rules usually given by the ordainer to the ordained, and which were subsequently given to him in writing; and to write out and subscribe the Creed, and hand it so subscribed to the metropolitan. The written consents of the absent bishops were then produced and read, and the

day and place of consecration fixed (*Conc. Gallic. Sirmond*, ii. 651). See also the Ordinals in Martene (ii. 386) and Morinus (*de Sac. Ord.* ii.). A *professio*, i. e. at first both of his faith and of canonical obedience to his archbishop, came also to be part of the formal proceedings of the confirmation of a bishop. The English "Professions" begin early in the 9th century; and the early ones commonly contain a kind of creed, as well as a promise of obedience. So likewise in the East, the 2nd Council of Nice, A.D. 787 (can. ii.) requires a careful enquiry to be made whether the candidate is well acquainted with the Canons, with the Gospels, Epistles, and the whole Scriptures, and is prepared himself to walk, and to teach the people committed to him, according to God's commandments. And the bishop elect was required to profess that he "receives the Seven Synods, and promises to keep the canons enacted by them, and the constitutions promulgated by the Fathers." A solemn recitation and subscription of the Creed, and a disclaimer of simony, were required also of the bishop elect before his consecration (Sym. Thessal. ap. Morin. ii. 156). In the Western Church, even at this date, no further confirmation was usual or necessary. The pope only intervened in a few extraordinary cases (Thomassin, II. ii. 30, § 1: and see PATRIARCH, POPE).

3. *Ordination* (*χειροτονία* most commonly, as probably in Acts xiv. 23, although the word is also used of election, as 2 Cor. viii. 19; *χειροθεσία*, which also means sometimes benediction only, as *ὁ πρεσβύτερος χειροθετεῖ, οὐ χειροτονεῖ*, *Apost. Constit.* viii. 28 [and so *χειροτονεῖν* and *χειροθετεῖν* are distinguished in the spurious *Epist.* of St. Ignat. to Hero, c. iii.]; *καθιέρωσις*; *τελεσιουργία*; *ἀφορισμός*; and in Pseudo-Dion. Areop., rhetoricized into *τελείωσις ἱερατικῇ, ἀποπλήρωσις, διακόσμησις, κ.τ.λ.*)<sup>a</sup>—followed upon the completion of the confirmation.

And (α) first, the matter and form (as it was afterwards called) of ordination was, from the beginning, laying on of hands (*ἐπιθέσις τῶν χειρῶν*, Acts vi. 6, 1 Tim. iv. 14, v. 22, 2 Tim. i. 6; *χειρεπιθεσία*, Euseb.), accompanied necessarily by words expressive of the purpose of the act, but by no invariable and universal formula claiming apostolic authority. Other rites, added as time went on, cannot claim to be either apostolical or universal, and pertain therefore, at best, "to the solemnity, not to the essence," of the rite. (i.) The only other rite indeed in episcopal ordination, that has any appearance of a claim to the "ubique et ab omnibus," but which is not traceable (although it very probably existed) before the 3rd century, is the laying of the Gospels, open in the ancient and in the Greek church, shut acc. to the *Ordo Romanus*, upon the head (in some rites, upon the neck and shoulders) of the bishop to be ordained.—*Const. Apostol.* viii. 4: *Καὶ σιωπῆς γενομένης, εἰς τῶν πρώτων Ἐπισκόπων ἅμα καὶ δυσὶν ἑτέροις πλησίον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἑστῶς, τῶν λοιπῶν Ἐπισκόπων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων σιωπῇ προσευχομένων,*

<sup>a</sup> The special appropriation of the term *consecration* to episcopal ordination is purely modern; Leo M., e. g., uses the term indifferently of bishops, priests, or deacons; and Gillebert, quoted by Du Cange, opposes it to "dedicare," the latter meaning to devote to God, the former to set apart for holy uses.



τῶν δὲ διακόνων τὰ θεῖα Εὐαγγέλια ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ χειροτονουμένου κεφαλῆς ἀνεπτυγμένα κατεχόντων, λεγέτω, κ.τ.λ.—And with unimportant variations, *Conc. Carth.* IV. A.D. 398, can. ii.: “Episcopus cum ordinatur, duo episcopi ponant et teneant Evangeliorum codicem super caput et cervicem ejus, et uno super eum fundente benedictionem, reliqui omnes episcopi qui adsunt, manibus suis caput ejus tangant.”—And so also *Constit. Apostol.* viii. 3 (assigning the act to deacons), Pseudo-Chrysa. (*Hom. de Uno Legislator.* Opp. vi. 410, Montfauc.), Pseudo-Dion. Areop. (*de Eccl. Hier.* V. i. 7, iii. 7), and almost every ritual, Eastern and Western, including (so Denzinger) Nestorian, Maronite, and Jacobite (assigning it either to the patriarch or to the assisting bishops). And although it came to be used in Egypt in the consecration of the patriarch only, yet there too, if the Pseudo-Dionysius represents the Alexandrian rite, it must have been used at first for all bishops (Denzinger, *Rit. Orient.* 135). Alcuin however (*de Div. Off.*), Amalarius (*de Offic. Eccl.* ii. 14), and Isidor. Hispal. (*de Div. Offic.* ii. 5), quoted by Morinus, seem (rather unaccountably) to imply its absence in Gaul, Germany, and Spain, in the 8th and 9th centuries. And it is certainly wanting in two pontificals in Mabillon (*Mus. Italic.* tom. ii. numm. viii. ix.). The actual delivery of the Gospels to the consecrated bishop occurs among the Maronites, but not among the Jacobite Syrians or the Nestorians (Denzinger); and in the West, it is in the present Roman Pontifical, but was unknown until the 11th century (Morinus, iii. 23).—(ii.) Anointing of the head in episcopal ordination is a much less ancient or general rite than the imposition of the Gospels. Among the Easterns it never existed at all (Morinus, Denzinger, &c.); the few ambiguous expressions in Eastern rituals (cited by, e.g., J. A. Assemani) referring to spiritual anointing, while the testimony to the absolute non-occurrence of the material rite is express. It is found in Gaul in the 6th century (*Rit. ap. Morin. de Ordin.* ii. 261, sq.); in Africa not at all; doubtfully in Spain (Morinus); but in Italy, also in the 6th century (S. Leo M., *Serm.* viii. *de Passion. Domini*; Greg. M. in *Reg.* I. x.; ap. Morin. *ib.* III. vi. 2, § 2); and in Saxon England it was extended to hands as well as head in the 8th century (Egbert’s *Pontif.* ed. Greenwell; and so also in the Roman ordinal in Morinus, ii. 288).—(iii.) The sign of the cross, accompanying the imposition of hands (which is therefore called σφραγίς), is mentioned by St. Chrys. (*Hom.* lv. in *Matth.*), and by the Pseudo-Dionysius as above. In the later Greek ritual it occurred thrice (see Morinus, iii. 254).—(iv.) Delivery of pastoral staff and ring became also a part of the Western rite from about the latter part of the 6th century (Maskell, *Mon. Rit.* vol. iii. 273). It occurs in the Pontificals of Gregory the Great and Egbert, but not in those of Gelasius or Leo. The staff indeed dates from the 4th century, as one of the insignia of a bishop, both in East and West. And the ring, which is unused in the East (except by the Maronite Syrians, and by the Armenians, the latter of whom borrowed it from Rome—so Denzinger—and the σφραγίς, or sign of the cross, is ἀντὶ δακτυλίου, acc. to Sym. Thessalon.), occurs in the West as early as Isid. Hispal. *de Div. Off.* ii. 5; but “is not in either Amalarius, Alcuin, or Rab.

Maurus” (Maskell). Both staff and ring are in *Conc. Tolet.* IV. A.D. 633, can. xxviii. (mentioning “orarium, annulum, baculum”); and, seemingly, in *Conc. Francof.* A.D. 794, can. x. (mentioning, however, only in general, “episcopalia”). [RING; CROSIER STAFF.] But as part of the rite of ordination, they belong to the West, and to the latter part of the 6th century. [INVESTITURE.] The staff, however, occurs in a late Greek Pontifical in Morinus (*de Sac. Ord.* ii. 124).—(v.) The ὁμοφόριον, or pallium (a linen vestment marked with crosses), also came to be given at episcopal ordination in the East. It is mentioned as an (Eastern) episcopal vestment as early as Isidor. Pelus. in the beginning of the 5th century (lib. i. Ep. 136; and see Morinus, p. ii. pp. 220 sq., and Denzinger); and occurs in the Eastern rituals. In the West, the delivery of a vestment also called by the name of pallium followed ordination, not of all bishops, but of archbishops, as a totally distinct ceremony, and with an entirely different meaning and purpose. And this began about A.D. 500: see Gieseler, ii. 133, Eng. ed., and under PALL.—(vi.) The delivery of the mitre at ordination in the West dates only after the close of the period to which this article refers; occurring first about the 10th century (see Maskell’s *Mon. Rit.* iii. 275). It is in the Sarum, as in all later Pontificals. As part of the episcopal dress during Divine service, in some shape or other, and under various names, it occurs both in East and West from apparently the 4th century. [MITRE.]—(vi.) The delivery of the paten “cum oblatis,” and of the chalice “cum vino,” which forms a principal part of the later additions to the ordination of a presbyter [PRESBYTER], is found for the first time in the *Sacram.* of Gregory the Great (Morinus, ii. 277, iii. 134), and in the consecration of a bishop (in which however it does not occur again). Among the Syrians, however, the consecrating bishop touched the consecrated elements with his hands before laying hands upon the head of the bishop to be consecrated (Denzinger); and in the *Apost. Constit.* viii. 5, one of the consecrating bishops is ordered ἀναφέρειν τὴν θυσίαν ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ χειροτονηθέντος.—(vii.) The ἀνάβησις or proclamation (*praedicatio, promulgatio, ἀνακήρυξις, ἐπικήρυξις, or κήρυξις ἐξ ὀνόματος*), and (viii.) the kiss of peace, are mentioned by Pseudo-Dion. Areop. as following upon the consecration. The latter is mentioned also in *Apost. Constit.* viii. 5, but as occurring at the subsequent enthronization. And it was repeated four times during the service in the East in the time of Sym. of Thessal. (ap. Morin. ii. 171). The former occurs in the time of Symeon before the consecration, and was in that position a public proclamation by name of the appointment (ἡ θεία χάρις προχειρίζεται) of the elect bishop, made by the consecrating archbishop (among the Jacobites and Copts, however, by the archdeacon—Denzinger). There were indeed two such μηνύματα: one, the declaration made to the bishops, intimating the choice made by emperor, or by metropolitan, among the three presentees; the other, the proclamation of the name to the people (Morinus, iii. 254). In the older Latin Ordinals the same form occurs in substance in like place (*id. ib.* 27); viz. as a declaration by the consecrator, that “cives nostri elegerunt sibi illum pastorem,

oremus itaque pro hoc viro," &c. It is also in use among the Syrians (*id. ib.* 31). The *Apost. Constit.* do not mention it. But St. Greg. Naz. seems to allude to it under the term ἐπιφημί-*ζεται* (*Mor. ib.* 30). Ἀνάρρησις is also used in Synesius (*Epist.* 67) as equivalent to consecration; and see also Suicer *in voce*.

All these, however, are later additions to the rite; arising (as was not unnatural) out of the gradual extension of the "traditio instrumentorum," which had constituted the ordination of the minor orders from the beginning (see *Conc. Carth.* IV.), to the higher orders also; and accompanied in the case of some of them by an equally natural conversion of accessories in course of time into essentials. It is waste of words to prove that the one and only essential act from the beginning was imposition of hands. This also, however, in process of time, became varied, 1. by repetition, 2. by the use of one or both hands, and the like: for which details see IMPOSITION OF HANDS.

The *form* of ordination was not similarly fixed. Pope Innocent III., speaking as a canonist, and Habert, writing of the Greeks as a theologian, expressly declare that the Apostles appointed no form of words; that it rests therefore with the Church to appoint such a form; and that, apart from Church authority, any words whatever, adequate to the purpose, would suffice. And the facts of the case are in themselves enough to establish this. In the Greek Church, the form in Sym. Thessal. runs thus: Ἡ θεὸς χάρις προ-*χειρίζεται* τὸν δεῖνα εἰς Ἐπίσκοπον, κ.τ.λ.; these words, which are used at the ἀνάρρησις, being repeated at the actual consecration. Denzinger, however (pp. 140, 141), considers the essential words in the Eastern rites which he mentions to be found in the prayers which accompanied the laying on of hands, and to be of a precatory form. In the Latin Church, since the 11th century, it has been simply, "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum," without express mention in the form itself of the episcopal office either by name or by description, the context sufficiently limiting the purpose of the words (Vazquez, &c.). Prior to that date, the "consecratio" of a bishop was not an imperative declaration, but was in the form of a prayer. [ORDINATION.]

β. The ordainers were necessarily bishops (see below, III. 1, α. i). "Two or three at the least," was the rule of the *Apostolic Canon* (1), and of the *Apost. Constit.* (viii. 4, 27): the latter also deposing both ordained and ordainer, if any were ordained (of course, without sufficient cause), by one bishop (viii. 27), yet expressly not voiding such ordination if the case were one of necessity. But while St. Cyprian (*Epist.* 67) implies the ordinary presence of all or most of the comprovincial bishops, the Nicene Council (can. iv.) requires the actual participation in the consecration, of three absolutely, as a minimum—of all, if possible—but in any case with the consent at least of the rest of the comprovincial bishops, or (can. vi.) of the major part of them. And so also *Conc. Chalced.* Act. xvi. Several Gallican provincial councils go further, by requiring in one case (*Conc. Arelat.* I. A.D. 314, can. xx.) seven as a rule, but if that is impossible, at least "infra tres non aude[n]t ordinare;" or again (*Conc. Arelat.* II. A.D. 353, can. v.), the metropolitan with three suffragans (or, according to another reading, the

metropolitan in person or by letter, and three suffragans), with the consent of the remainder, or of at least the major part of the whole number, in case of division; or yet again (*Conc. Arausic.* I. A.D. 441, can. xxi.), by actually deposing the ordainer, and (if a willing participator in the irregularity) the ordained bishop also, if "two bishops presumed" to ordain; while yet a fourth like council (*Regiens.* A.D. 439, can. ii.) not only censures but voids a consecration, which shall lack any of the three conditions, of consent of comprovincial bishops, presence of three of them, and assent of metropolitan. The rule requiring three is also matter of constant reference (as, e. g., in *Conc. Epaon.* A.D. 517, can. i.; or again by popes from Damasus onward to Leo III., in discussing the position of *chorepiscopi*; see Morin. iii. 58). Spanish councils simply repeat the Nicene canon on the subject (e. g. *Conc. Tolet.* IV. A.D. 581, can. xviii.; and so Isidor. Hispal. *de Offic. Eccl.* ii. 5). And in Africa, at an earlier date, *Conc. Carth.* III. A.D. 397, can. xxxix., condemns consecration by two bishops, pronounces the requirement of twelve (which had been suggested) impracticable, and repeats accordingly the old rule of three: can. xl. of the same council prohibiting the three from proceeding to consecrate, in case objections are taken to the bishop-elect, until themselves with "one or two" more have enquired into those objections on the spot, and found them groundless. The rule in the East was the same (Denzinger, p. 142), "scil. ut non minuatur numerus ternarius." And *Conc. Seleuc. et Ctesiph.* A.D. 410 (ed. Lamy, 1869), deposes (if the record is genuine) both consecrated and consecrators, if any be ordained bishop by one bishop or by two. But then the principle which underlay this rule, was not the inability of one bishop by himself to consecrate, but the desirableness that many, and if possible all, should co-operate in, and testify to, the act of consecration. So expressly the *Apost. Constit.* viii. 27; adding with like clearness a proviso, that "one" may consecrate in case of necessity, if only a greater number signify their sanction of the act. So Gregory the Great, in the well-known *Answers* to Augustine, requires "three or four" if possible, but speaks of the presence of more than one only as "valde utilis," as of those "qui testes assistant;" and distinctly authorizes consecration by one on the ground of necessity. So Synesius (*Epist.* 67) censures the consecration of Siderius, bishop of Palaebisca, as (not invalid but) ἐκθέσμως, 1. because not in Alexandria or with the consent of the patriarch; but also, 2. because performed by "not three," but a single bishop; and Theodoret (v. 23) that of Evagrius of Antioch, as also παρὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν θεσμόν, "because (among other things) Paulinus alone consecrated him. But Synesius adds, that necessity justified the former of these consecrations, and had led St. Athanasius to allow the like; and in that of the latter, both the bishop of Alexandria and the Western bishops recognized it none the less (Theodoret, *ib.*; Innocent I. *Epist.* 14). So again the bishops of Pontus (*Epist.* ad fin. *Conc. Chalced.*) speak of Dioscorus of Alexandria as actually bishop, although consecrated by only two bishops (and those under censure), "cum regulæ patrum . . . tres episcopos corporaliter adesse . . . prospiciant." Of the very councils themselves of Arles II. and of Riez, above quoted, the former

recognizes the reality of the censured consecration by appointing the bishop consecrated by two to one of the sees vacated by the deposition of his consecrators, if the irregularity had been without his consent; and the latter,—although its canon can scarcely be explained away (as by Thomassin) by referring it to election and not consecration,—yet both permits the deposed bishop to confirm, and allows the orders he may have already conferred, subject only to the favour of the metropolitan; or in other words, does not venture to quash the consecration outright. The Welsh and early Irish and Scotch practice—of only one consecrator—was no doubt at first a matter of necessity; although continued after it had ceased to be so. The Saxon Church resumed the canonical rule of three, on the other hand, as soon as possible. And even in 664 a Wessex bishop called in two British bishops, albeit he must have thought them schismatical, to complete that number (Baed. *H. E.* iii. 28). The cases of Pope Pelagius I. A.D. 555, ordained by two bishops and a presbyter (*Lib. Pontif. in V. Pelag.*), and of Novatian long before, calling in three bishops, ἀγροίκους καὶ ἀπλουστάτους, from some corner of Italy, to ordain him to the see of Rome (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43), and long afterwards, the permission given by the popes (see Bellarm. *de Eccl.* iv. 8) to make up the number of three by two or more mitred abbats, so that there was one bishop (Labbe, i. 53),—prove at once the existence of the rule while they violate its spirit. Pope Siricius also (*Epist.* iv. c. 2, A.D. 384 × 398) forbids “ne unus episcopus episcopum ordinare praesumat;” but it is “propter arrogantiam,” and “ne furtivum beneficium praestitum videatur.” Michael Oxita (patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 1145–6) also rejected two bishops who had been ordained by a single bishop (Bever. *Pandect.* ii. *Annot.* p. 10). Among the Nestorians, again, the patriarch Timotheus, about A.D. 900, asserting the “need” of three bishops, allows in a case of necessity the sufficiency of two, so long as the necessity lasted; but enjoins that the Gospels shall be placed on the right hand upon a throne in lieu of a third bishop (Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* III. i. 163). Compare finally the distinction drawn in the Pontificals between the consecrator and the “assisting bishops”—“socii ordinationis” (*Coptic Rit.*): or again the words of the bishops of Pontus mentioned above, “per suffragium consensumque duorum episcoporum cum ipso (patriarcha) praesentium.” Whether *chorepiscopi*, consecrated by one bishop, were bishops themselves, see CHOREPISCOPI.

γ. The place of ordination was properly and originally the actual see itself to which the bishop was to be ordained. So St. Cyprian (*Epist.* 67), Possid. (in *V. S. Aug.* viii.), St. Augustin himself (*Epist.* 261), Pope Julius (*Epist. ad Orient.* ap. St. Athan. *Apol.* ii.), *Conc. Chalced.* Act. xi. (Labbe, iv. 700), *Conc. Rom.* A.D. 531 (in Holstein. *Collect. Rom.* p. 7), and Synesius (*Epist.* 67, as above). The practice however came in time to be that the metropolitan appointed the place (Synes. *ib.*; *Conc. Tolet.* IV. A.D. 581, can. xviii.), although it was commonly the metropolitan see, and the metropolitan himself was always to be consecrated there (*Conc. Tolet.* *ib.*). If, however, not there, then, by *Conc. Tarracon.* A.D. 516, can. x., the bishop consecrated elsewhere was to present himself to the metropolitan within two

months. And *Conc. Aurelian.* IV. A.D. 541, can. v., restricts it to the metropolitan see, unless unavoidably removed elsewhere; and even in that case commands the presence of the metropolitan, and that it shall be within the province. In whatsoever town it was, the rite was always celebrated at the altar of the church, the candidate kneeling (Pseudo-Dion. as above, and repeatedly; Theodoret, iv. 15, παρὰ τὴν ἱερὰν τράπεζαν). A natural custom also in course of time marked out the Lord's Day, or at any rate some great festival, as the “legitimus dies” for a bishop's consecration (Pope Zosimus, *Epist.* vi.; *Conc. Tolet.* IV. can. xviii.); while Leo the Great (*Epist.* ix.) insists upon the Lord's Day, but as beginning from the Saturday evening; and Pope Gelasius actually limits the ordinations of presbyters and deacons to the Saturday evening exclusively. But there was certainly no restriction of days at all until the 4th century (Pagi, ap. Bingham. IV. vi. 7). In the East the same rule of Sunday came to prevail universally (Denzinger); but the Nestorian rubric (as does also common Western practice) admits festivals likewise (*id.*). Ember-days, when they came to exist, belonged to presbyterial and diaconal ordinations. The hour also came to be limited as well as the day, viz. to the time of the celebration of the Eucharist, i.e. the morning (τῆς μυστικῆς ἱερουργίας προκειμένης, says Theodoret, *Hist. Relig.* xiii., speaking however of presbyterial ordination): and this at an early period, inasmuch as Novatus is censured (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43), as having been (among other things) consecrated ὀρθὰ δεκάτῃ, i.e. somewhere about 4 P.M. In the East the rule became equally fixed, and on like grounds; and this as regards bishops universally: save (as before) the one exception of the Nestorians, who leave it optional, and provide rubrics for ordinations made “extra missam” (Denzinger). Theodore in England enacts (*Poenit.* II. iii. 1), that in the ordination of a bishop “debet missa cantari ab episcopo ordinante.” The particular part of the liturgy, however, at which the ordination was to be (so to say) interpolated, differed in East and West. The “dies anniversarius” of the ordination, i.e. the “dies natalis” or the “natalitia” of the bishop, was also commonly kept as a kind of festival (St. Aug. *Cont. Lit. Petil.* ii. 23, *Hom.* xxxii. *de Verb. Dom.*, *Hom.* xxiv. et xxv. *ex Quinquaginta*, *Hom.* cccxl. ed. Bened.; Leo M., *Hom.* i. ii. iii.; Paulin. *Epist.* xvi.; St. Ambros. *Epist.* v.; Pope Hilary, *Epist.* ii.; Sixtus, *Epist. ad Joh. Antioch.* Labbe, iii. 1261; Pagi, ap. Bingham. IV. vi. 15).

δ. The ordainers were also, according to African rule (*Cod. Can. Afric.* 89), to give letters under their own hand to the bishop ordained, “continentes consulem et diem,” in order to prevent future disputes about precedence. And a register of ordinations (*archivus, matricula, ἀρχέτυπος, ματρικίον*) was to be kept both in the primate's church and in the metropolis of the province for the like purpose (*ib.* 86; and see Bingham. II. xvi. 8).

4. *Enthronization* (ἐνθρονιάζειν, *incathedralare*), which is mentioned in the *Apost. Constit.*, and in Greek Pontificals, as the concluding act of ordination, followed upon ordination, either (as at first) immediately or (in course of time) after an interval; a regular service being then provided for it, which is described by Sym. Thess. c.



viii. A sermon was thereupon preached, at least in the East, by the newly consecrated bishop, styled "sermo enthronisticus," of which instances are given in Bingham II. xi. 10. And *litterae communicatoriae*, or *synodicae*, or *enthronisticae*, γράμματα κοινωνικά, συλλαβαὶ ἐνθρονιστικά, were written to other bishops, to give account of the seader's faith, and to receive letters of communion in return (Bingham *ib.*). Τὰ ἐνθρονιστικά, also, were payments which came to be made by bishops on occasion of their enthronization. The Arabic version of the Nicene canons has a rule about enthronization (can. lxxi.), viz. that the bishop be enthroned at once by a delegate of the archbishop, and that the archbishop visit him personally after three months, and confirm him in the see. In 664 or 5, when Wilfrid was consecrated at Compiègne by twelve French bishops, they carried him, with hymns and chants, "in sella aurea sedentem, more eorum" (Edd. in V. Wilf. xii.).

5. A Profession of Obedience to the metropolitan, and (in the Carolingian empire) an oath of allegiance to the emperor or king, began to be required, prior to confirmation, the former from the 6th century onwards, the latter from the time either of Charlemagne or of his immediate successors; but far earlier in Spain. a. The earliest written profession of obedience to the metropolitan produced by Thomassin—"cartula de obedientiae sponsione"—is one made by the metropolitan of Epirus to the archbishop of Thessalonica, and is condemned by Pope Leo I. A.D. 450 (*Epist.* lxxxiv. c. 1). And some kind of written promise—"tempore ordinationis nostrae unusquisque sacerdos cautionem scriptis emitimus, studiose de fide ordinatoris nostri"—was made to the patriarch of Aquileia, c. A.D. 590, by his suffragans (Baron. in *an.* 590, num. xxviii.). But Spanish councils of a little later date are (as might be expected) most express on the point. *Conc. Emerit.*, indeed, A.D. 666, can. iv.,—extending to bishops, &c., an enactment of *Conc. Tolet.* IV. A.D. 581, can. xvii., respecting presbyters and deacons,—only enjoins the metropolitan at the time of his ordination, and the bishops at the time of theirs, respectively to promise "vivere caste, recte, et sobrie." But *Conc. Tolet.* XI. A.D. 675, can. x., requires every one of all grades of clergy, before "consecration," to bind himself, not only to keep the faith, live piously, and obey the canons, but also "ut debitum per omnia honorem atque obsequii reverentiam praeeminenti sibi unusquisque dependat." St. Boniface shortly after, in Germany, A.D. 723, when consecrated bishop by Pope Gregory II., goes a long step further, by giving a written promise addressed to St. Peter, "vobis, beato Petro, vicarioque tuo B. Papae Gregorio, successoribusque ejus;" that he will keep the faith in its purity, &c., and that he will "fidem et puritatem," &c., "praedicto vicario tuo atque successoribus ejus per omnia exhibere," &c. (S. Bonif. *Epist.* xvii., ed. Jaffe); an innovation which Thomassin tells us was not repeated by any one, not even by St. Boniface's own successors at Mentz. Further on, in Gaul, *Conc. Cabillon.* A.D. 813, can. xiii., expressly forbids the oath which some then exacted at ordination, "quod digni sint, et contra canones non sint facturi, et obedientes sint episcopo qui eos ordinat," &c.; "quod juramentum quia periculosum est, omnes una inhibendum statuimus."

CHURCH. ANT.

And a Capitulary of Ludov. Pius, A.D. 816 (*Capit.* i. c. 97), noticing the "sacramenta," as well as "munera," which Lombard bishops then exacted "ab his quos ordinabant," forbids "omnibus modis, ne ulterius fiat." But this prohibition applied to the exaction of an oath of fealty (*Canciani, Leg. Barbar.* v. 121). Professions to the metropolitan by the bishop to be consecrated were, certainly, from that time forward the regular practice. The form of that of the bishop of Terouenne to Hincmar of Rheims is in *Conc. Gallic.* ii. 655. And English professions likewise run on from the like date. A special oath to the pope, and the meaning attached to the reception of the pall, belong to later centuries, the instance of St. Boniface's oath alone excepted. In the East, a form of written promise of canonical obedience, made by the bishop to the patriarch, is in *Jur. Orient.* i. 441; and is expressly sanctioned by the 8th can. of *Conc. Constantin.* A.D. 869, while condemning certain unauthorized additions to it. It may also be mentioned here that St. Augustin procured an enactment, at a Council of Carthage, that all canons relating to the subject, "ab ordinatoribus ordinandis vel ordinatis in notitiam esse deferenda" (Possid. V. S. Aug. viii). β. A general oath of allegiance to the king, from all subjects, occurs repeatedly in the Spanish councils (e. g. *Conc. Tolet.* XVI. A.D. 693). And a promise of fidelity from bishops is mentioned in Gaul as early as the time of Leodegarius of Autun and St. Eligius, c. A.D. 640. But special mention of an oath of fidelity taken by a bishop at his ordination seems to occur first at the Council of Toul, A.D. 850, where it is declared that the archbishop of Sens had thrice sworn allegiance to Charles the Bald, the first time being when the king gave him his bishopric. Such an oath of allegiance seems also to be meant by *Conc. Tur.* III. A.D. 813, can. i.; and by *Conc. Aquisgr.* II. A.D. 836, cap. ii. can. xii.: although spoken of with no reference to ordination. But the absence of all formulae for it in earlier times is conclusive against throwing back the date before Charlemagne. Homage in the feudal sense belongs to a later period still. At the same time Charlemagne introduced an oath of fealty in the case of bishops, and invested a bishop with the temporalities of his see by ring and crosier (De Marca, *de Conc. Eccl. et Imp.* pp. 402, 426). As regards the East, there is no mention whatever in Symeon Thessalon. of any oath to the emperor taken by a bishop at ordination. γ. The oath against simony may also be mentioned here, enacted by Justinian (*Novell.* cxxxvii. c. 2) as to be taken by a bishop at ordination; an enactment repeated by Pope Adrian I. (*Epist. ad Cur. M.* in *Conc. Gallic.* ii. 97). (See also above, I. 2; and SIMONY.)

II. We have next to consider how a bishop ceased to be so, either of a particular see, or altogether. And,

1. Of Translation, which, as a rule, was forbidden, but only as likely to proceed from selfish motives, and therefore with the exception, expressed sometimes, but seemingly always understood, of cases where there was sufficient and good cause. Before the period of the Apostolic Canons this prohibition would have been hardly needed. *Apost. Can.* xiv. forbids it, unless there be a εὐλογος αἰτία, scil. a prospect of more episcopal "gain" in saving souls; and guards the



right practical application of the rule by the proviso, that neither the bishop himself, nor the *παρῳικτα* desiring him, but "many bishops," shall decide the point, and that *παρὰ κλήσει μεγίστη*. The Council of Nice (can. xv.), *Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341 (can. xxi.), *Conc. Sardic.* A.D. 347 (can. i.), *Conc. Carth.* III. A.D. 397 (can. xxxvii.), and *Conc. Carth.* IV. A.D. 398 (can. xxvii.), forbid it likewise: the first two without qualification; and the second, whether the suggestion proceed from the bishop, the people, or other bishops; but the third, if *ἀπὸ πόλεως μικρᾶς εἰς ἑτέραν*; and the fourth, also in case it be "de loco ignobili ad nobilem," while allowing it if it be for the good of the Church, so that it be done "by the sentence of a synod," and at the request of the clergy and laity. And the Council of Nice itself both shewed that exceptional cases were not excluded, by actually itself translating a bishop (Sozom. i. 2, quoted by Pagi), and is explained by St. Jerome as prohibiting it, only "ne virginalis pauperulae societate contempta, ditioris adulterae quaerat amplexus" (*Epist.* lxxxiii. ad *Ocean.*). St. Athanasius indeed gives us the *obiter dictum* of an Egyptian council, condemning translation as parallel with divorce, and therefore with the sin of adultery (Athan. *Apol.* ii.). And similarly St. Jerome (*Epist.* lxxxiii. ad *Ocean.*). But Pope Julius condemns it on the assumption throughout that its motive is self-aggrandizement. Pope Damasus also condemns it, but it is when done "per ambitionem;" and Pope Gelasius, but only "nullis existentibus causis." Leo the Great, c. A.D. 450 (*Epist.* lxxxiv. c. 8) deposes a bishop who seeks to be translated, but it is "ad maiorem plebem," and "despecta civitatis suae mediocritate." And Pope Hilary, in *Conc. Rom.* A.D. 465, condemns a proposed Spanish translation, among other things, as contrary to the Nicene canon (Hilar. *Epist.* 1-3). While *Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, can. v., re-enacts the canons against "transmigration." At the same time, both translations, as a matter of fact, were repeatedly sanctioned, beginning with the noted case of Alexander and Narcissus of Jerusalem (Hieron. *de Scriptt. Eccl.* 62); as may be seen in Socrat. vii. 35, &c., and in the authorities quoted by Bingh. VI. iv. 6. St. Greg. Naz., indeed, A.D. 382, speaks of the Antiochene canon on the subject as a *νόμος πάλαι τεθνήκως*: and Socrates actually tells us in terms, that translations were only forbidden when persecutions ceased, but had previously been perfectly free to all; and asserts that they were a thing *ἀδιάφορον*, whenever circumstances made them expedient (v. 8, vii. 35): and the author of the tract *De Translationibus* in the *Jus Orient.* (i. 293) sums up the matter tersely in the statement that *ἡ μετάβασις κεκώλυται, οὐ μὴν ἡ μετάθεσις*: i. e. the thing prohibited is "transmigration" (which arises from the bishop himself, from selfish motives), not "translation" (wherein the will of God and the good of the Church is the ruling cause); the "going," not the "being taken," to another see. The same rule and practice prevailed both in East and West down to the 9th century, complicated however in the West by frequent cases of sees destroyed in war, or removed "ad alia loca quae securiora putamus" (St. Greg. M. *Epist.* ii. 14). Many cases occur in Gregory's letters, of bishops of Italy, Corsica, &c., translated by him for these or like causes, but always under

pressure of necessity (see Thomassin, II. ii. 62); and Joan. Diac. (iii. 18) asserts expressly, that Gregory "nunquam episcopum ab integritate suae Ecclesiae vel ipse in aliam commutavit vel sub quacunque occasione migrare consensit." Gregory of Tours supplies instances of like translations in Gaul, all made "consensu regum et episcoporum," but "inconsulta sede apostolica" (Thomassin, *ib.* § 5). So in Spain (*Conc. Tolet.* X. A.D. 656, and XVI. A.D. 693, can. xii.). In Saxon England, after the first shifting of sees consequent upon the settlement of the Church down to Abp. Theodore was passed, no translations occurred at all, except the simoniacal instance of Wine in 666, until that of Dunstan from Worcester to London, A.D. 959, except in the cases of (1) the ever-shifting sees of Hexham and Whit-herne, and there once, in 789, and (2) the archbishoprics of Canterbury and York; and even in the case of the archbishoprics, Cuthbert's was the only instance (A.D. 740) until the 10th century. In the East, while the case of Anthimus, condemned by *Conc. Constantin.* A.D. 536, Act. i., for *τὴν μοιχικὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῆς βασιλίδος Ἐκκλησίας*, viz. Constantinople, and for leaving his own (smaller) see of Trapezus "widowed and without a husband, against the canons,"—condemned also by Pope Agapetus I. ("Impossibile translaticium hominem in illa sede permanere," *Liberat. Breviar.* 21),—shews the existence of the old feeling on the subject; the counter case of Germanus of Cyzicum, translated A.D. 714 to Constantinople, "suffragio atque consensu religiosorum, presbyterorum, diaconorum, et totius sanctioris cleri sacrique senatus et populi imperatricis hujus civitatis" (Thomassin, from Theophanes in *an.* and Anastasius), shews equally that translations, if circumstances were thought to justify them, were not prohibited. In the Alexandrian Church the rule appears to have been exceptionally strict, so that originally it was forbidden to translate a bishop, already such, to the patriarchate, although in later and Mohammedan times this rule after great contentions became relaxed (Denzinger and among the Nestorians, as one result of such relaxation of a like rule, it came to pass that patriarchs were often actually re-consecrated (Assemani and Renaudot, ap. Denzinger).

2. Of *Resignation*, and (a) of resignation simply; respecting which there is no express canon, absolutely speaking; but *Can. Apostol.* can. xxxvi. *Conc. Ancyra.* can. xviii., *Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, cans. xvii. xviii., assume or enact that a bishop once consecrated cannot refuse to go to a see, even if the people will not receive him; and the two latter refer the decision to the synod, which may allow him to withdraw or not as it judges best. Instances accordingly occur of resignations allowed because circumstances rendered it expedient for the good of the Church, as where the people obstinately refused to submit to the bishop: e. g. St. Greg. Naz., when archbishop of Constantinople, with the consent of the Council of Constantinople (Theodoret, v. 8; Socrat. v. 7; Sozom. vii. 7; St. Greg. Naz. *Epist.* xlii. al. xxxvi., lxxv. al. lix., *Orat.* xxxii., and *Carmen de Vita Sua*): Meletius when bishop of Sebaste in Armenia (Theodoret, ii. 31); Martyrius, bishop of Antioch (Theod. Lector i.): all cases in point to the canons above mentioned, the people in each case being factious and perverse; but the second and third (although the latter was at Antioch itself), apparently in

direct contradiction to the Antiochene rule, no synodical decision being mentioned, but only the will of the bishops themselves: *e.g.* of Martyrius, Κλήρω ἀνυποτάκτω, καὶ λαῶ ἀπειθεῖ, καὶ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐβρύκωμένην ἀποτάττομαι. Instances occur also of resignations offered (and approved though not accepted) for peace's sake: as St. Chrys. (*Hom. xi. in Ephes.*), Flavian of Antioch under Theodosius (Theodoret, v. 23), the Catholic African bishops under Aurelius and St. Augustin at the time of the Donatist schism (*Collat. Carthag. A.D. 411, die i. c. xvi.*). And Eustathius of Perga, again, was permitted to resign by the *Conc. Ephes. A.D. 431* (Act. vii. in *Epist. ad Synod. Pamphyliae*), on account of old age, retaining τὸ τε τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ὄνομα καὶ τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν κωνονίαν, but without authority to act as bishop unless at a fellow-bishop's request. And a pension out of the revenues of the see was granted to Domnus, who had resigned the see of Antioch, by the *Conc. Chalced. A.D. 457* (Act. vii. al. Act. x., Labbe, iv. 681), at the request of Maximus, who had succeeded him. These and like instances testify to the gradual establishment of a rule, permitting resignations under circumstances of obvious expediency for the Church, so that they were sanctioned by at least the provincial synod. And forms of voluntary resignation both for patriarchs and bishops in the East occur in Leunclav. *Jus Orient.* At the same time the feeling of the Church ran strongly against resignations, as being a giving up of work for Christ. So Leo M., *Epist. xcii.* And Cyril Alex. puts the dilemma: "If worthy, let them continue; if unworthy, let them not resign but be deposed" (*Epist. ad Domnum ap. Balsam.*, quoted by Thomassin). Although St. Chrys. in like case bids a bishop, conscious of serious guilt, resign rather than be deposed (*de Sacerd. lib. iii. c. 10*). From the 5th century onward, resignations occur not unfrequently in the West (see a list in Thomassin, II. ii. 52), with the consent of the clergy, or at least the metropolitan and council, and of the laity, or at least the king. In the East, the consent of the emperor and of the patriarch of Constantinople became necessary; as in the case of Paulus of Antioch in the time of Justin (inter *Epist. Hormisd. Papae*, post *Epist. lxxx.*). The conception of a matrimonial tie, such that no authority could sever it unless (in the West) that of the bishop of Rome, developed itself prominently at a considerably later period, after at least the 8th century. The canonical grounds for a resignation, as summed up, later still, in the *Corp. Juris (Decret. Greg. IX. lib. i. tit. ix. de Renunc. c. 10)*, are in substance those already intimated:—i. Guilt, limited however from earlier severity to such only as impedes the discharge of the episcopal office: ii. Sickness (in which case Gregory the Great would have permitted a coadjutor only): iii. Ignorance: iv. Perverse rebelliousness of the people: v. The healing of a schism: vi. Irregularity, such as, *e.g.* bigamy. A desire to take monastic vows, although a not unfrequent case, and in some instances at least tolerated, was not a canonical ground of resignation. (β.) Resignation in favour of a successor, however, was distinctly prohibited, by *Conc. Antioch. A.D. 341*, can. xxiii.: Ἐπίσκοπον μὴ ἐξεῖναι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καθιστᾶν ἕτερον αὐτοῦ διάδοχον, κἀν πρὸς τῇ τελευτῇ τοῦ βίου τυγχάνῃ· εἰ δέ τι τοιοῦτον γίγνηται, ἄκυρον εἶναι τὴν κατάστασιν.

But it was so, as the rest of the canon shews, only in order to secure canonical and free election when the see became actually vacant,—μετὰ τῆς κοίμησης τοῦ ἀναπαυσαμένου. And the object was, not to prohibit, but to prevent the abuse of, the recommendations very commonly made by aged bishops of their successors; a practice strongly praised by Origen (in *Num. Hom. xxii.*), comparing Moses and Joshua (so also Theodoret, in *Num. c. xlvii.*), but which naturally had often a decisive influence in the actual election: as, *e.g.* in the case of St. Athanasius recommended by Bishop Alexander, and Peter recommended by St. Athanasius, both of whom were duly elected, &c., but after the bishopric was actually vacant; the story being apparently without grounds, of an intervening and rival episcopate before St. Athanasius, of Achilles, and of Theonas (Epiphan. *Haer. lxviii. 6, 12*; Theodoret, iv. 18). So also St. Augustin recommended his own successor, Eraclius. But such recommendations slipped naturally into a practice of consecrating the successor, sometimes elected solely by the bishop himself, before the recommending bishop's death, thus interfering with the canonical rights of the provincial bishops and of the diocese itself. Limiting then the prohibition to the actual election by a single bishop of a successor to take his own place during his own lifetime, the Antiochene canon is repeated by, *e.g. Conc. Paris. V. A.D. 615*, can. ii. ("ut nullus episcoporum se vivente alium in loco suo eligeret"), and became the rule; although one often broken in the West in the 7th and 8th centuries, as *e.g.* in the noted case of St. Boniface, who was permitted by Pope Zacharias, although after strong remonstrances, and with great reluctance, to nominate and ordain his own successor. But then we must distinguish (γ) that qualified resignation, which extended only to the appointment of a coadjutor—not a coadjutor with right of succession, which was distinctly uncanonical, but simply an assistant during the actual bishop's life, and no further. The earliest instance indeed of a simple coadjutor, that of Alexander, coadjutor to Narcissus of Jerusalem (Euseb. *H. E. vi. 11*), was supposed to require a vision to justify it. But examples occur repeatedly thenceforward, both in East and West (*e.g.* in Sozom. ii. 20; Theodoret, v. 4: St. Ambros. *Epist. lxxix.*; St. Greg. Naz. *Orat. xii. ad Patr. Opp. i. 248. c.*, quoted by Bingham); including St. Augustin himself, who did not "succeed," but "accede," to the see of Hippo, being coadjutor therein first of all to his predecessor Valerius, by the consent of "primate, metropolitan, and the whole clergy and people of Hippo," yet this "contra morem Ecclesiae" (Possid. *V. S. Aug. viii.*); the canon of the Nicene Council, which prohibits two bishops in one city, being held to prohibit only two independent and distinct bishops, and not where one was (as English people might now call it) curate to the other, although Augustin afterwards thought that canon condemned himself. But a coadjutor with right of succession was distinctly uncanonical; although instances occur of this also: as of Theotecnus of Caesarea in Palestine (Euseb. *H. E. vii. 32*), before the Antiochene canon, and of Orion, bishop of Palaebisca (Synes. *Epist. lxvii.*); and of Augustin himself, but with this difference, that he was formally and canonically elected, so that the one point in his case was his being co-

secrated before his predecessor's death. So also Paulinus of Antioch, whose act was condemned as uncanonical by St. Ambrose (*Epist.* lxxviii.), and by Theodoret (v. 23) and by Socrates (ii. 15). And a like case in Spain, where a bishop of Barcelona, with consent of the metropolitan and comprovincial bishops and the whole of his own diocese, sought to make a neighbouring bishop (who was also his heir) his coadjutor and successor, but was condemned for so doing by Pope Hilary and a Roman Council, A.D. 465, protesting against making bishoprics hereditary (Hilar. *Epistt.* ii. iii.). So also Pope Boniface II. A.D. 531, was compelled to desist from his attempt to appoint Vigilius his own successor. And Pope Boniface III. in a Roman Council, A.D. 606, forbade any formal discussion about a successor to a deceased bishop until "tertio die depositionis ejus, adunato clero et filiis Ecclesiae; tunc electio fiat." Thomassin sums up the case by laying down, (1) that coadjutors or successors were up to the 9th century never asked for from the Pope; (2) that the consent of metropolitan and provincial synod was necessary; and (3) after the 5th century that of the king; but that, lastly, with these last-named sanctions, coadjutors were permitted whenever it was for the good of the Church, although coadjutors with right of succession were forbidden. The hereditary benefices of the Welsh Church of the 11th and 12th centuries, and of the contemporary Breton Church, and, indeed (in some degree or other), of other churches also, are too late to come into this article. So far of the removal of bishops merely from a particular see. But, next, of

3. The *Deposition* of bishops. And here only of the case of bishops as such, referring to the art. DEGRADATION, for the general "irregularities," which affected all clergy, and therefore inclusively bishops also.

(A.) The grounds upon which bishops as such were deposed were as follows. (a.) First, there were certain irregularities which vitiated an episcopal consecration *ab initio*; and these were for the most part, although not wholly, irregularities such as disqualified for consecration at all, as those already referred to above. (i.) If prior to ordination to a bishopric the candidate had not been examined in the faith, or had failed to meet such examination, Justinian (*Novell.* cxxxvii. c. 2) deposed both the ordainer and the recently ordained. (ii.) Although the *Conc. Neocaes.* (can. ix. A.D. 314) speaks of a belief that ordination remitted sins, except fornication, yet *Conc. Nicaen.* (canons ix. x.) rules that those who are ordained through ignorance or laxity, being guilty of sins (without any exception) that would rightly disqualify them, *γνωσθέντες καθαιρούνται*. (iii.) The canons that require the consent of metropolitan and synod, &c., to the consecration of a bishop, sometimes proceed to void a consecration made in violation of them, *μηδὲν ἰσχύειν* (*Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, can. xix.), and similarly *Conc. Rejiens.* can. ii., *Conc. Aurelian.* V. canons x. xi., *Conc. Cabillon.* I. can. x. &c. Yet it does not appear that in such a case the consecrated bishop suffered commonly more than the forfeiture of the see, *ἐκφυγον εἶναι τὴν κατάστασιν*. (iv.) Consecration of a bishop into a see already lawfully filled was reckoned as no consecration (Bingh. XVII. v. 3, quoting St. Cypr. *Epist.* lv.; *Conc. Sardic.* acc. to Hilary, *de Syn.* p. 128; *Conc. Chalced.*

P. iii. *Epist.* 51, 54, 56, 57, &c., about Timothy the Cat; Liberat. *Breviar.* xv.). (v.) The ordination of one under sentence of deposition was also void (*Conc. Chalced.* Act. xi.). But then (β) bishops already validly consecrated were liable to deposition, as well for the general causes affecting all clergy, as also in particular for causes relating to their own especial office; as, e. g. (i.) if they ordained, or if they preached (*Conc. Trull.* can. xx.), without permission, outside their own dioceses (*Apostol. Can.* xxxv.; *Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, c. xii.); or (ii.) if they received a clergyman who had disobediently quitted his own diocese (*Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, can. iii.; *Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 457, can. xx. excommunicated them in this case); or (iii.) if they ordained for money (*Apostol. Can.* xxix.; *Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, can. ii.); or (iv.) according to a late Gallican council (*Conc. Arausic.* A.D. 441, can. xxi.), if two bishops presumed to consecrate by themselves, whereupon both of them were to be deposed; or (v.) according to Pope Innocent I. (*Epist.* xxiii. c. 4, A.D. 402 x 417), bishops who ordained soldiers were themselves to be deposed; or (vi.) if they ordained a bishop into a see already full (*Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, as above); or (vii.) if they ordained any that had been baptized or rebaptized or ordained by heretics (*Apost. Can.* lxxviii.); or (viii.) if they ordained any of their own unworthy kindred (*Apost. Can.* lxxvi.) or (ix.) if they absented themselves from their diocese for longer than a year (*Conc. Constantin.* IV. A.D. 870, can. xvi., says six months), and persisted in disobedience when duly summoned to return (Justinian, *Novell.* vi. c. 2; see also below under III. 1, a. xv.). (x.) For simony, see SIMONY; or (xi.) if they did not duly enforce discipline [DISCIPLINE]; or (xii.) if they sought to create a bishopric for themselves out of ambition, either in a place where there had been none (*Conc. Tolet.* XII. A.D. 681, can. iv.: see however below), or by getting royal authority to divide a province, so as to erect a new metropolis in it (*Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, can. xii.). And yet further (γ), bishops were liable to excommunication as well as deposition, if (i.) they received as clergy such as were suspended for leaving their own diocese (*Apost. Can.* xvi.; *Conc. Carthag.* V. A.D. 398, can. xiii. &c. &c.); or (ii.) if they "made use of worldly rulers to obtain preferment" (*Apost. Can.* xxx., often repeated); or (iii.) if, being rejected by a diocese to which they have been appointed, they move sedition in another diocese (*Conc. Ancyra.* A.D. 314, can. xviii.); &c. &c. (δ.) Lastly, bishops were liable to suspension or other less censure, (i.) if they refused to attend the synod when summoned (*Conc. Carthag.* V. A.D. 398, can. x.; *Arelat.* II. A.D. 452, can. xix.; *Tarracon.* A.D. 536, can. vi. &c. &c.); and if when summoned to meet an accusation, they failed to appear even to a third summons, they were deposed (*Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, Act. xiv.); or (ii.) if they unjustly oppressed any part of their diocese, in which case the African Church deprived them of the part so oppressed (St. Aug. *Epist.* cclxi.); &c. &c.

(B.) The authority to inflict deposition was the provincial synod: and for the gradual growth and the differing rules of appeal from that tribunal, see APPEAL.

*Conc. Chalced.* can. xxix. A.D. 451, forbids



degradation of a bishop to the rank of a priest: he must be degraded altogether or not at all. And *Conc. Antioch.* canons xi. xii. A.D. 341, forbids recourse to the emperor to reverse a sentence of deposition passed by a synod. [DEGRADATION; ORDERS.]

III. From the appointment and the removal of a bishop, we come next to his office, as bishop. And here, in general, the conception of that office—consisting in, 1. τὸ ἄρχειν, and, 2. τὸ ἐπαρτερεύειν (so St. Ignat. *interpol. Ep. ad Smyrn.* c. 9)—was plainly, at the first, that of a ruler, not autocratic, but (so to say) constitutional, and acting always in concert with his clergy and people, as he had in the first instance been elected by them; and of a chief minister, in subordination to whom, for the sake of the essential unity of the Church, all Christian sacraments and discipline were to be administered, yet not as by mere delegates, but as by the due co-operation of subordinate officers, each having his own place and function: for the former of which points St. Cyprian is the primary and explicit witness, and no less so St. Ignatius for the latter. The legal powers and the wealth gradually acquired by the bishop, the weight derived from his place in synods, and the natural increase of the power of a single ruler holding office for life, and habitually administering the discipline and the property of his diocese, naturally rendered the essential “monarchy” of the episcopate more and more absolute, from Constantine onwards, and especially under Justinian; while, on the other hand, the bishops, *pari passu*, became also more and more under State control, especially in the East. In the West, and from the break up of the Roman empire, the monopoly in the hands of churchmen of knowledge and of civilization, the political powers thrown (and necessarily thrown) into the hands of the bishop, the unity of the Church of all the separate kingdoms, and its relations to the still respected imperial, as well as to the pontifical, influence of Rome,—to which no doubt might be added at the first the reverence for the priesthood as such felt by barbarians, and especially by Germanic peoples, met and strengthened by the Christian view of the priestly office,—gave to the bishops special weight, as the leaders of the Church: a weight exceptionally increased in Spain by the elective position of the Visigoth kings; but qualified both there, and much more elsewhere, especially in France, by the right of nomination of bishops assumed by the kings, and by their simoniacal and corrupt use of it, and by the assumption on the part of the State of a full right of making laws for the Church. But to proceed to details. And here—

(1.) Of the SPIRITUAL OFFICE of a bishop, as pertaining to him essentially and distinctively. And of this, first (a), in respect to his own diocese.

(a.) i. The power of *ordination* belonged to bishops exclusively. They were the organ by which the Church was enabled to perpetuate the ministry. Starting with the fact, that no one is spoken of in the N. T. as ordained except either by an Apostle, or by one delegated by an Apostle to this special office, the earliest intimation we meet with is the statement of St. Clem. Rom., already quoted, which draws a plain distinction between the original appointment of presbyter-

bishops and deacons, and the subsequent provision made by the Apostles of an order of men who should be able to perpetuate those offices. When next the subject happens to be mentioned, the ordainers are assumed, as of course, to be bishops, and the question is only of their requisite number and acts, or the like; as in *Can. Apost.* i., Ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων δύο ἢ τριῶν, and can. ii. πρεσβύτερος ὑπὸ ἐνὸς ἐπισκόπου χειροτονείσθω; and in *Conc. Carthag.* III A.D. 397, can. xlv. “Episcopus unus . . . per quem presbyteri multi constitui possunt;” and IV. A.D. 398, canons ii. iii. &c., which is the classical passage (so to call it) respecting the rites of ordination, and which allows presbyters no part at all in episcopal consecration; and in presbyterial, only to hold their hands “juxta manum episcopi super caput illius” (qui ordinatur), but “episcopo eum benedicente et manum super caput ejus tenente.” And this latter practice (which however does not exist in the Eastern church [Denzinger], although supposed to be based upon 1 Tim. iv. 14) appears to be alluded to by Firmilian (in St. Cypr. *Epist.* lxxv.), “majores natu . . . ordinandi habent potestatem.” Similar assumptions occur in *Conc. Nic.* can. xix., *Antioch.* A.D. 341, can. ix., *Chalced.* A.D. 451, can. ii. &c. &c.; and in *Conc. Sardic.* A.D. 347, can. vi., Ἐπίσκοποι καθιστῶν ὀφείλουσιν Ἐπισκόπους; and also Pseudo-Dion. *Areop. Eccl. Hier.* v. So also, not affirming simply but assuming the fact, St. Jerome (*Epist. ad Evangel.*), “Quid facit, excepta ordinatione, episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat?” and St. Chrys. (*Hom.* xiii. in 1 Tim.), Οὐ γὰρ δὴ πρεσβύτεροι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονοῦν (and similarly, *Hom.* i. in Philipp.), and (*Hom.* xi. in 1 Tim. iii. 8), Τῇ γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μόνῃ (οἱ ἐπίσκοποι) ὑπερβεβήκασι, καὶ τούτῳ μόνον δοκοῦσι πλεονεκτεῖν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους; while Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxxv.), expressly affirming what at length Aetius had denied, lays down that Πατέρας γὰρ γεννᾷ (ἡ τῶν ἐπισκόπων τάξις) τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἡ δὲ (τῶν πρεσβυτέρων) πατέρας μὴ δυναμένη γεννᾷ, διὰ τῆς τοῦ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας τέκνα γεννᾷ. So again, in actual practice, the cases of Ischyra, declared to be only a “layman” by an Alexandrian synod, A.D. 324 or 325 (Neale, *Hist. of East. Ch., Alexandria*, vol. i. p. 135), because ordained presbyter ὑπὸ Κολλούθου τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου φαντασθέντος ἐπισκοπῆν (St. Athanas. *Apol.* ii. Opp. i. p. 193, ed. 1698), and of certain presbyters declared to be laymen for the like reason by *Conc. Sardic.* A.D. 347, can. xix.; while the much later Council of Seville (*Conc. Hispan.* II. A.D. 619, can. v.) pronounced certain presbyterial and diaconal ordinations void, because, although the bishop had laid his hands upon the candidates, a presbyter, the bishop being blind, “illis contra ecclesiasticum ordinem benedictionem dedisse fertur.” The one and only distinct assertion of a contrary practice upon this point, and this too (even had it been trustworthy) of a single and exceptional case, is that of Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 933–940, born A.D. 876, who affirms in his *Origines*, that in Alexandria, from the beginning, the twelve city presbyters not only chose the Alexandrian patriarch, upon a vacancy, out of their own number, but also by imposition of hands and benediction created him patriarch; and that this lasted down to the



patriarchate of Alexander, who was at the Nicene Council, i.e. down to about A.D. 308 or 313: or, in other words, that the bishop, in whose time an Alexandrian synod deposed one who had received presbyterial ordination, and on that very ground, viz. Ischyra, was himself ordained by presbyters, and that all his predecessors had been so likewise. Both date, and the internal evidence of this and of many other equally gross blunders (see Pearson, *Vindic. Ignat.* c. XI. ii. 2, pp. 270, 282 sq., ed. Churton), make Eutychius' statement unworthy of the notice it once attracted. And it is, besides, an obvious perversion of the fact alleged by St. Jerome, that up to the time (not of the patriarch Alexander, but) of the patriarchs Heraclas and Dionysius, viz. A.D. 232 or A.D. 264, "Alexandriae presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori loco collocatum, episcopum nominabant;" and of the stranger practice still, mentioned by Liberatus (as above in I. 1, γ). That there were bishops enough in Egypt to consecrate legitimately (Eutychius also affirming that there were no others except the bishop of Alexandria until A.D. 190), is evident by the testimonies collected in Pearson (as above, pp. 296, sq.: there were above a hundred at one of Bishop Alexander's councils). The further assertion of both Ambrosiaster (in *Ephes.* iv. 11) and of the author of the *Quaest. in Vet. et Nov. Test.* ci., that in Egypt "presbyteri consignat si praesens non sit episcopus," and that "in Alexandria et per totam Aegyptum, si desit episcopus, consecrat presbyter," is ruled to mean either the consecration of the Eucharist or the rite of confirmation, not that of ordination, whether to the episcopate or the presbyterate, 1. by the date of the statements, viz. long after the period fixed even by Eutychius, and much more that named in St. Jerome; 2. by the meaning of the word *consignare*; 3. by the case of Ischyra, above mentioned, which is conclusive. Other instances of alleged presbyterial ordination are either "mere mistakes" (see a list with explanations in Bingham. II. iii. 7), or depend upon the assumption that *chorepiscopi* were not bishops, or upon a misinterpretation of an obscure canon of the Council of Ancyra, can. xiii. [CHOREPISCOPI.] The early Scotch and Irish Churches, in which the presbyter-abbats of certain monasteries exercised an anomalous jurisdiction, never allowed presbyterial ordination (see Adamnan in *V. S. Columbae*, and other authorities, in Grub's *Hist. of Ch. of Scotl.* c. xi. vol. i. 152-160). That a bishop however was not at liberty to ordain clerks "sine consilio clericorum suorum, ita ut civium conniventiam et testimonium quaerat" (*Conc. Carth.* IV. can. xxii.), but did so "communi consilio" (St. Cypr. *Epist.* xxxviii.), see below in (a.) x. Moreover, he was strictly forbidden to ordain in the diocese of another bishop (see below, (a.) xii.), or indeed in any way ἀλλοτριοεπισκοπεῖν.

(a.) ii. *Confirmation*, in accordance with the intimations in the N. T. (Acts viii. 17, xix. 6), appears also, when first mentioned, as the office of the bishop (*Constit. Apost.* iii. 16; Pseudo-Dionys. *Hierarch. Eccl.* ii. p. 254; *Conc. Carthag.* II. A.D. 390, can. iii., "ut chrisma, &c., a presbyteris non fiant"). But (through the difficulty of always securing the bishop's presence) the practice gradually issued in a severance between

the two acts, of imposition of hands, which was restricted to the bishop (St. Cypr. *Epist.* lxxiii.; Firmilian, ap. St. Cypr. *Epist.* lxxv.; Anon. *de Bapt. Huer.* in *Append. ad S. Cypr. Opp.*; *Conc. Eliberit.* A.D. 205, canons xxxviii. lxxvii.; Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43; St. Chrys. *Hom.* xviii. in *Act. Apost.* § 3; St. Jerome, *cont. Lucif.* iv.; St. Ambros. *de Sacram.* iii. 2; St. Aug. *de Trin.* xv. 26; Pope Innoc. I. *ad Decent.* iii.; Gelasius, *Epist.* ix.; Leo M. *Epist.* lxxxviii.; Greg. M. *Epist.* iii. 9; Siricius, *Epist.* i. *ad Himer.*; *Conc. Hispal.* II. A.D. 619, can. vii.; *Conc. Meld.* A.D. 845, can. xlv.); and of anointing with the consecrated chrism, the consecration of which was also restricted to the bishop (*Conc. Carthag.* III. A.D. 397, can. xxxvi.; *Tolet.* I. A.D. 400, can. xx.; *Bracar.* II. A.D. 563, can. xix., and III. A.D. 572, can. iv.; *Autissiod.* A.D. 576, can. vi.; *Barcinon.* II. A.D. 599, can. ii.; Pope Innocent I. *Epist.* i. *ad Decent.* c. iii.; Leo M. *Epist.* lxxxviii.; Gelas. *Epist.* ix.), and to the bishop of the diocese (*Conc. Carth.* IV. A.D. 398, can. xxxvi.; *Vasens.* I. A.D. 442, can. iii. &c. &c.); but the actual application of it, with some qualifications and in certain cases, allowed to presbyters: as e.g. in the Church of Rome, there being a double anointing, that of the forehead was restricted to the bishop, the rest not so; in Gaul, a single anointing was ordinarily the presbyter's office; in the East, a single anointing also, but ordinarily the bishop's office, and only in his absence, as at Alexandria and in Egypt, allowed to presbyters; but in West and East alike, allowed to presbyters in cases of urgency, as of energumens or of those at the point of death, or again by commission from their bishop (see Bingham. XII. ii. 1-6). The *Constit. Apostol.* vii. 43, 44, describe the practice of the 3rd or 4th century. [CONFIRMATION.]

(a.) iii. In the administration of sacraments, the bishop's authority was primary, that of presbyters, and a *fortiori* of deacons, subordinate. St. Ignat. *ad Smyrn.* viii.: Οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστι χερσὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν. Tertull. *de Bapt.* 17: "Dandi (baptismus) jus quidem habet summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus: dehinc presbyteri et diaconi; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiae honorem; quo salvo, salva pax est." Hieron. *cont. Lucif.* IV.: "Inde venit ut sine jussione episcopi neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habeat baptizandi." St. Ambros. *de Sacram.* iii. 1: "Licet presbyteri fecerint, tamen exordium ministerii a summo est sacerdote." Similar statements are numerous (Bingham. *Lay Bapt.* i. § 2, sq.). So e.g. *Conc. Eliberit.* A.D. 305, can. lxxvii.—If any are baptized by a deacon, "episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debet." So also *Conc. Vern.* I. A.D. 755, can. viii., forbids presbyters baptizing, or celebrating mass, "sine jussione episcopi." Although no doubt the statement of Ambrosiaster in *Ephes.* iv. is true also,—as it is indeed perfectly consistent with the principle above laid down, and both would be and is in like case the Church's rule now,—that, before the Church was settled, laymen were allowed "evangelizare et baptizare et Scripturas in ecclesia explanare." See also Van Espen, *Jur. Eccl. Univ.*, *De Bapt.* c. iii. § 1; and Bingham on *Lay Baptism*.

(a.) iv. The office of formal *preaching*, as distinct from exposition of Scripture, belonged also properly to bishops. So e.g. in the African

Church, if the bishop were present, until the time of St. Augustin; who was the first African presbyter that preached "coram episcopo," but this, "accepta ab episcopis potestate" (Possid. *V. S. Aug.* v.). So also in Spain, *Conc. Hispal.* II. A.D. 619, can. vii. In the East the practice was otherwise, since there it was only "in quibusdam Ecclesiis, tacere presbyteros et praesentibus episcopis non loqui" (Hieron. *ad Nepot.* Epist. ii.). Yet there also the privilege depended on the consent of the bishop, and was taken away in Alexandria by an absolute prohibition: Πρεσβύτερος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ οὐ προσομιλεῖ (Socrat. v. 22; Sozom. v. 17, vii. 19), from the time of Arius. In Rome, on the other hand, it is asserted that no bishop (οὐτε ὁ ἐπίσκοπος οὐτε ἄλλος τις, acc. to Sozom. vii. 19, repeated by Cassiodorus, *Hist. Tripart.*) preached at all until Leo the Great (Thomassin, II. iii. 83, § 5). To preach, however, every Sunday, was reckoned ordinarily the duty, as well as the privilege, of the bishop; on the ground that he is to be διδακτικός = apt to teach (so θρόνος διδασκαλικός = the bishop's throne, in St. Chrys. *Hom.* ii. in *Tit.*, and ἀξίωμα διδασκαλικόν = the bishop's office, in St. Cyril Alex. *Epist. ad Monach.* in *Conc. Ephes.* Labbe, iii. 423; —and Sozom. vii. 19, Μόνος ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἐπίσκοπος διδάσκει, —and St. Ambros. *de Offic.* i. 1, "Episcopi proprium munus docere populum"). And see also Origen, *Hom.* vi. in *Levit.* *Conc. Laodic.* c. A.D. 366, can. xix., and *Conc. Valent.* A.D. 855, can. i., take the practice for granted. King Guntram, A.D. 585 (*Edict. confirm. Conc. Matis.* II.), exhorts bishops to frequent preaching; Charlemagne enjoins their having suitable homilies (*Capit.* i. A.D. 813. c. xiv., and *Conc. Arelat.* can. x., *Mozart.* can. xxv., and *Rhem. canons* xiv. xv., all of the same year), and deprives bishops of their sees who should not have preached before a fixed day (*Monach. S. Gall.* i. 20); Ludov. Pius enjoins bishops to preach either in person or by their vicars (*Capit.* i. 109); and *Conc. Ticin.* A.D. 850, can. v., threatens deposition to all bishops who did not preach at least on Sundays and holidays. Ethelred also in England enjoins bishops to preach (*Laws*, vii. 19; repeated by Cnut, *Laws* xxvi). And similarly in Spain, *Conc. Tolet.* XI. A.D. 675, can. ii. Bishops are also enjoined by *Conc. Turon.* III. A.D. 613, can. xvii., to have homilies about the Catholic faith and a holy life, and to cause them to be translated "in rusticam Romanam linguam aut Theodiscam, quo facilius cuncti possint intelligere," &c. In the East, the Council in *Trullo* (A.D. 691, canons xix. xx.), while deposing bishops who preached outside their own dioceses without permission, enjoins all bishops to preach at least every Sunday, and if possible every day. And Balsamon, on can. lxiv. of the same council, lays down the principle, that "to teach and expound belongs by divine grace to bishops only, and so to those to whom bishops delegate the office." It is assumed to be the bishop's duty, also, in *Cod. Theodos.* lib. xvi. tit. ii., *de Episc.* l. 25; and also lib. ix. tit. xl. *de Poenis* l. 16; and in *Cod. Justin.* lib. ix. tit. xxix. *de Crim. Sacrilegii*, l. 1.

(α.) v. As in the points hitherto mentioned, so also in the administration of discipline, the bishop took the lead; the presbyters (and apparently in some cases the deacons) held their proper subordinate place under him, and formed his council. Bishop and presbytery occur to-

gether *passim* in St. Ignatius. The condemnations of Origen (Pamphil. *Apol. ad Phot. Cod.* cxviii.), of Novatian (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 43), of Paul of Samosata (*id.* vii. 28, 30), of Noëtus (Epiphani. *Haer.* lvii. 1), of Arius at Alexandria (*id.* lxi. 3; and see Cotelier. *ad Constit. Apost.* viii. 28), proceeded from the bishop, or bishops, but with presbyters, the πρεσβύτεριον alone indeed being mentioned in the case of Noëtus, and deacons as well as presbyters in that of Arius. So also Pope Siricius in the case of Jovinian, "facto presbyterio" (Siric. *Epist.* ii., the deacons also it appears concurring); and Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, in that of Andronicus, a layman (Synes. *Epist.* lvii. lviii.). At the same time, the bishop was the chief, and ordinarily the sole, judge in the first instance in cases of excommunication ("mucro episcopalis"), following the authority of 1 Tim. v. 1, 19 (but see also 1 Cor. v. 4, 2 Cor. ii. 10:—so St. Cypr. *Epist.* xxxviii. xxxix. lxx. &c.; *Conc. Nicaen.* can. v.; *Conc. Carth.* II. A.D. 390, can. viii.; *Conc. Carthag.* IV. A.D. 398, can. lv.; *Can. Apost.* xxxi.; *Conc. Ephes.* can. v.; *Conc. Agath.* A.D. 506, can. ii.; and countless other evidence—see EXCOMMUNICATION); subject however to an appeal to the synod [APPEAL]: although his power came to be limited in Africa by a Carthag. Council (II. A.D. 390, can. x.), by the requirement of twelve bishops to judge a bishop (which came to be the traditional canonical number), of six to judge a presbyter, and of three, in addition to the accused's own diocesan, to try a deacon. The power of formal absolution from formal sentence is throughout assumed by the canons to be in such sense in the bishop, that presbyters could only exercise it (apart from him) in cases of imminent danger of death, unless by leave of the bishop; and deacons only in very extreme cases indeed (Dion. Alex. in Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 44; *Conc. Carth.* II. canons ii. iv., and III. can. xxxii.; *Conc. Arausiac.* I. A.D. 441, can. i.; *Conc. Epheson.* A.D. 517, can. xvi.; &c. &c.). St. Cypr. (*Epist.* xiii.) allows a deacon to absolve, only if neither bishop nor presbyter can be had, and in a case of extreme urgency. But he also speaks of "episcopus et clerus" as both uniting in the solemn act of absolution by imposition of hands. And the rule is laid down fully in *Conc. Eliberit.* A.D. 305, can. xxxii.: "Apud presbyterum . . . placuit agere poenitentiam non debere sed potius apud episcopum: cogente tamen infirmitate, necesse est presbyterum communionem praestare debere, et diaconum si ei jusserit episcopus." See also Marshall's *Penit. Discipl.* pp. 91, sq.; and Taylor's *Episcop. Asserted*, § 36. [DISCIPLINE; PENANCE.] See also under PENITENTIARY, PRESBYTER, for the πρεσβύτερος ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας (Socrat. v. 19), and the like delegates of this part of the bishop's office.

This authority extended over the whole diocese and all its members. Exemptions, as of monasteries, from episcopal jurisdiction, are directly in the teeth of the Council of Chalced. canons vii. viii., of Justinian's law (*Cod.* i. tit. iii. *de Episc.* l. 40), of the provincial councils of *Orleans*, I. A.D. 511, can. xix.; *Conc. Agath.* A.D. 506, can. xxxviii.; *Conc. Ilerdens.* A.D. 546, can. iii.; &c. The well-known case of Faustus of Lerins and his bishop at the Council of Arles in A.D. 455, was an adjustment of rights as between abbat and bishop, but not an exemption in the proper

sense of the word (as Hallam superficially states). The earliest real case of the kind appears to belong to the 8th century, when Zachary, A.D. 750, granted a privilege to Monte Casino, "ut nullius juri subiaceat nisi solius Romani pontificis" (Mabill. *Act. S. Ord. Bened.*, Saec. iii. p. 643). Precedents for such exemptions, as granted by royal authority, occur in the *Formulae* of Marculfus. [EXEMPTION; MONKS.]

(a.) vi. As in the special subject of discipline, so generally in the affairs of the diocese, the bishop had the primary administration of them, with the power of veto, but (as throughout) with the counsel and consent of his presbyters, and of the diocese at large. So e.g. St. Cyprian, repeating the statement over and over again in equivalent terms,—*"Nihil sine consilio vestro (presbyterorum) et sine consensu plebis mea privata sententia gerere."* The same rule, as regards the presbyters, and in their place the deacons, is prominent in the language of St. Ignatius in the earliest time. And the "consensus presbyterorum" is likened by St. Jerome to the bishop's "senate," and by Origen and others to the *βουλή Ἐκκλησίας*, and by St. Chrysostom and Synesius to the Sanhedrim (*συνέδριον*). That presbyters also shared in diocesan synods, "adstantibus diaconis," see COUNCIL, SYNOD. On the other hand, *μηδὲν ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου* (*Conc. Laodic.* can. lvii.) is repeated so endlessly by councils, and asserted by church writers, as to make it needless to multiply quotations. Imperial legislation, in conferring special powers upon bishops, tended largely to increase episcopal authority. Yet provincial synods of presbyters (and of abbats) still continued, throughout, down to Carolingian times. [COUNCIL; SYNOD.] And Guizot (*H. de la Civ. en France*, Leçon 15) joins priests with bishops as the really governing body of the Church in the earlier Frankish period. In the particular matters of creeds, liturgies, and church worship generally, the bishop is also inferred to have had authority to regulate and determine all questions, partly as being a natural portion of his office, partly from the fact, that in unessentials, even the creeds, much more liturgical points, varied in various dioceses, within undefined but obvious limits. And so Basil of Caesarea, we learn, composed certain *εὐχῶν διατάξεις καὶ εὐκοσμίας τοῦ βήματος* for his own Church while still a presbyter, of which Eusebius his bishop sanctioned the use. St. Augustin (*Epist.* 88, *ad Casulan.*) assumes a like power in the bishop to appoint fasting days for his own diocese. And the like is implied in the tradition, that St. Ignatius introduced antiphons and doxologies into his own church (Cassiod. *Hist. Tripartit.* x. 9). So Proclus of Constantinople, A.D. 434–447, is said to have introduced the Trisagion into that Church. It was the bishop's office also to consecrate churches and cemeteries [CONSECRATION, p. 426]: mentioned as early as Euseb. *H. E.* x. 3, *Ἐγκαίνων ἑορταί . . . καὶ τῶν ἁγίων νεοπαγῶν προσευκτηρίων ἀφιερώσεις, ἐπισκόπων τε ἐπὶ ταυτὰ συνελεύσεις.*

(a.) vii. *Visitation* of his diocese was, at first, rather a duty following as a matter of course from a bishop's office, than a legal and canonical obligation: see St. Athanas. *Apol.* ii. § 74; St. Chrys. *Hom.* i. in *Epist. ad Titum* (*ἐπισκέψεις*); Sulp. Sever. *Dial.* ii. (of St. Martin); St. Aug. *Epist.* vi. Opp. ii. 144; Greg. Tur. *H. E.* v. 5, and *De Glor.*

*Confess.* lix. cvi.; St. Greg. M. *Dial.* iii. 38, &c.: and see also under CHOREPISCOPI, and *Περιοδεύτης* or VISITATOR. Accordingly, no canons at first defined or enforced the duty. But in course of time, so soon as canons came to be made upon the subject, the bishop became bound to visit his diocese once a year, both to confirm and to administer discipline, and generally to oversee the diocese: St. Bonif. *Epist.* lxx. ed. Jaffé; *Conc. Tarracon.* A.D. 516, can. viii.; *Conc. Bracar.* III. A.D. 572, can. i.; *Conc. Tolet.* IV. A.D. 633, can. xxxvi.; *Conc. Tolet.* VII. A.D. 646, can. iv.; *Conc. Liptin.* A.D. 743 (i. e. St. Boniface, as above); *Conc. Suess.* A.D. 744, can. iv.; *Conc. Arelat.* A.D. 813, can. xvii; *Capit. Cur. M.* lib. vii. cc. 94, 95, 109, 365, A.D. 769, 813, &c.

(a.) viii. Further (1), it was the bishop's office to issue *letters* of credence to any members of his diocese, which alone enabled them to communicate in other churches: sc. *litterae formatae*, or *canonicae*, &c. So, *Can. Apost.* xxxii., no stranger bishop or clergy were to be received *ἄνευ συστατικῶν*; *Conc. Laodic.* A.D. 366, can. xli., *Οὐ δεῖ ἱερατικὸν ἢ κληρικὸν ἄνευ κανονικῶν γραμμάτων ὁδεύειν*; *Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, can. vii., *Μηδένα ἄνευ εἰρηνικῶν δέχεσθαι τῶν ξένων*: *Conc. Carthag.* I. A.D. 348, can. vii., "Clericus vel laicus non communicet in aliena plebe sine litteris episcopi sui." So also *Conc. Milevit.* A.D. 402, can. xx. ("formatam ab episcopo accipiat"); *Conc. Agath.* A.D. 506, can. lii., and repeated *Conc. Epaon.* A.D. 517, can. vi. ("sine antistitis sui epistolis"); but, in each case, of the clergy, who should travel from home. And the Councils of Arles (A.D. 314, can. ix.) and of Eliberis (A.D. 305, can. xxv.) forbid "confessors" to give such letters, and order those who have them to procure fresh "communicatoriae" from the bishop. The Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, can. viii., permits *chor-episcopi διδόναι εἰρηνικάς*, but forbids presbyters doing so; and the Council of Eliberis (A.D. 305, can. lxxxi.) prohibits the worse abuse of the wives (apparently of bishops) giving and receiving such "pacificae." These letters, according to their purpose, were called "commendatitiae" (of credence, or recommendation), "pacificae" (also "ecclesiasticae" or "canonicae," of communion), or "dimissoriae" (*ἀπολυτικάι, συστατικάι*, or again *εἰρηνικάι*, or "concessoriae"); see e.g. *Conc. Trull.* can. xvii. (not necessary or granted, like modern letters dimissory, to any one who desired to be ordained in another diocese than his own—who, however, had of course to obtain leave to do so—but only when a clergyman desired to change his diocese); and they are to be distinguished from the unauthoritative "libelli" given by martyrs or confessors during a persecution to those who had lapsed. *Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, can. xi., orders *συστατικάι* to be given only to such as were "suspectae;" but to those who were poor and in want, only *εἰρηνικάι*, and not *συστατικάι*—*pacificae*, and not *commendatitiae*. (2.) The bishop also represented his diocese collectively, besides answering for its individual members; as in communicating with other dioceses. So, e.g. St. Clement of Rome writes to the Corinthian Church, as speaking for the Church of Rome, of which he was bishop; and is spoken of by Hermas Pastor (*Vis.* ii. 4) as officially communicating with Christians of other dioceses. It is needless to give evidence from later times.



(a.) ix. The income and offerings of the Church, and its alms, were likewise, in the first instance, under the disposition of the bishop, to be dispensed either by himself or by his proper officers (see ALIENATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY, ALMS, ARCHDEACON, DEACON, OECONOMUS); and this upon the ground of Acts iv. 35, 37, v. 2, 1 Cor. xvi. 3, 4; but with the general consent of his presbyters, as Acts xi. 30. *Τὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας . . . διοικεῖσθαι προσήκει μετὰ κρίσεως καὶ ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἐπισκόπου* (*Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, can. xxiv., and see can. xxv.). And *Conc. Gangr.* (A.D. 325, canons vii. and viii.) puts an anathema on those who intermeddle with church property, *παρὰ γνώμην* (or *παρεκτὸς*) *τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἢ τοῦ ἐγκεχειρισμένου τὰ τοιαῦτα*. So *Can. Apost.* xxxvii.: *Πάντων τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐχέτω τὴν φροντίδα καὶ διοικεῖτω αὐτὰ ὡς Θεοῦ ἐφορῶντος*. And so also *ib.* can. xl.; and at length, *Constit. Apostol.* ii. 25. And St. Cypr. (*Epist.* xxxviii. al. xli.), “*Episcopo dispensante*.” And St. Hieron. *ad Nepot. Epist.* xxxiv., “*Sciat episcopus, cui commissa est Ecclesia, quem dispensationi pauperum curaeque praeferat*.” And Possid. in *V. S. Aug.* But *Conc. Antioch.* (as above, can. xxv.) forbids the bishop from dealing with church revenues, *μὴ μετὰ γνώμης τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἢ τῶν διακόνων*, and orders him *εὐθύνας παρέχειν τῇ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας*. And *Can. Apost.* xxxix. al. xl. bids him keep his own goods and those of the church distinct, so that *ἔστω φανερά τὰ ἴδια τοῦ ἐπισκόπου πράγματα* (εἴ γε καὶ ἴδια ἔχει) *καὶ φανερά τὰ κυριακά, κ.τ.λ.* And *Conc. Carth.* IV. A.D. 398, can. xxxii., “*Irrita erit donatio episcoporum vel venditio vel commutatio rei ecclesiasticae, absque conniventia et subscriptione clericorum*.” Compare also the established exceptional cases wherein church plate, &c., might be sold, viz. for redeeming captives (as St. Ambrose, *de Offic.* ii. 28; Acacius of Amida, in Sozom. vii. 21; Deogratias of Carthage, in Victor Utic. *de Persec. Vandal.* i.; St. Augustin [Possid. in *V. S. Aug.* 24]), or feeding people in case of famine (as St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in Theodoret. ii. 27, and Sozom. iv. 25); in which, as in other cases of real necessity, the bishop allowably disposed of the property, but with the consent of the primate “*cum statuto numero episcoporum*” (*Conc. Carth.* V. A.D. 398, can. iv.), or “*apud duos vel tres comprovinciales vel vicinos episcopos*” (*Conc. Agath.* A.D. 506, can. vii.); which last canon, however, permits the bishop by himself to dispose of “*terrulae aut vineolae exiguae aut ecclesiae minus utiles*,” &c. (can. xlv.): and *Conc. Epton.* A.D. 517, can. xii., requires the “*consentia metropolitani*” to a like sale. Councils of Orleans, III. and IV. A.D. 538, 541, repeat like rules. And in Spain, *Conc. Hispal.* II. A.D. 619, canons ix. and xlix., and *Tolet.* IV. A.D. 633, can. xlviii., and the *Capit.* of Martin of Braga; in Italy, the letters of Gregory the Great, and *Conc. Rom.* VI. under Symmachus, A.D. 504; and in the East, Justinian (*Novell.* 123, c. 23, 131, c. 11), shew a like system. This general rule, however, held good only so long as the church goods of each diocese formed a common fund. After the appropriation of special incomes to special officers and to particular parishes, the bishop of course ceased to have control over more than his own share, except over alms and general contributions, and in like cases (see TITHES): un-

less so far as he still retained the power of appointing clergy and ordaining them to particular benefices. The era of such limitation may be taken to be the *Conc. Troasian.* (Troli, near Soissons), A.D. 909, can. vi.; the old rule lingering still during the time of Charlemagne (see Thomassin, III. i. 8). About 600% a year is Gibbon's estimate of an average episcopal revenue in the time of Justinian; the valuation fluctuating at the time from 2 pounds of gold to 30 (*Justin. Novell.* 123, c. 3).

(a.) x. The bishop also appears, in the first instance, to have so taken charge of his whole diocese, as that, the diocesan city being served by clergy of his own ordaining, the country districts were served from the city by clergy at his appointment, although with counsel and consent of both presbyters and laity. The diocese was in fact one parish, there being no such thing as a parish in the modern sense. And this original condition of things gradually settled into rule, as follows:—1. That no clergyman could migrate to, or be ordained to a higher order in, another diocese than that in which he had been born and ordained, or (if this involved two dioceses) in which he had been ordained, without the express leave of the bishop who had ordained him: the presbyters being bound to the bishop who had ordained them, as he in turn was bound to support them if in need. See CLERGY, LITTERAE DIMISSORIAE, PRESBYTER. An exception however came to exist in favour of the bishop of Carthage, in relation to Africa, “*ut soli ecclesiae Carthaginis liceat alienum clericum ordinare*” (*Ferrand. Breviar.* c. 230). 2. That no clergyman, when benefices came to exist, could resign his benefice, or remove to another, within the particular diocese, without his bishop's consent. *Conc. Carth.* IV. A.D. 398, can. xxvii., probably refers to different dioceses,—“*Inferioris gradus sacerdotes vel alii clerici concessionem suorum episcoporum possunt ad alias ecclesias transmigrare*.” But in later times, *Conc. Remens.* A.D. 813, can. xx., *Conc. Turon.* A.D. 813, can. xiv., and *Conc. Namnet.* can. xvi., are express, “*De titulo minori ad maiorem migrare nulli presbytero licitum est*,” and are confirmed by Charlemagne, *Capit.* lib. vi. c. 197,—“*Nullus presbyter creditam sibi ecclesiam sine consensu sui episcopi derelinquat et laicorum suasionem ad aliam transeat*,” and see also lib. vi. c. 85, lib. vii. c. 73. But, at the same time, the bishop could not remove or eject a clergyman against his will or at his own pleasure, the rule coming to be that three bishops were required to judge a deacon, and six a presbyter, including their own diocesan, with an appeal to the provincial synod: see APPEAL, DEACON, PRESBYTER, SYNOD. 3. That the bishop as a rule collated to all benefices within his diocese, conferring, by ordination to a particular “title,” the spiritual jurisdiction, which drew with it the temporal endowments (see BINGH. IX. viii. 5, 6; Thomassin, II. i. 33–35). But, 4. that the right of nominating to a church in another's diocese was granted, as time went on, to a bishop who had founded that church (and apparently to his successors, on the assumption that he founded it out of church property), in the West (*Conc. Arausic.* I. A.D. 441, can. x.); and in the East from Justinian, and ultimately in the West likewise (e.g. *Conc. Tolet.* IX. A.D. 655, can. ii.; *Conc. Francof.* A.D. 794, can. liv.), to laymen also in like position;



and in both East and West, by the time of Justinian and of Charlemagne respectively, to kings, nobles, and other laymen, without any such ground: although the right of the bishop to determine whether the presentee was fit, and if unfit, to reject him, remained still, even in the case of noblemen's chaplains. Further, 1. in the East, a limit also was put to the "requests" (δυσωπήσεις) of the nobles, and to the "command" (κέλευσις) of the emperor, in making such presentations (*Novell.* 3, in *Praef.* and c. 2): and, 2. in the West, the Council of Arles, VI. A.D. 813, can. iv., commands, "ut laici presbyteros absque iudicio proprii episcopi non ejiciant de ecclesiis nec alios immittere praesumant;" and the Council of Tours, III. A.D. 813, can. xv., "Interdicendum videtur clericis sive laicis ne quis cuilibet presbytero praesumat dare ecclesiam sine licentia et consensu episcopi sui;" while, on the other hand, both Charlemagne and Louis the Pious guard the lay side of the question by enacting, "Si laici clericos probabilis vitae et doctrinae episcopis consecrandos suisque in ecclesiis constituendos obtulerint, nulla qualibet occasione eos rejiciant;" or if they do reject them, then, "diligens examinatio et evidens ratio, ne scandalum generetur, manifestum faciat" (*Capit.* lib. v. c. 178, and *Lud. Pii Capit.* in *Conc. Gall.* ii. 430): an enactment repeated by *Conc. Paris.* A.D. 829, can. xxii. See also *Conc. Rom.* A.D. 826 and 853, can. xxi. The right of presentation to such a benefice by lapse, as devolving upon the bishop, is not traced by Thomassin (*II.* i. 31, § 5) higher than the time of Hincmar. The consent of the Church, necessary in the time of St. Cyprian to the ordination of a presbyter, does not appear to have been required in that of a deacon—"diaconi ab episcopis fiunt" (*St. Cypr. Epist.* lxx.)—and *a fortiori* not in the case of minor orders.

(a.) xi. The bishop became also a judge or arbitrator in secular causes between Christians, on the ground of 1 Cor. vi. 4: necessarily, however, by consent only of both parties, and by an authority voluntarily conceded to him; an office which continued so late as the time of St. Augustin; sitting on Mondays for the purpose: for which, and for other details, see *Apost. Constit.* ii. 45–53. See also under APPEAL. As an office conferred by the State, and endowed with legal power, see also below under (2).

(a.) xii. All these powers belonged to a bishop solely in relation to his own diocese. Beyond that diocese—not to discuss here, 1. the authority of synods, or, 2. the gradual growth of the offices of archbishop, primate, metropolitan, exarch, patriarch (for which see the several articles)—each bishop had no right to interfere, except under circumstances (such as the prevalence of schism or heresy, or of persecution, or the like) which would obviously constitute a necessity superseding law. So, *e.g.* St. Athanasius καὶ χειροτονίας ἐποίει in cities out of his diocese, as he returned from exile (*Socrat.* ii. 24). And similarly Eusebius of Samosata, in the Arian persecution under Valens (*Theodoret.* iv. 13, v. 4). And Epiphanius likewise in Palestine; defending his act on the ground that, although each bishop had his own diocese, "et nemo super alienam mensuram extenditur, tamen praeponitur omnibus caritas Christi" (*Epist. ad Joan. Hieros. Opp.* ii. 312). Compare also the letters of Cle-

ment of Rome to the Corinthians, and of Dionysius of Corinth (καθολικαὶ ἐπιστολαὶ) to the Lacedaemonians, and to the Athenians, and many others (*Euseb. H. E.* iv. 23); and St. Cyprian's interference in Spain in the cases of Martial and Basilides, and in Gaul in that of Marcian. And see Du Pin, *de Antiq. Eccl. Discipl.* pp. 141, sq. Still, the rule was—

(a.) xiii. A single bishop to each diocese, and a single diocese to each bishop. "Unus in Ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos," is St. Cyprian's dictum (*Epist.* lii. al. lv.). And St. Jerome, "Singuli Ecclesiarum episcopi, singuli archipresbyteri, &c., in navi unus gubernator, in domo unus dominus" (*Epist. ad Rustic.*, and repeatedly). And similarly St. Hilar. Diac. (*in Phil.* i. 1, in 1 Cor. xii. 28, &c.). And *Socrat.* vi. 22; *Sozom.* iv. 15; *Theodoret.* ii. 17 (ἐἷς Θεός, ἐἷς Χριστός, ἐἷς ἐπίσκοπος), and iii. 4; and, above all, *Conc. Nicaen.* A.D. 325, can. viii. &c. &c. &c. And to the same effect the numerous canons forbidding the intrusion of any one into a diocese as bishop during the lifetime of the bishop of that diocese, unless the latter had either freely resigned or been lawfully deposed. The seeming exceptions to this, indeed, prove the rule. Merely as a temporary expedient, in order to heal a schism, the Catholic bishops in Africa offered to share their sees with the Donatist bishops (*Collat. Carthag.* 1 die c. xvi. in Labbe, ii. 1352); as Meletius long before had proposed to Paulinus at Antioch to put the Gospels on the episcopal throne while they two should sit on either side as joint bishops (*Theodoret.* v. 3): the proposal dropping to the ground in both cases. See also what is said above of coadjutors; and the conjecture, not however solidly grounded, of Hammond and others, respecting two joint bishops, respectively for Jews and Gentiles, in some cities in Apostolic times (see *Bingh.* II. xiii. 3). It must be added, however, that Epiphanius (*Hier.* lxxviii. 6) does say that Alexandria never had two bishops, ὡς αἱ ἄλλαι πόλεις. On the other side, two sees to one bishop was equally against all rule. The text, "Unius uxoris virum," says the *De Dign. Sacerd.* (c. iv. inter *Opp. S. Ambros.*), "si ad altiorem sensum conscendimus, inhibet episcopum duas usurpare Ecclesias." And later writers, *e.g.* Hincmar, work the same thought with still greater vehemence, and loudly inveigh against spiritual adultery. And apart from this exalted view, the canon of Chalcedon, which forbids a clergyman being inscribed upon the roll of two dioceses, was (very reasonably) held to include bishops. The exceptional cases indeed of *Interventores*, and of the temporary "commendation" of a diocese to a neighbouring bishop [*INTERVENTORES, COMMENDA*], occur, the former in the early African Church, the latter as early as St. Ambrose himself (*Epist.* xlv.). And a case occurs in St. Basil the Great's letters (290 and 292), where a provincial synod, under urgent necessity, and not without vehement opposition, by a dispensation (τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας ἀναγκάϊον), allowed a bishop, promoted to the metropolitan see of Armenia, to retain his previous see of Colonia. And Gregory the Great in several cases joined together in Italy ruined or impoverished or depopulated sees. St. Medard also, in 532, united the sees of Noyon and Tournay, upon the urgency of his metropolitan and comprovincial bishops, and of the king, nobles, and people (*Surius*, in

V. S. *Med.* Jun. 8). But pluralities, in the sense of two or more previously independent bishoprics held together for merely personal reasons, do not seem to have crept in until early Carolingian times; when, *e.g.*, Hugh, son of Drogo, became archbishop of Rouen, A.D. 722, and added thereto subsequently the sees of Paris and Bayeux, besides the abbeys of Jumièges and Fontanelles (*Chron. Gemmetic.*), for no other apparent reason than that he was nephew of Pipin the Elder. In England, the first case was that of St. Dunstan, who held Worcester and London together, in order no doubt to further his monastic schemes, A.D. 957-960. And this is followed by the well-known series of archbishops of York who were also bishops of Worcester, from 972 to 1023; and this, again, by the union of the same unfortunate see of Worcester to that of Crediton in the episcopate of Living, 1027-1046. The union of other preferment, as of deaneries or abbeys, to bishoprics, began much about the like period, when circumstances tempted to it. And for two abbeys held together, see ABBAT. The apparent exception of the province of Europa in Thrace in earlier times, in which two bishops were allowed upon their own petition by the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431, Act. vii. sub finem) to hold each two, and in one case more, bishoprics together, on the ground that those bishoprics had always been held together, brings us rather to the previous enquiry respecting the size of dioceses, and whether necessarily limited to one city and its dependent country, and if so, of what size the city must be.

(a.) xiv. And here, there being no principle involved beyond that of suitableness in each case to the particular locality, and the original diocese in each case being the great city of the neighbourhood with so much of its dependent country and towns as was converted to the faith, questions necessarily arose, as the district became completely Christianized, and were determined in different ways in different places, as to the subdivision of the original vaguely limited diocese. In some countries that subdivision was carried so far as to call forth prohibitions against placing bishops *ἐν κώμῃ τινὶ ἢ ἐν βραχεῖα πόλει* (*Conc. Sardic.* A.D. 347, can. vi.); or again, *ἐν ταῖς κώμας καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις* (*Conc. Laodic.* about A.D. 366, can. lvii.), which latter canon perhaps only prohibits *chorepiscopi*. Leo the Great also vehemently condemns the erecting sees "in castellis," &c., in Africa (*Epist.* lxxxvii. c. 2). And it was made an objection to the Donatists that (to multiply their numbers) they consecrated bishops "in villis et in fundis, non in aliquibus civitatibus" (*Collat. Carth.* c. 181; Labbe, ii. 1399). The prohibition is repeated in later times, as by Pope Gregory III. A.D. 738, and Pope Zacharias, A.D. 743. The practice however had continued nevertheless; as is obvious by St. Greg. Naz., St. Chrysostom, Synesius, and others, quoted in Bingham. II. xii. 2, 3; and by Sozomen (vii. 19), stating, but as an exceptional case, that *ἐστὶν ὁπῇ καὶ ἐν κώμας ἐπίσκοποι ἱεροῦνται, ὡς παρὰ Ἀραβίους καὶ Κυπρίους ἔγγων.* On the other hand, the conversion of the German and other European nations, as it were, wholesale, upon the conversion of their kings, led in a large part of northern Europe to sees of nations rather than cities, and to sees therefore of often unwieldy extent. *E.g.*, in Scythia, *πολλὰ πόλεις ὄντες Σκύθαι ἓνα πάντες ἐπίσκοπον ἔχουσι* (Sozom. vii. 19; and see also vi.

21): viz. the Bishop of Tomi. In the older countries it might obviously happen, very naturally, that (as in the province of Europa) two or more towns or "civitates" of small but nearly equal size might come to be united in one diocese, of which yet neither of them could claim to be pre-eminently the city. Just as, on the other hand, Sozomen tells us, that Gaza and Majuma, being two "civitates" (although very small ones) and also two bishoprics, were united by the emperors into one "civitas," yet remained two bishoprics still (v. 4). The actual number of bishops in the time of Constantine is reckoned by Gibbon as 1800, of whom 1000 were Eastern, 800 Western. The authority for subdivision was "voluntas episcopi ad quem ipsa diocesis pertinet, ex consilio tamen plenario et primatis autoritate" (Ferrand. *Breviar.* xiii. in Justell. *Bibl. Jur. Can.* i. 448). See also *Conc. Carthag.* II. A.D. 397, can. v., and III. A.D. 397, can. xlii. (Labbe, ii. 1160, 1173), and St. Aug. *Epist.* cclxi., respecting his erecting the see of Fussala with the consent of the primate of Numidia. The consent of the bishop of Rome was not asked or thought of, until in the West in the time of St. Boniface, and even then it was chiefly in respect to newly converted countries. Compare the well-known history of Wilfrid in England in the end of the 7th century, the action of Pope Formosus a century later in respect to the same country, and the history of Nominoë and the Breton sees in 845. The Pope's consent became needful about the time of Gregory V. The consent of the king became also necessary from the commencement of the Frank kingdom, and in Saxon England. While in the East the absolute power of erecting new sees accrued to the emperors solely, without respect to diocesan bishop, metropolitan, council, or any one else (Thomassin, *De Marca*, &c.). An exceptional African canon (*Cod. Can. Afric.* cxvi.), in order to reconcile Donatists, allowed any one reclaiming a place, not a bishop's see, to retain it for himself as a new and separate bishopric upon a prescription of three years. And so again in Spain, according to *Conc. Tolet.* A.D. 633, can. xxxiv., and *Conc. Emerit.* A.D. 666, can. viii., thirty years' undisturbed possession by one bishop, of what had previously been a part of another's bishopric, constituted a prescriptive right on behalf of the possessor. The *Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, can. xi., had fixed the same period. The union of sees was subject to the same rules with the subdivision of them. There were in England no instances of such union within our period, except in the cases of the temporary sees of Hexham and of Whitherne, and of the possible brief-lived see of Ripon; the union of Cornwall and Devonshire being of considerably later date. The transference of the episcopal see from one place to another within the same bishopric, as distinct from any change of the limits or independency of the bishopric itself, seems to have followed a like rule with the larger measures of union or division. The bishop, with sanction of his comprovincials, and with the acquiescence of the State, was sufficient authority at first in European kingdoms or in the East; as, *e.g.* in the shiftings of the see of East Anglia, or of that of Wessex, &c. The consent of the Pope came to be asked afterwards; as in the time of Edward the Confessor, in the case of the removal of Crediton to Exeter, or in that of the great movement of sees from smaller

to larger towns in the time of William the Conqueror in England generally; which however were both of them done, and the latter of the two expressly, "by leave of the king."

(α.) xv. Finally, bishops were required to *reside* upon their dioceses. The Council of Nice (can. xvi.), enjoining residence on the other orders of clergy, plainly takes that of bishops for granted, and as needing no canon. The Council of Sardica, A.D. 347, can. xv., in the case of bishops who have private property elsewhere, permits only three weeks' absence in order to look after that property, and even then the bishop so absent had better reside, not on his estate itself, but in some neighbouring town where there is a church and presbyter. And *Conc. Trull.* A.D. 691, can. lxxx., deposes a bishop (or other clerk) who without strong cause is absent from his church three Sundays running. A year's absence from his diocese forfeited the see altogether, acc. to Justinian's law (at first it had forfeited only the pay, *Novell.* lxvii. c. 2), or six months acc. to *Conc. Constant.* A.D. 870 (see above). Presence at a synod (which was compulsory) was of course a valid reason for absence. Bishops however were not to cross the sea, acc. to an African rule (*Cod. Can. Afric.* xxiii.; and so also in Italy, *Greg. M. Epist.* vii. 8), without the permission and the letter (*ἀπολυτική, τετυπωμένη, formata*) of the primate; nor to go to the emperor without letters of both primate and comprovincial bishops (*Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, can. xi.). Nor were they to go into another province unless invited (*Conc. Sardic.* can. ii.); nor indeed to go to court at all unless invited or summoned by the emperor; nor to go too much "in canali" or "canalio" (along the public road) "ad comitatum" (to the court) to present petitions, but rather to send their deacon if necessary (*ib.* can. ix.-xii.). Yet, A.D. 794, by *Conc. Francof.* can. lv., some four and a half centuries later, Charlemagne is permitted to have at court with him, by licence of the Pope and consent of the synod, and for the utility of the Church, Archbishop Angelram and Bishop Hildebald. Bishops, again, were not to leave their dioceses "negotandi causa," or to frequent markets for gain (*Conc. Eliberit.* A.D. 305, can. xviii.). How far persecution was an excuse or reason for absence, is not absolutely determined. St. Augustin excuses an absence of his own on the ground that he never had been absent "licentiosa libertate sed necessaria servitute" (*Epist.* cxxxviii.). And Gregory the Great repeatedly insists upon residence. And to come later still, *Conc. Francof.* A.D. 794, canons xli. xlv., renews the prohibition of above three weeks' absence upon private affairs. And Charlemagne at Aix (*Capit. Aquisgr.* A.D. 789, c. xli.) restrains the bishop's residence, not simply to his see, but to his cathedral town: just as previous Frank canons repeatedly enjoin his presence there at the three great feasts of Easter, Whitsunday, and Christmas. The bishop, too, by a canon of *Conc. Carthag.* IV. A.D. 398, can. xiv., was bound to have his "hospitulum" close to his cathedral church. The sole causes, in a word, that were held to justify absence, were such as arose from service to the Church; as when at synod, or employed on church duties elsewhere, or summoned to court on church business or for Christian purposes (but this was an absence jealously watched: see *Conc. Sardic.* &c. &c. as above). Absence

also on pilgrimage was seemingly, yet hardly formally, acquiesced in. And a journey to Rome (by permission of the prince) would come under the same class of exemption as the attending a synod. By the time of Charlemagne, moreover, the office of *Missi Dominici*, and other State duties, were held to justify at least temporary non-residence.

β. From the spiritual office of the bishop singly, we pass to his joint authority when assembled in provincial synod; and this, i. as respects the consecration of bishops, for which see above; and, ii. as a court of appeal and judicature over individual bishops, for which see *APPEAL, COUNCIL, SYNOD*; and, iii. as exercising a general jurisdiction over the province; for which, and for the relative rights of bishops and presbyters, &c. in synod assembled, see *COUNCIL, SYNOD*.

γ. Thirdly, for the collective authority of bishops assembled in general council, i. as respects doctrine, ii. as respects discipline, see *COUNCIL, OECUMENICAL*.

III. (2.) Over and above the spiritual powers inherent in the episcopate as such, certain TEMPORAL POWERS AND PRIVILEGES were conferred upon the bishop from time to time by the State; and these, partly, in his general capacity as of the clergy [*IMMUNITIES*, p. 822], partly upon him as bishop.

(i.) The *judicial authority* in secular causes between Christians, which attached to the bishop as a matter of Christian feeling, became gradually an authority recognized and enlarged by state law. See details under *APPEAL*. He was limited in the Roman empire to civil causes, and to criminal cases that were not capital, and almost certainly to cases where both parties agreed to refer themselves to the bishop. In England, however, the bishop sat with the alderman in the Shire Gemot, twice a year, "in order to expound the law of God as well as the secular law" (Eadgar's *Laus*, ii. 5, &c. &c.); an arrangement to which (as is well known) William the Conqueror put an end. In Carlovingian France, the bishop and the *comes* were to support one another, and the two as *Missi Dominici* made circuits to oversee things ecclesiastical as well as civil (*Capit.* of A.D. 789, 802, 806, &c.; see Gieseler, ii. 240, Eng. tr.). Questions relating to marriages, and to wills, were also referred to the bishops by the Roman laws, and by the Carlovingian (see under *MARRIAGE, TESTAMENT*). The bishop also was authorized by *Cod. Justin.* I. iv. 25, to prohibit gaming; as he had been by *Cod. Theod.* IX. iii. 7, XVI. x. 19, to put down idolatry; and IX. xvi. 12. sorcerers; and XV. viii. 2, pimps. He had also special jurisdiction, in causes both civil and (subsequently) criminal, over clergy, monks, and nuns—"episcopalis audientia"—from Valentinian, A.D. 452 (*Novell.* iii. *de Episc. Judicio*), and from Justinian, A.D. 539 (*Novell.* lxxix. and lxxxiii., and so also cxxiii. c. 21); and from Heraclius, A.D. 628 (for the inclusion of criminal cases, see Gieseler, ii. 119, n. 14, Eng. tr.). And this exemption of the clergy from civil courts was continued by Charlemagne (Gieseler, *ib.* 256).

(ii.) Bishops also became members of the great council of the kingdom in all the European states; the result of such amalgamation being to merge ecclesiastical councils to some extent in civil ones. Their political position had also the effect of rendering them more despotic, while



it made them at the same time more worldly. They were in effect nobles, with the additional powers of a monopoly of education and of the sanctity of their office. See for this Guizot, *Hist. de la Civ. en France*, Leçon 13.

(iii.) Under the Roman emperors it would seem also that civil magistrates were placed in a certain sense under the jurisdiction of the bishop in respect to their civil office. *Conc. Arel.* A.D. 314, can. vii., de Praesidibus, "placuit ut cum promoti fuerint, literas accipiant ecclesiasticas communicatorias: ita tamen ut in quibuscunque locis gesserint, ab episcopo ejusdem loci cura de illis agatur: ut cum caeperint contra disciplinam publicam agere, tum demum a communione excludantur: similiter et de his qui rempublicam agere volunt" (Labbe, i. 1427). And so Socrates (vii. 13), writing of St. Cyril of Alexandria and Orestes the *Præfectus Augustalis* of Egypt. The episcopal power of excommunication seemed to afford a ground for this authority. And so St. Gregory of Nazianzum declares to the *Δυνάσται καὶ Ἀρχόντες*, that *ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ νόμος ὑποτίθησιν ὑμᾶς τῇ ἐμῇ δυναστείᾳ καὶ τῷ ἐμῷ βήματι, κ.τ.λ.* (*Orat.* xvii.). In Spain, at a later period, *Conc. Tolet.* III. A.D. 589, can. xviii., describes the bishops as "prospectores qualiter iudices cum populo agant," an enactment repeated by *Conc. Tolet.* IV. A.D. 633, can. xxxii. And a constitution of Lothaire's in France, about A.D. 559, enacts, in case of an unjust decision by the civil judge, that, in the absence of the king, "ab episcopis castigetur" (Labbe, v. 828). And this seems to have been based upon Justinian's Code (I. iv. 26), and upon *Novell.* viii. 9, lxxxvi. 1 and 4, cxxviii. 23 (see Gieseler, ii. 118, 119, Eng. tr.)

(iv.) The more special office of protecting minors, widows, orphans, prisoners, insane people, foundlings, in a word all that were distressed and helpless, was also assigned to bishops; at first, as a natural adjunct to their office (see, e. g. *Conc. Sardic.* A.D. 347, can. vii.; St. Jerome, *ad Gierunt.* [of a widow protected "Ecclesiae praesidio"]; St. Ambros. *de Offic.* ii. 29; St. Aug. *Epist.* 252 al. 217, and *Serm.* 176, § 2); afterwards by express law (*Cod.* tit. i. c. iv. *de Episc. Audientia*, ii. 22, 24, 27, 28, 30, 38); repeated further on by Gallic councils (*Aurelian.* V. A.D. 549, can. xx.; *Turon.* II. A.D. 567, can. xxix.; *Mutiac.* II. A.D. 585, can. xiv.; *Francof.* A.D. 794, can. xl.; *Aelat.* VI. A.D. 813, can. xvii.); and by Spanish ones (*Tolet.* III. A.D. 589, can. xviii.); and referred to in Italy in the letters of Gregory the Great frequently. The manumission of slaves belonging to the Church (e. g. *Conc. Agath.* A.D. 535, can. vii.), and the protection of freedmen (*ib.* can. xxix., and *Conc. Aurelian.* V. A.D. 549, can. vii. &c.), were also permitted and assigned to bishops; and this not only in Gaul but elsewhere (see Thomassin, II. iii. 87, sq.). And the manumission of slaves generally was often made in their presence (e. g. in Wales and England, *Counc.* I. 206, 676, 686, Haddan and Stubbs), and was furthered by their influence.

(v.) The practice of anointing kings at their coronation, and the belief which grew up that the right to the crown depended upon, or was conveyed by, the episcopal unction, added further power to the bishops. But this began in the West (if we except the allusion in Gildas to the practice, and the well-known case of St. Columba

and King Aidan) only from about Carolingian times; in the East, however, from the emperor Theodosius, A.D. 408 (see Maskell's *Dissert.* in *Mon. Rit.* iii., and a list in Morinus, *de Sac Ordin.* ii. 243; and CORONATION, UNCTION).

(vi.) Bishops were further exempted from being sworn in a court of justice, from *Conc. Chalced.* (A.D. 451, Act. xi.); confirmed by Marcian and by Justinian (*Cod.* i. tit. iii. *de Episc. et Cler.* l. 7, and *Novell.* cxxiii. 7); the privilege, however, being mixed up in the first instance with the general question of the legality of oaths at all to any Christian. And this privilege was repeated by the Lombard laws (L. ii. tit. 51, and L. iii. tit. 1), and is traceable in the *Capit.* of Charlemagne (ii. 38, iii. 42, v. 197). But oaths of fidelity to the king were imposed upon bishops by Charlemagne (see above). It was extended to presbyters also in so-called Egbert's *Excerpts*, xix. (9th century), and by the provincial Council of Tribur (near Mayence, A.D. 895, can. xxi.): as it was always, by both law and canon, in the East, acc. to Photius in *Nomocan.* tit. ix. c. 27, and Balsamon, *ib.* Bishops indeed had the privilege of not being summoned to a court to give evidence at all, from at least Justinian's time (as above); possibly from that of Theodosius (*Cod.* lib. xi. tit. xxxix. *de Fide Testium*, l. 8); but the latter law is taken to mean only that a clergyman chosen to act as arbiter could not be compelled to give account of his decision to a civil tribunal (see Bingh. V. ii. 1). The value of a bishop's evidence, and that not on oath, was also estimated, according to a very suspicious law assigned to Theodosius (*Cod.* xvi. tit. xii. *de Episc. Audient.* l. 1), as to be taken against all other evidence whatever; and certainly was ranked by Anglo-Saxon laws (Wihfred's *Dooms* xvi.) with the king's, as "incontrovertible." See also Egbert's *Dialogus*, *Resp.* i.; and a fair account of "compurgation," as required or not required of the clergy, in H. C. Lea's *Superstition and Force*, pp. 30, sq. Philadelphia, 1870. Gregory of Tours, when accused, condescended, "regis causa" and "licet canonibus contraria," to exculpate himself by three solemn denials at three several altars; although it was held superfluous for him to do this, because "non potest persona inferior" [which was the case here] "super sacerdotem credi." *Conc. Meld.* A.D. 845, can. xxxvii. forbids bishops to swear. And the *Capit.* of Carolus Calvus, A.D. 858 (*Conc. Carisiac.* c. xv.) is express in forbidding episcopal oaths upon secular matters, or in anything but a case of "scandalum Ecclesiae suae." The office of *Advocatus Ecclesiae*, among other things, was connected with this inability to be sworn. See also H. C. Lea, as above.

(vii.) Bishops had also a privilege of intercession for criminals in capital or serious criminal cases; which the Council of Sardica regards as a duty on their part calling for frequent exercise: *Ἐπει πολλακὶς συμβαίνει τινὰς . . . καταφυγεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν . . . τοῖς τοιούτοις μὴ ἀρνῆσθαι εἶναι τὴν βοήθειαν, ἀλλὰ χωρὶς μελλησμοῦ, κ.τ.λ.* (can. vii., transportation and banishment to an island being the penalties named). As an office naturally as well as legally attached to the episcopate, such intercession is mentioned by St. Ambrose, by St. Augustin (interceding for the Circumcellions, *Epist.* clviii. and clx.), by St. Jerome (*ad Nepot.*, *Epist.* xxxiv.) by Socrates



(v. 14, vii. 17). It did not extend to pecuniary causes, on the ground that in these to help the one side would be to injure the other (St. Ambros. *de Offic.* iii. 9). It is mentioned later still by Sulp. Severus, *Dial.* iii. of St. Martin, by Ennodius of St. Epiphanius of Ticinum, &c. Restrictions, however, are placed upon the (admitted) right by *Cod. Theod.* (IX. tit. xl. cc. 16, 17), renewed by Justinian (I. tit. iv. *De Episc. Audient.* l. 6), and again by Theodoric in Italy (*Edict.* c. 114): free access being given nevertheless to bishops to enter prisons with a view to such "interventiones" (*Append. Cod. Theod.* c. xiii.). And Charlemagne gives authority to bishops to obtain pardon for criminals from the secular judges at the three great festivals (*Capit.* vi. 106). A series of councils, mostly in Gaul, had put limits, before Charlemagne, to the Church's right of protecting criminals. See CHURCH, SANC-TUARY.

(viii.) A bishop's character, life, and property, were also placed under special legal protection: (1.) By the canons, rejecting the evidence of a heretic altogether, and requiring more than one Christian lay witness, against a bishop (*Apost. Can.* lxxiv.); or again, rejecting in such case the evidence of one known to be guilty of crime (*Conc. Carth.* II. A.D. 390, can. vi.); or of one, cleric or lay, without previous enquiry into the character of the witness himself (*Conc. Chalc.* A.D. 451, can. xxi.); which provisions occur also in *Conc. Constantin.* (A.D. 381, can. vi.), with the qualification that they do not apply to suits against a bishop touching pecuniary matters, but only to ecclesiastical cases. (2.) By the canons which excommunicate any one proved to have falsely accused a bishop (*Apost. Can.* xlvii.); extended also to priests and deacons by *Conc. Eliberit.* A.D. 305, can. lxxv. Under the Germanic states this protection was carried still further (see, e.g. for Anglo-Saxon laws, Thorpe's index, vol. i.; and across the Channel, *Leg. Alaman.* cc. x. xii.; *Leg. Longob.* I. ix. 27; *Leg. Bavar.* i. 11; and *Capit. Carol. et Ludov.* lib. vi. cc. 98, 127; vii. c. 362; and *Capit. Ludov. Add.* iv. c. 3): provisions suggested by Justinian's legislation of a like kind.

How far bishops were exempt, with other clergy, from civil jurisdiction, see IMMUNITIES. Justinian gave to bishops the special privilege, that they could not be brought before the civil magistrate for any cause, pecuniary or criminal, without the emperor's special order (*Novell.* cxxiii. l. 8).

(ix.) For the legal force attached to the decrees of (episcopal) synods, see under COUNCIL, SYNOD.

(x.) In addition however to privileges thus accorded to bishops by the State, their office as bishops entailed upon them also certain restrictions and burdens, partly in common with clergy generally (for which see the several articles), partly peculiar to themselves, or belonging to them more especially than to the clergy of lower rank. As (1) in the disposal of their property by will: wherein, in the case of any lands acquired by them after ordination, they were required to leave such lands to the Church (*Conc. Carth.* III. A.D. 397, can. xlix.), and could only dispose of such as had come to them by inheritance or by gift, or such as they had possessed before ordination. And even those they could not leave save to their kinsfolk, nor to them if they were

heretics or heathens, but were bound to leave them by will to the Church in such case (*Can. Eccl. Afric.* 48). Justinian also allows bishops to leave nothing by will except what they possessed before being ordained bishops, or what might have accrued to them since that time by inheritance from kinsmen up to the 4th degree and no further; all else to go to the Church, or to works of piety (*Cod. I. de Episc. et Cler.* l. 33): the goods of a bishop dying intestate to go wholly to the Church (*ib.*). And Gregory the Great acts upon a like rule. And in Gaul, *Conc. Agath.* A.D. 506, can. vi., *Epaon.* A.D. 517, can. xvii., *Paris.* III. A.D. 557, can. ii., *Lugdun.* II. A.D. 567, can. ii., contain various enactments founded on like principles, although not quite so rigorous. So likewise Spanish councils from *Conc. Tarracon.* A.D. 516, can. xii., *Conc. Valent.* A.D. 524, can. ii. iii., onwards; carefully guarding the right of the Church to all church goods (especially, it must be owned, in the matter of limiting the manumission of slaves belonging to the Church), while leaving the bishop's property, otherwise acquired, to his heirs. And all these enactments were backed by a strong feeling in favour of the principle, that a clergyman, and especially a bishop, should have no private wealth, but should give up all to the Church and the poor: see e.g. Possidius' *Life of St. Augustin.* He was to have "vilem suppellectilem et mensam ac victum pauperem," acc. to *Conc. Carthag.* IV. A.D. 398, can. xv. Nor was he to become executor under a will (*ib.* xviii.), or to go to law "pro rebus transitoriis" (*ib.* xix.). But see for this GUARDIAN, LITIGATION. The requirement of the royal consent to a bishop's will in England in Norman times arose from a totally different source, viz. the king's right to the temporalities during vacancy, and the regarding the bishopric as a fee in the feudal sense. See also the parallel case of abbats, under ABBAT. (2.) Acc. to *Conc. Carthag.* A.D. 398, can. xvi., a bishop was not to read "gentilium libros, haereticorum autem pro necessitate et tempore." But see, for the fluctuations of the dispute respecting classical study and the reading of Pagan writers, Thomassin, II. i. 92. (3.) For prohibitions about hunting and hawking, and social matters generally, see HUNTING. (4.) Under the Frank kings also, and notably under Charlemagne and his successors, bishops, who with the other clergy enjoyed large exemptions under the Roman empire, gradually became liable to certain duties, arising from their wealth and position, and gradually assuming large proportions as the feudal system grew up: as, e.g. annual gifts to the crown, the entertainment of the king and his officers on progress (*jus gisti, jus metatus*, &c., see Du Cange *sub vocibus*, and Thomassin, III. i. 38, sq.), the finding soldiers for the emperor's service, &c. &c. But feudal dues belong to a later date. Clergy had been especially exempted from the "jus metatus" under the Roman emperors.

(xi.) We may also mention here the custom of educating boys in the bishop's house for the ministry (see Possid. in *V. S. Aug.*, and Sozom. vi. 31, speaking respectively of Africa and of Egypt); and *Conc. Tolet.* II. A.D. 531, can. i. and ii., and IV. A.D. 633, can. xxiv. (regulating the practice in Spain); and *Conc. Turon.* V. A.D. 567, can. xii. for Gaul). See Thomassin, III. i. 92-97.

III. (3.) From the office, we pass to the MONO-RARY PRIVILEGES and rank of a bishop; of whom in general the *Apost. Constit.* (ii. 34) declare, that men ought τὸν ἐπίσκοπον στέργειν ὡς πατέρα, φοβεῖσθαι ὡς βασιλέα, τιμᾶν ὡς κύριον. But no doubt many of such privileges belong to Byzantine times, and date no earlier than the 3rd or 4th centuries at the earliest. And here—

(i.) Of the modes of salutation practised towards him from the 4th century onwards. As, 1. bowing the head to receive his blessing—ὁποκλίνειν κεφαλὴν—inclinare caput: see Bingham. II. x. 1, and Vales. in Theodoret. iv. 6, from St. Hilary, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, &c. speaking of bishops only; and a law of Honorius and Valentinian, speaking of bishops as those “quibus omnis terra caput inclinat.” 2. Kissing his hand—manus osculari (Bingham. *ib.* 2, quoting Savaro on Sidon. Apollin. *Epist.* viii. 11). 3. Kissing the feet also—pedes deosculari—appears by St. Jerome, *Epist.* lxi. (speaking of a bishop of Constantina in Cyprus; and see Casaubon, *Exercit.* xiv. § 4), to have been at one time a mark of respect common to all bishops; being borrowed indeed from a like custom practised towards the Eastern emperors. The deacon is to kiss the bishop's feet before reading the Gospel, acc. to the *Ordo Romanus*. It was restricted to the Pope as regards kings, by Gregory VII. 4. The forms of address, and the titles and epithets, applied to bishops, have been mentioned already.

(ii.) The insignia of a bishop were,—1. the mitre; seemingly alluded to by Eusebius, x. 4, as τὸν οὐράνιον τῆς δόξης στέφανον, and certainly mentioned by Greg. Naz. *Orat.* v. under the name of κίδαρις, and by Ammian. Marcell. lib. xxix. under that of “corona sacerdotalis,” yet not occurring in Pontificals in the West until after the 10th century (Menardus, in Du Cange), and not reckoned among the “episcopalia” even in A.D. 633 (see above); while in the East, Symeon of Thessalonica tells us that all bishops officiated with bare heads except the bishop of Alexandria, who did then wear a κίδαρις; and the homily attributed to St. Chrysostom, *de Uno Legistit.* (Opp. vi. 410, Montf.), implies that there was then no τιάρα or κορυβάντιον appropriated to bishops at their consecration. The “aurea lumina,” however, attributed to St. John by St. Jerome (*de Scriptt. Eccl.*), and by Eusebius (περαλον, iii. 31, v. 24) on the authority of Polycrates,—and again by Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxix.), on that of Eusebius and Clement of Alexandria, to St. James of Jerusalem,—seem to favour the supposition that some kind of mitre soon became usual. See Maskell, *Mon. Rit.* iii. 274. [MITRE.] 2. The ring, peculiar to the West, and alluded to by Optatus (lib. i.): see above, and under RING. 3. The staff, belonging apparently to patriarchs in the East (so Balsamon), and of a shape to supply the ordinary uses of a staff, viz. to lean upon; in the West, growing by Carolingian times into a sceptre of some seven feet long, occasionally of gold (see the *Monach. S. Gall.* i. 19, quoted by Thomassin, I. ii. 58); so that instead of golden bishops carrying wooden staves, there had come to be (acc. to a saying quoted by Thomassin) wooden bishops carrying golden ones. See STAFF. The two last named, the ring and the staff, were so far the characteristic insignia of a bishop before the time of Charlemagne as to become the symbols by

which bishoprics were given (see above). And they are recognized as such A.D. 633 in Spain, in conjunction with yet another, viz., 4. the orarium: for which see ORARIUM. 5. A cross borne before him was peculiar in the East to a patriarch; in the West it does not occur until the 10th century, unless in such exceptional cases as that of the first entry of St. Augustin into Canterbury, A.D. 596: the cross of gold mentioned by Alcuin as carried about with him by Willibrord being apparently only a pectoral cross. See CROSS. 6. The tonsure, when general rules about modestly cut hair, &c., settled into form: rule about the 6th century, was not peculiar in any special form to bishops: see TONSURE. Nor yet, 7. was there apparently any special dress for bishops apart from solemn occasions and in ordinary life, during the period with which this article is concerned: as appears, among other evidence, by the rebukes addressed by popes to the Gallic bishops of the 5th century onwards, who, being monks before they were bishops, retained their monastic habit as bishops (see at length Thomassin, I. ii. 43, sq.). For the vestments used during divine service, see VESTMENTS.

(iii.) Singing hosannas before a bishop on his arrival anywhere, is mentioned only to be condemned by St. Jerome (in Matt. xxi. Opp. vii. 174 b). But see Vales. ad Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 23: and Augusti, *Denkwürd. aus der Christl. Archaeol.* v. 218.

(iv.) The form of addressing a bishop by the phrase *corona tua* or *vestra*, and of adjuring him *per coronam*, frequent in St. Jerome, St. Augustin, Sidon. Apollin., Ennodius, has been explained as referring to the mitre, to the tonsure, or to the *corona* or *consessus* of the bishop's presbyters. The personal nature of the appellation appears to exclude the last of these. Its being peculiar to bishops is against the second. While the objection taken by Bingham against the first, viz. that bishops did not wear mitres at the period when the phrase came into use, seems scarcely founded on fact. And the bishop's head-covering was also certainly called “corona,” as by Ammianus Marcellinus. At the same time, the phrase after all possibly means nothing more definite than “your beatitude,” or “your highness.”

(v.) The bishop's throne—θρόνος, θρόνος ἀποστολικός—or (after the name of the founder of the see) ὁ Μάρκου θρόνος, for Alexandria, &c.—βῆμα—θρόνος ὑψηλός, in contradistinction to the “second throne” of the presbyters—“linteata sedes” (Pacian. *ad Sempron.* ii.)—“cathedra velata” (St. Aug. *Epist.* cciii.)—θρόνος ἐπισκοπικῶς (St. Athan. *Apolog.*)—was also a mark of his dignity. The Council of Antioch, A.D. 364, condemns Paul of Samosata for erecting a very splendid throne, like a magistrate's tribunal (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30). See also above in this article under *Enthronization*. By *Conc. Carthag.* IV. A.D. 398, canons xxxiv. xxxv., a bishop is enjoined that, as a rule of courtesy, “quolibet loco sedens, stare presbyterum non patiatur;” and that although “in Ecclesia et in consessu presbyterorum sublimior sedeat, intra domum . . . collegam se presbyterorum esse cognoscat.” During prayers, according to the Arabic version of the Nicene canons (lxii.), the bishop's place in church was “in fronte templi ad medium altaris” (Labbe, ii. 334).

(vi.) If we are to take the pretended letter of Pope Lucius (Labbe, i. 721) to be worth anything as evidence in relation to later times, the bishop of Rome was habitually attended by two presbyters or three deacons, in order to avoid scandal.

IV. (1.) The relation of bishops to each other was as of an essentially equal office, however differenced individuals might be in point of influence, &c., by personal qualifications or by the relative importance of their sees. St. Cyprian's view of the "unus episcopatus"—the one corporation of which all bishops are equal members—is much the same with St. Jerome's well-known declaration (*Ad Evangel. Epist. ci.*), that "ubicunque fuerit episcopus, sive Romae sive Eugubii, . . . ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii." And a like principle is implied in the *litterae communicatoriae* or *synodicae*,—*συγγράμματα κοινωνικά*, sometimes called *litterae enthronisticae*, *συλλαβαὶ ἐνθρονιστικά*,—by which each bishop communicated his own consecration to his see to foreign bishops as to his equals (Bingh. II. xi. 10). The order of precedence among them was determined by the date of consecration (see, e. g. the *Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric. lxxxvi.*, *Conc. Bracar. II. A.D. 563*, can. vi., and *Talet. IV. A.D. 633*, can. iv., and *Bracar. IV. A.D. 675*, can. iv.; and the English Council of *Hertford, A.D. 673*, can. viii.; and Justinian's *Cod. I. tit. iv. l. 29*; and above under I. 3. 8). But—

(2.) This equality was gradually undermined by the institution of metropolitans, archbishops, primates, exarchs, patriarchs, pope: for each of whom see the several articles.

(3.) However, apart from this, there came to be special distinctions in particular Churches: as, e. g. in Mauritania and Numidia the senior bishop was "primus;" but in Africa proper, the bishop of Carthage (Bingh. II. xvi. 6, 7); and in Alexandria the bishop had special powers in the ordinations of the suffragan sees: for which see ALEXANDRIA, (Patriarchate of), p. 48; METROPOLITAN.

(4.) The successive setting up of metropolitans and of patriarchs gave rise to exceptional cases [*Ἀυτοκέφαλοι*]: all bishops whatever having been really *ἑαυτοκέφαλοι*, i. e. independent (save subjection to the synod), before the setting up of metropolitans, and all metropolitans before the establishment of patriarchs: see Bingh. II. xviii. [AUTOCEPHALI, METROPOLITANS, PATRIARCHS.] Whether there continued to be any bishop anywhere, *ἑαυτοκέφαλος* in such sense as to have neither patriarch nor metropolitan nor provincial bishops, appears doubtful: and such a case could only occur, either in a country where there was but one bishop (as in Scythia in the 5th century), or as a temporary state of things in a newly converted country: see Bingh. *ib.* 4.

(5.) For *Chorepiscopi*, in contradistinction from whom we find in Frank times *Episcopi Cathedralis* (Du Cange), 6. for *Suffragans*, 7. for *Coadjutors*, 8. for *Intercessores* and *Interventores*, and, 9. for *Commendatarii*, see under the several titles.

V. There remain some anomalous cases; as, (1.) *Episcopi vacantes*, *σχολαῖοι*, *σχολάζοντες*. viz. bishops who by no fault were without a see, but who degenerated sometimes into *epi-*

*scopi vagi* or *ambulantes*, *ἀπόλιδες*, or *βακαρτίβοι* (*Βασκαρτίβοι*, in Synes. *Epist. 67*), *vacantivi*, and among whom in Carolingian times, and in northern France, "Scoti" enjoyed a bad pre-eminence. Bishops indeed without sees, either for missionary purposes to the heathen, or merely *τιμῆς ἕνεκεν* (Sozom. vi. 34, *οὐ πόλεως τινός*), existed from the time of the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, can. xix.; and see *Apost. Can. xxxvi.*, But "*Episcopi vagi, vagantes, ambulantes, qui parochiam non habent*," are condemned by *Conc. Vermer. A.D. 752* or *753*, can. xiv., and *Conc. Vernens. or Vernovens. A.D. 755*, can. xiii., *Conc. Calch. A.D. 816*, can. v., and *Conc. Meld. A.D. 845*, can. x.; and the "Scoti, qui se dicunt episcopos esse," by *Conc. Cabillon. II. A.D. 813*, can. xliii. Compare the case of the early Welsh and Irish (Scotch) churches for honorary bishops, and again for the custom of dioceseless bishops. "*Episcopi portatiles*" is a very late name for them (*Conc. Lugd. A.D. 1449*).

(2.) For the *bishop-abbats* or *bishop-monks*, principally of Celtic monasteries, but also in some Continental ones, the former having no see except their monastery (see ABBAT), the latter being simply members of the fraternity in episcopal orders, but (anomalously) under the jurisdiction of their abbat, and performing episcopal offices for the monastery and its dependent district: see Todd's *St. Patrick*; Reeves' edition of Adamnan's *Life of St. Columba*; Mabillon, *Annal. Bened.*; Martene and Durand, *Thes. Nov. Anecd.* vol. i. Pref. Five bishops of this class—"episcopus de monasterio S. Mauricii, &c. &c.—were at *Conc. Attiniac. A.D. 765*.

(3.) *Episcopus* or *Antistes Palatii*, was an episcopal counsellor residing in the palace in the time of the Carolingians, by special leave (see above, III. 1, a. xv.). For the court clergy, whether under the Roman emperors from Constantine, or under the Franks, see Thomassin, II. iii. 589, and Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. v. pp. 144, sq. Eng. transl.

(4.) For *Episcopus Cardinalis*, which in St. Gregory the Great means simply "proprius," i. e. the duly installed (and "incardinated") bishop of the place, see Du Cange, and under CARDINALIS.

(5.) *Episcopus Regionarius*, i. e. without a special diocesan city: see REGIONARIUS.

(6.) Titular bishops, and bishops in *partibus infidelium*, belong under these names to later times.

(7.) *Episcopus Ordinum*, in Frank times, was an occasional name for a coadjutor bishop to assist in conferring orders (Du Cange).

(8.) For the special and singular name of *Libra*, applied to the suffragans of the see of Rome, see LIBRA.

(9.) For lay holders of bishoprics, see DIOCESE, p. 559.

(10.) And, lastly, it almost needs an apology to mention such mockeries as *Episcopi Fatuorum—Innocentium—Puerorum*; all too of later date: for which see Du Cange.

(Bingham; Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discipl.*; Du Pin, *de Antiqua Eccles. Disciplina Dissert.*; Morinus, *de Ordinibus*; Van Espen, *Jus Eccl. Univ.*; De Marca, *de Conc. Eccl. et Imp.*, and *de Primatu Dissert.* ed. Baluz.; Martene, *de Sacris Ordinationibus*; Cave, *Dissert. on Anc. Ch. Government*; Brerewood, *Patriarch. Gov. of the Church*; Bishop Potter, *Disc. on Ch. Government*; Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri.*) [A. W. II.]

**BISOMUS**, a sepulchre capable of containing two bodies (*σώματα*). The word is found in inscriptions in Christian cemeteries at Rome and elsewhere, as in one found in the cemetery of Callistus, near Rome: "Bonifacius, qui vixit annis xxi. et ii. (menses), positus in bisomum in pace, sibi et patr. suo." [A. N.]

**BISSEXTILE**. [CHRONOLOGY.]

**BITERRENSE CONCILIUM**. [BEZIERA, COUNCIL OF.]

**BITURICENSE CONCILIUM**. [BOURGES, COUNCIL OF.]

**BLANDINA**, martyr at Lyons under M. Aurelius; commemorated June 2 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**BLASIUS**, or **BLAVIUS** (St. BLAISE), bishop, martyr at Sebaste (circ. 320); commemorated Feb. 15 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); Feb. 11 (*Cal. Hysant.*); Jan. 15 (*Cal. Armen.*). [C.]

**BLASPHEMY**: lit. "defamation," and to blaspheme, *βλάπτειν τὴν φήμην*, "to hurt the reputation; to reproach or speak injuriously of another;" which is the meaning of both words in Plato, Demosthenes, Isocrates, and other subsequent writers, where they occur: particularly the LXX. translators of the Old Testament. Accordingly, when the Proconsul bade St. Polycarp revile Christ, the answer was, "How can I blaspheme Christ—that is, speak evil of—"the King who has saved me?" (Euseb. *E. H.* iv. 15). By the writers of the New Testament this word would seem appropriated to any wickedness said or done against God, especially where used without adjuncts, as the Jews said of our Lord, "This man blasphemeth" (Matt. ix. 3), and St. Paul of his own doings at one time, "I compelled them to blaspheme" (Acts xvi. 11); and it is the wilful and persistent commission of this act against the Third Person in the Godhead, or the Holy Ghost, which is denounced by our Lord Himself as the one sin or blasphemy which is never forgiven (Mark iii. 29: cf. Heb. vi. 4-7 and 1 John v. 16), on which see Bingham at great length (xvi. 7, 3; cf. Bloomfield on Matt. xii. 31). He had previously shewn that "blasphemy" was by the primitive Church placed first of the sins against the third Commandment; for which reason it was, doubtless, that all Christians are forbidden by the 15th African canon to frequent places where blasphemy was used. Very rarely the word occurs in a good sense for salutary chiding or remonstrance: see Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon* for its classical, and Schleusner's *Lexicon* and Suicer's *Thes.* for its scriptural and ecclesiastical senses. [E. S. Yf.]

**BLESSING**. [BENEDICTION.]

**BLIND, HEALING OF** (IN ART). The healing of the blind is frequently represented on ancient monuments, perhaps as a symbolical representation of the opening of the eye of the soul wrought by the power of the Saviour (1 Pet. ii. 9). See Bottari, *Sculture e Pitture*, tav. xix. xxvii. xxxix. xlv. lxxviii. cxxxvi.; Millin, *Midi de la France*, lrv. 5.

In most cases only one blind man, probably the "man blind from his birth" of St. John ix. 1, is being healed. He is generally represented little or stature, to mark his inferiority to the Saviour and the Apostles (when any of the latter

are introduced), as shod with sandals and bears a long staff to guide his steps. The Saviour, young and beardless, touches his eyes with the fore-finger of the right hand. This representation is found on an antique vase given by Mamachi (*Origines*, v. 520), on an ivory casket of the fourth or fifth century, engraved by D'Agincourt (*Sculpture*, pl. xxii. No. 4); in a bas-relief of a tomb of the Sextian family, in the museum of Aix in Provence, of about the same epoch (*France Pittoresque*, pl. cxxvii.); and elsewhere.

In a few cases (e.g. Bottari, tav. cxxxvi.) the blind man healed appears to be Bartimaeus, from the circumstance that he has "cast away his garment" (*ἔκβαλεν τὸν ἱμάτιον*, Mark x. 50) before throwing himself at the feet of Jesus.

On a sarcophagus in the Vatican (Bottari, xxxix. see woodcut) is a representation of the healing of two blind men; probably the two who



Healing of Two Blind-Men. From an ancient Sarcophagus.

were healed by the Lord as He left the house of Jairus (Matt. ix. 27-31). Here, too, the figures of those upon whom the miracle is wrought are of small size; the blind appears to lead the blind, for one only has a staff, while the other places his hand upon his shoulder. The Lord lays His hand upon the head of the figure with the staff, while another, probably one of the Apostles, raises his hand, the fingers arranged after the Latin manner [BENEDICTION], in blessing. (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chret.*) [C.]

**BODY**, in the sense contemplated by St. Paul when he said of the Church, "Which is His body" (Eph. i. 23), meaning Christ's, which is expressed further on, "For the edifying of the body of Christ" (iv. 12), and of Christians generally, "Ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular" (1 Cor. xii. 27). The Apostle, we know, spoke (Acts xxi. 37), as well as wrote, Greek; but being a Roman citizen (ib. xxii. 27) he probably had some knowledge of Latin as well: and it is to this circumstance, therefore, that we must ascribe his affixing a sense to the Greek word *σῶμα*, long before appropriated by its Latin equivalent "corpus," but which it had never itself shared hitherto. What Greek ears had always understood hitherto by *σῶμα* was a physical or material body, organic or inorganic, as the case might be; and occasionally the latter in a confused mass, as "body of water" or "of



the universe." But "corpus," besides these senses, had for some time been familiar to Latin ears as denoting a combination of living agents in various relations: a troop of soldiers, a guild of artisans, or the whole body politic; of these the second acceptation was beginning to be stereotyped in law, where "corpora" (corporations) quickly became synonymous with what, in classical literature, had been known as "collegia" (colleges). There must have been many such in existence at Rome when the Apostle wrote; and they were extended, in process of time, to most trades and professions. The general notion attaching to them was that of "a number of persons"—the law said, not fewer than three—"and the union which bound them together" (Smith's *Dict. of Roman and Greek Antiq.* p. 255). Tit. 1 of B. xiv. of the Theodosian Code is headed "De Privilegiis Corporatorum urbis Romae," and Tit. 14 of B. xi. of that of Justinian is on the same subject. Writing from Rome, therefore, where such "bodies" abounded—his own craft possibly, that of tent-makers, among the number—what could be more natural than for the Apostle to apply this designation to the new brotherhood that was forming, and then paint it in glowing colours to his Ephesian converts as a corporation, whose head, centre, and inspiring principle was Christ? He was the union that bound it together and supplied it with life. So far, indeed, it stood on a different footing, and required to be placed in a different category from all other corporations; still, as outwardly it resembled them, might it not also be described in terms which they had been beforehand with it in appropriating, and invested with a new idea? The Apostle authorised this for all languages in communicating the adopted sense of the Latin word to its Greek equivalent. Accordingly with us too the Church of Christ is both spoken of and exists as a corporation. But though it has many features in common with all such bodies, it has essential characteristics of its own, evidenced in its history throughout, which are not shared by any other. Their agreement, therefore, must have been one, not of identity, but of analogy, to which the Apostle called attention. And this is clear from his having recourse to other kindred analogies elsewhere, to develop his meaning. "The husband," he says, "is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the Head of the Church; and He is the Saviour of the body." As if he had said, "Do not misunderstand me: the relation of the church to Christ is not merely that of corporations in general to the principle which binds them together: it is closer still. It may be compared to the marriage tie, described when first instituted in these solemn words: 'They two shall be one flesh' (Eph. v. 23-32). Even this falls short of my full meaning. I would have you 'grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ, from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love' (Eph. iv. 15, 16). Realise the vital connexion that subsists between the head and members of each individual man; realise the depth of communion that there should or may be between husband

and wife; realise the full force of the bond determining the character and cohesion of every society, or corporate body: then from all these collectively, form your estimate of the church of Christ. Each of them illustrates some feature belonging to it which is not so clearly traced in the others; therefore none of them singly will bear overstraining, and all together must not be supposed to exhaust the subject." Unseen realities cannot be measured or determined by what can be seen or felt. "It is the description of a man and not a state," said Aristotle of the Republic of Plato, in which every body could say of every thing, "it is my property" (*Pol.* ii. 1). Spiritual union is neither political, nor conjugal, nor physical, nor anything earthly. It may be illustrated from such earthly relations, but it transcends them all; nor is it explained really, when called "sacramental," further than that it is then asserted to have been assured to us by what are called in theological—not Scriptural—language, the Sacraments of the Church. As Hooker says: "Christ and His holy Spirit with all their blessed effects, *though entering into the soul of man we are not able to apprehend or express how*, do notwithstanding give notice of the times when they use to make their access, because it pleaseth Almighty God to communicate by sensible means those blessings which are incomprehensible" (*Eccl. Pol.* v. 57, 3). That is to say, when such blessings are communicated through the Sacraments. Another writer adds: "We are told in plain and indubitable terms that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the means by which men are joined to the Body of Christ, and therefore by which Christ our Lord joins Himself to that renewed race of which He has become the Head. . . . These facts we learn from the express statements of St. Paul: 'For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body;' and again, 'We being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.' Herein it is expressly declared that the one and the other of these Sacraments are the peculiar means by which union with the Body of Christ is bestowed upon men. They are the 'joints' and 'bands' whereby the whole body in its dependence on its Head has nourishment ministered" (Wilberforce's *Incarn.* p. 415). . . . Body, then, in the sense predicated by St. Paul of the Church, stands for a multitude of singulars, and not an abstraction. It means the collection or aggregate of Christian souls who, cleansed, quickened, and inhabited by Christ, form one brotherhood in Him. What each of them is separately, that all of them are collectively, neither more nor less. Numbers cannot affect its integrity. To say that a body so composed is one is to say no more of it than must, from the nature of the case, be said of every body corporate without exception. The fact of its unity resulting from a personal union of each of its members with one and the same Person, viz. Him who redeemed them, is its distinguishing feature. "From the oneness of His Body which was slain, results the oneness of His body which is sanctified." [E. S. Ff.]

**BODY, MUTILATION OF THE.** This subject may be considered under three aspects in reference to Church history; 1st, in respect to its bearing upon clerical orders; 2nd, as a crime to be repressed; 3rd, as a form of punishment.

1. The Pentateuch forbade the exercise of the priest's office to any of the Aaronites who should have a "blemish," a term extending even to the case of a "flat nose" (Lev. xxi. 17-23); whilst injuries to the organs of generation excluded even from the congregation (Deut. xxiii. 1). The Prophets announce a mitigation of this severity (Is. lvi. 3-5), which finds no place in the teaching of our Saviour (Matt. xix. 12), nor does any trace of it remain in the rules as to the selection of bishops and deacons in the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim. iii., Tit. i.). Nevertheless, the Jewish rule seems to have crept back into the discipline of the Christian Church,—witness the story of the monk Ammonius having avoided promotion to the episcopate by cutting off his right ear,—for which see Socrat. *H. E.* iv. 23 (Baronius indeed holds him to have been eventually ordained). And one of the so-called Apostolical Canons (deemed probably antecedent to the Nicene Council of A.D. 325), which provides that one-eyed or lame men, who may be worthy of the episcopate, may become bishops, "since not the bodily defect" (ἁλώβη, translated in the later Latin version of Haloander *mutilatio*), "but the defilement of the soul, pollutes" the man (c. 69, otherwise numbered 76 or 77), leaves at least open the question whether such defects are a bar to the first reception of clerical orders. No general rule however as to mutilation is to be found in the records of any of the early General Councils, but only in those of the non-œcumenical ones of the West, or in the letters, &c., of the Popes, always of suspicious authority. Thus, a letter of Innocent I. (402-17) to Felix, bishop of Nocera, says that no one who has voluntarily cut off a part of any of his fingers is to be ordained (*Ep.* 4, c. 1). A Council of Rome in 465 forbade from admission to orders those who had lost any of their members, requiring even the ordaining bishop to undo his act (c. 3). So Pope Gelasius (492-6) in a letter to the bishops of Lucania, complains that persons with bodily mutilations are admitted to the services of the Church; an abuse not allowed by ancient tradition or the forms of the Apostolic see (*Ep.* 9, c. 16). A fragment of a letter of the same Pope to the clergy and people of Brindisi condemns in like manner the ordination of a man "weak and blemished in any part of his body." But a letter to Bishop Palladius lays down—in accordance with the Apostolical Canon above quoted—that a dignity received whilst the body was yet whole was not to be lost by subsequent enfeeblement; with which letter may be connected, for what it is worth, a canon or alleged canon of the Council of Ilerda in 524, quoted by Ivo, to the effect that a cleric made lame by a medical operation is capable of promotion. Not to speak of an alleged canon of Gregory the Great, 590-603, against the ordination of persons self-mutilated in any member, to be found in Gratian; two centuries later, in a capitulary of Pope Gregory II. (714-30) addressed to his ablegates for Bavaria, we find in like manner any bodily defect treated as a bar to ordination. On the other hand, we may quote a testimony later indeed than the period embraced in this work, but as occurring after the schism of East and West, above the suspicion of all Romanizing partiality, that of Balsamon (ad Marci Alex. interrog. 23, quoted by Cotelierius, *Patres Apost.* i. pp. 478-9), who says that

bodily injuries or infirmities supervening after ordination, even if they rendered the priest unable physically to fulfil his office, did not deprive him of his dignity, as "none was to be hindered from officiating through bodily defect" (ἁλώβη, also rendered by Beveridge as mutilation).

We may take it therefore that the rule of the Church as to mutilations and bodily defects generally was this: such mutilations or defects were a bar to ordination, especially if self-inflicted; but supervening involuntarily after ordination, they were not a bar to the fulfilment of clerical duties, or to promotion in the hierarchy. There is, however, one particular form of mutilation—that of the generative organs—which occurs with peculiar prominence in early Church history, and is dealt with by special enactments.

One sect of heretics, the Valesians (whose example is strangely recalled by the practices of a well-known body of dissenters from the Russian Church at the present day), enforced the duty of emasculation both on themselves and others (*Epiph. cont. Haer.* 58; *Aug. de Haeres.* c. 37). Their catechumens, whilst un mutilated, were not allowed to eat flesh, but no restrictions as to food were imposed on the mutilated. They were said to use not only persuasion but force in making converts, and to practise violence for the purpose on travellers, and even on persons received as guests.

The most notorious instance of self-mutilation in Church history is that of Origen, who, when a young catechist at Alexandria, inflicted this on himself in order to quench the violence of his passions (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 8). He was nevertheless ordained by the bishops of Caesarea and Jerusalem, men of the highest authority among the prelates of Palestine. But Demetrius of Alexandria, who had formerly spoken of him in terms of high praise, began attacking the validity of his ordination, and the conduct of his ordaining bishops. It is indeed remarkable that Epiphanius mentions three separate traditions as to the mode which Origen adopted to maintain his continence—two of them not implying actual mutilation, but only extinction of the generative power—and seems to consider that a good many idle tales had been told on the subject (*Contra Haer.* 64). It is well known, at any rate, that Origen was condemned and sentenced to be deprived of his orders for self-mutilation by the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 230. This is not the place, of course, for dwelling on the unworthy motives mixed up in Origen's condemnation; but if what is recorded of the Valesians be true—whose heresy appears to have been contemporaneous with Origen—it was absolutely necessary that the Church should firmly resist not only the return to the emasculate priesthoods of the heathen, but the utterly anti-social tendencies which such practices portended or expressed. The Council of Achaia, by which the Valesians were condemned, is usually set down to the year 250.

If the Apostolical Canons are as a whole anterior to the Council of Nicaea, they constitute the next authority on the subject. According to these, whilst a man made a eunuch against his will was not excluded from being admitted into the clergy, yet self-mutilation was assimilated to suicide, and the culprit could not be admitted, or

was to be "altogether condemned" (expelled?) if the act were committed after his admission (c. 17, otherwise numbered 20-22, or 21-23). A layman mutilating himself was to be excluded for 3 years from communion (c. 17, otherwise 23 or 24). It may however be suspected that on this head at least these canons must have been interpolated after the Nicene Council (325), or they would have been referred to in that well-known one which stands first of all in the list of its enactments,—that if any one has been emasculated either by a medical man in illness, or by the barbarians, he is to remain in the clergy; but if any has mutilated himself he is, if a cleric already, on proof of the fact by examination, to cease from clerical functions, and if not already ordained not to be presented for ordination; this however, not to apply to those who have been made eunuchs by the barbarians or by their masters, who, if they are found worthy, may be admitted into the clergy. Contemporaneously, or nearly so, with the Council we find a constitution of the emperor Constantine rendering the making of eunuchs within the "orbis Romanus," a capital crime (*Code*, bk. iv. t. xcii. l. 1).

It is, however, at this period that we find the next most prominent instance of self-mutilation in Church history after that of Origen,—that of Leontius, Arian bishop of Antioch in the time of Athanasius, who, when a presbyter, had been deposed on this account, but was nevertheless promoted to the episcopate by the emperor Constantius, against the decrees of the Nicene Council, observes Theodoret (ii. 23; cf. Euseb. vi. 8). This Leontius figures by no means favourably in the Church histories. Athanasius was very hostile to him, and he was accused of cunning and double-dealing, of promoting the unworthy and neglecting the worthy in his diocese.

A canon on bodily mutilation similar to the Nicene one was enacted by the Synod of Seleucia in Persia, A.D. 410 (c. 4), and by a Syrian synod in 465, and the interdiction against the admission to orders of the self-mutilated was also renewed by the Council of Arles, A.D. 452 (c. 7). Pope Gelasius, in his before quoted letter to the Lucanian bishops, recalls as to the self-emasculation that the canons of the Fathers require them to be separated from all clerical functions, as soon as the fact is recognized (*Epist.* 9, c. 17). It thus appears that this most serious form of mutilation, so long as it was not self-inflicted, was no bar either to clerical ordination or promotion, but that if self-inflicted, it was a bar to the exercise of all clerical functions.

II. *Mutilation as a Crime.*—An alleged decretal of Pope Eutychianus (275-6), to be found in Gratian, enacts that persons guilty of cutting off limbs were to be separated from the Church until they had made friendly composition (the very idea of composition for such an act was entirely foreign to the Italy of the 3rd century) before the bishop and the other citizens, or, if refusing to do so after two or three warnings, were to be treated as heathen men and publicans. The document may probably safely be set down to the 9th century, but in the meanwhile we find in the records of the 11th Council of Toledo, A.D. 575 (from which it is perhaps borrowed), evidence that similar crimes were committed by the clergy themselves. The 6th canon enacts amongst other things that clerics

shall not inflict or order to be inflicted mutilation of a limb on any persons whomsoever. If any do so, either to the servants of their church or to any persons, they shall lose the honour of their order, and be subject to perpetual imprisonment with hard labour. The Excerpt from the Fathers and the Canons attributed to Gregory III. bears that, for the wilful maiming another of a limb, the penance is to be three years, or more humanely, one year (c. 30). The Capitulary of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 789, c. 16, and the Council of Frankfort, 794, forbid abbats for any cause to blind or mutilate their monks (c. 18)—enactments which sufficiently shew the ferocity of the Carolingian era, and with which may be noticed the 2nd Capitulary of Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, to his clergy, A.D. 797, treating amongst minor sins the maiming of a man so that he shall not die, the reference being at least mainly to clerical maimers.

In the early barbarian codes no difference was made in principle between the various shapes of bodily mutilation, and all cases were punished by pecuniary compensation. But in the later Roman law we find absolute distinction made between emasculation and every other form of mutilation, the former being the only one which it is deemed necessary to legislate against. We have already seen that Constantine had made the former a capital crime, when committed within the Roman world. The 142nd Novel goes further still. Speaking of the crime as having become rife again, it enacts the *lex talionis* against male offenders, with confiscation of goods and life-long labour in the quarries if they survive the operation; or as respects females, flogging, confiscation and exile. We may probably ascribe the character of the imperial law on this subject to the influence of the Christian Church, which, at the risk of whatever incongruities in its practice, has always treated emasculation as a crime *sui generis*, analogous only to murder and suicide, according as it is endured or self-inflicted.

III. *Mutilation as a Punishment.*—Mutilation is no unfrequent punishment under the Christian emperors of the West: Constantine punished slaves escaping to the barbarians with the loss of a foot (*Cod.* 6. tit. 1. s. 3). The cutting off of the hand was enacted by several Novels; by the 17th (c. viii.) against exactors of tribute who should fail to make proper entries of the quantities of lands; by the 43rd (c. 1) against those who should copy the works of the heretic Severus. It is nevertheless remarkable that the 134th Novel finally restricted all penal mutilation to the cutting off of one hand only (c. xiii.). In the barbaric codes, mutilation is a frequent punishment. The Salic law frequently enacts castration of the slave, but only as an alternative for composition (for thefts above 40 denarii in value, t. xiii., and see t. xlii.; for adultery with the slave-woman who dies from the effects of it, t. xxix. c. 6). The Burgundian law, by a late enactment (*Additum.* i. t. xv., supposed to be by Sigismund), extends the mode of dealing to Jews.

Even in the legislation of the Church itself mutilation as a punishment occurs; but only in its rudest outlying branches, or as an offence to be repressed. Thus, to quote instances of the former case, in the collection of Irish Canons, supposed to belong to the end of the 7th cen-

tury, Patrick is represented as assigning the cutting off of a hand or foot as one of several alternative punishments for the stealing of money either in a church or a city within which sleep martyrs and bodies of saints (bk. xviii. c. 6). Another fragment from an Irish synod, appended by Labbe and Mansi to the above, enacts the loss of a hand as an alternative punishment for shedding the blood of a bishop, where it does not reach the ground, and a salve (collyrium) is needed; or the blood of a priest when it does reach the ground, and salve is required. Instances of the latter case have been already given in the enactments against abbots maiming their monks, which was no doubt done at least under pretext of enforcing discipline. In the 'Excerptions' ascribed to Egbert, archbishop of York (but of at least two centuries later date), we find a canon that a man stealing money from the church-box shall have his hand cut off or be put into prison (c. lxviii.). [J. M. L.]

**BONIFACIUS.** (1) Martyr at Tarsus under Diocletian, is commemorated Dec. 19 (*Ch. Hist.*). He was formerly commemorated in the Roman church on June 5, the supposed day of his burial at Rome (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); but in more recent martyrologies this Boniface is commemorated on May 14, the supposed day of his death; and,

(2) The Apostle of Germany, archbishop of Meitz, martyred in Friesland, is commemorated on June 5 (*Mart. Bedae, Adonis*). This saint is figured in his episcopal vestments (9th cent.) in the *Acta Sanctorum*, June, tom. i. p. 458. See also Brower's *Thesaurus Antiq. Fuldensis*, pp. 163-165.

(3) Deacon, martyr in Africa under Huneric; commemorated Aug. 17 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(4) "Natale Bonifacii episcopi," Sept. 4 (*M. Bedae*).

(5) Confessor in Africa; commemorated Dec. 8 (*Mart. Hieron.*); Dec. 6 (*M. Adonis*). [C.]

**BONOSA**, sister of Zosima, martyr in Porto under Severus; commemorated July 15 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron.*). [C.]

**BOOKS, CENSURE OF.** A studious life was strongly enforced upon the clergy by the ancient Fathers, and enjoined by various canons of the earlier Councils. St. Chrysostom in particular insists strongly and very fully on the duty in the clergy of qualifying themselves by patient and laborious study for the office of preaching, and for the defence of the faith against heretics and unbelievers; resting his argument on the exhortation of St. Paul to Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 13)—"Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine: meditate upon these things: give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all men." Exhortations to the like effect occur also in the writings of St. Jerome, Cyprian, Lactantius, Hilary, Minucius Felix, and others. In all these writers the study of the Holy Scriptures is urged upon the clergy as being of primary obligation, and the foundation on which all the superstructure of a more general and extensive learning was to be raised. Certain canons also required, e.g. Conc. Tolet. iii. c. 7, that in their most vacant hours, the times of eating and drinking, some portion of Scripture should be read to them—partly to exclude trifling and unnecessary discourse, and partly to

afford them proper themes and subjects for edifying discourse and meditation.

Next to the Scriptures the study of the best ecclesiastical writers was recommended as most profitable and appropriate to the clerical office: the first place in such writings, however, being assigned to the Canons of the Church. These were always reckoned of the greatest use and importance, as containing a summary account, not only of the Church's discipline and doctrine and government, but also rules of life and moral practice—on which account it was ordered that the Canons should be read over at a man's ordination; and again, the Council of Toledo (iv. c. 25) required the clergy to make them a part of their constant study, together with the Holy Scriptures. The Canons, it should be remembered, were then a sort of directory for the pastoral care, and they had this advantage of any private directory, that they were the public voice and authorized rule of the Church, and therefore so much the more entitled to respectful attention. In later ages, in the time of Charlemagne, we find laws which obliged the clergy to read, together with the Canons, Gregory's treatise *De Cura Pastoralis*.

With regard to other books and writings there was considerable restriction. Some of the canons forbade a bishop to read heathen authors: nor would they allow him to read heretical books, otherwise than as a matter of duty, i.e. unless there was occasion to refute them, or to caution others against the poison of them; e.g. Conc. Carth. iv. c. 16: "Ut episcopus Gentilium libros non legat: hæreticorum autem pro necessitate et tempore."

In some cases, however, the study of heathen literature might be advantageous to the cause of Christian truth; and the Church's prohibition did not extend to these. Thus St. Jerome observes that both the Greek and Latin historians are of great use as well to explain as confirm the truth of the prophecies of Daniel. St. Augustine says of the writings of heathen philosophers, that as they said many things that were true, both concerning God and the Son of God, they were in that respect very serviceable in refuting the vanities of the Gentiles. And in fact all who are acquainted with the Fathers and ancient writers of the Church know them to have been for the most part well versed in the classical or heathen literature.

On the whole it appears that the clergy were obliged in the first place to be diligent in studying the Scriptures, and next to them, as they had ability and opportunity, the canons and approved writers of the Church. Beyond this, as there was no obligation on them to read human learning, so there was no absolute prohibition of it; but where it could be made to minister as a handmaid to divinity, there it was not only allowed, but encouraged and commended; and there can be no doubt that in many instances the cause of Christian religion was advanced by the right application of secular learning in the primitive ages of the Church. The principles on which such studies were maintained are summed up by St. Ambrose, *Proem. in Luc. Evang.*: "Legimus aliqua, ne legamur; legimus ne ignoremus; legimus non ut teneamus, sed ut repudicemus" (Bingham). [D. B.]

**BOOKS, CHURCH.** [LITURGICAL BOOKS.]



**BORDEAUX, COUNCIL OF** (**BURDIGALENSE CONCILIUM**), provincial, at Bordeaux. (1) A.D. 385, condemned and deposed Priscillian, Instantius, and their followers, for complicity with Manicheism. Priscillian appealed to the emperor Maxentius, who, however, put him to death the same year at Trèves (Sulp. Sever., *H. E.* ii. 46, who affirms the appeal to have been permitted only "*nostrorum inconstantia*," whereas it ought to have been made to other bishops; Labbe, ii. 1034).—(2) A.D. 670, under Count Lupus and the archbishops of Bourges, Bordeaux, and Eauze in Armagnac, by order of King Chilpéric, upon points of discipline (*L'Art de Vérifier les Dates*, i. 291). [A. W. H.]

**BOSCI** (*Βοσκολ*), Syrian monks in the 4th century, so called because they lived on herbs only. Sozomen speaks of them as very numerous near Nisibis, and names a bishop among the most famous of them. They had no buildings but lived on the mountains, continually praying and singing hymns. Each carried a knife, with which to cut herbs and grasses (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 33). A connexion has been traced between them and the sect of Adamiani or Adamitæ, who went about naked. The principle is the same—of returning to a state of nature—but the Bosci are not accused, as the Adamitæ, of licentiousness; and with them the motive was apparently austere self-mortification. Frequent instances of similar abstinence are recorded of Eastern hermits in Moschus (*Prat. Spirit.*), Theodoret (*Philoth.*), and Evagrius (*H. E.* i. 21). (Tillemont, *H. E.* viii. 292.) [I. G. S.]

**BOSTRA, COUNCIL OF**, A.D. 243 or 244; indeed, there probably were two such: one at which Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, was reclaimed from his strange views respecting the Person of our Lord by Origen; and another at which Origen refuted some Arabians, who said that the souls of men died with their bodies, and came to life with their bodies again at the resurrection (Euseb. vi. 33 and 7; Mansi, i. 787–90). [E. S. Ff.]

**BOURGES, COUNCIL OF** (**BITURICENSE CONCILIUM**), at Bourges, but (1) A.D. 454, only conjecturally in that city. That there was a council in that year in that neighbourhood appears by a synodical epistle signed by the bishops of Bourges, Tours, and another (Sirmond. *Conc. Gall.* iii. App. 1507; Labbe, iv. 1819). Hincmar wrongly calls it a Council of Rome, under the mistaken impression that the Leo who signs it was the Pope.—(2) A.D. 473, to elect Simplicius to the see of Bourges (Sidon. Apoll. *Epist.* vii. 5, 8, 9, &c.; and his oration to the people for Simplicius, Labbe, iv. 1820–1827). Sidonius requests the intervention of Agroecius, archbishop of Sens (although out of his province), and of Euphronius of Autun, the provincial bishops being too few in number. And the "*plebs Biturigum*" appear to have referred the nomination to Sidonius himself.—(3) A.D. 767, under Pipin, mentioned by Regino and Fredegarius, but with no record of its purpose or acts (Labbe, vi. 1836). [A. W. H.]

**BOWING.** [GENUFLEXION.]

**BRACARENSE CONCILIUM.** [BRAGA, COUNCIL OF.]

**BRAGA, COUNCIL OF** (**BRACARENSE CONCILIUM**), provincial, at Braga, in Spain,

between the Minho and Douro. (1) A.D. 411 (if genuine), of ten bishops, to defend the faith against Alans, Suevi, and Vandals, who were either Arians or heathens, under Pancratianus of Braga (Labbe, ii. 1507–1510).—(2) A.D. 561 or 563, of eight bishops, "*ex praecepto Ariamiri* (or probably Theodomiri) Regis," to condemn the Priscillianists. It passed also twenty-two canons, about uniformity of ritual, church revenues, precedence, burial without and not within a church, and other points of discipline (Labbe, v. 836–845).—(3) A.D. 572, June 1, of twelve bishops, under Archbishops Martin of Braga and Nitigisius of Luca, under Miro, king of the Suevi, passed ten canons, about bishops exacting undue fees, appointment of metropolitan to proclaim annually the date of Easter, and other points of discipline. It was also the first to use the formula, "*regnante Christo*" (Labbe, v. 894–902). Mailloc, bishop of Britona, was one of the bishops present.—(4) A.D. 675, under Archbishop Leocidius, with seven suffragans (including a bishop of Britona), passed nine canons; prohibiting the giving of milk, or of the bread dipped in the wine, or of grapes instead of wine, at the Eucharist; allowing a priest to have dwelling with him no other woman than his mother, not even his sister; and on other points of discipline (Labbe, vi. 561–570). [A. W. H.]

**BRAINE, COUNCIL OF** (**BRENNACENSE CONCILIUM**), at Braine near Soissons (Berni near Compiègne, acc. to *L'Art de Vérifier les Dates*, but wrongly), rather a State than a Church Council, held, A.D. 580, under King Chilpéric, excommunicated Leudastes (who had been Count of Tours) for falsely accusing Gregory of Tours of having calumniated Queen Fredegunda. Witnesses were not produced, "*cunctis dicentibus, non potest persona inferior super sacerdotem credi*." And Gregory exculpated himself by solemn oath at three several altars after saying mass, the accusers in the end confessing their guilt (Greg. Tur., *Hist. Franc.* v. 50; Labbe, v. 965, 966). [A. W. H.]

**BRANDEUM.** The word *Brandium* probably designated originally some particular kind of rich cloth. Thus, Joannes Diaconus (*Vita S. Greg.* lib. iv., in Du Cange, s. v.) speaks of a lady wearing a head-dress "*candentis brandei*."

But the usages with which we are immediately concerned are the following:—

1. The rich cloth or shroud in which the body of a distinguished saint was wrapped. Thus Hincmar (*Vita S. Remigii*, c. 73) describing the translation of St. Remigius, says the body was found by the bishops who translated it wrapped in a red *brandium*. Compare Flodoard, *Hist. Remensis*, i. 20, 21.

2. Portions of such shrouds were used as relics; for instance, a portion of the *brandium* which enveloped St. Remigius, enshrined in ivory, was venerated with due honour (Hincmar, *l. c.*).

3. When relics of some saint came to be regarded as absolutely essential to the consecration of a church [CONSECRATION], pieces of cloth which had been placed near them were held to be themselves equivalent to relics. St. Gregory the Great set forth his view of this practice in a letter to Constantia (*Epist.* iii. 30). It is not, he says, the Roman custom, in giving relics of saints, to presume to touch any portion of the

body, but only a *brandeum* is put in a casket, and set near the most holy bodies. This is again taken up, and enshrined with due solemnity in the church to be dedicated, and the same miracles are wrought by it as would have been by the very bodies themselves. Tradition relates, that when some Greeks doubted the efficacy of such relics, St. Leo cut a *brandeum* with scissors, and blood flowed from the wound. St. Leo's miracle is related by St. Germanus to Pope Hormisdas (*Epist. Pontif.* p. 524) and by Sigebert (*Chronicon*, A.D. 441). Joannes Diaconus (*Vita S. Greg.* ii. 42) relates a similar wonder of St. Gregory himself, which is said to be also attested by an inscription in one of the crypts of the Vatican (*Torrignus de Cryptis Vaticanis*, pt. 2, c. 4, ed. 2). (Du Cange's *Glossary*, s. v. *Brandeum*). [C.]

#### BREAKING OF BREAD. [FRACTION.]

**BREGENTFORD, or BREGUNTFORD, COUNCIL OF (BRENTFORDENSE CONCILIUM)**, provincial, at Bregentforda, Breguntford, or Brentford. (1) A.D. 705, an informal political conference, mentioned by Waldhere, bishop of London, as to be held by the kings, bishops, and abbats, of Wessex and of the East Saxons, about certain unnamed grounds of quarrel (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* iii. 274).—(2) A.D. 781, held by Offa, king of Mercia, and Archbishop Jaenberht, freed the monastery of Bath from the jurisdiction of the see of Worcester (charter in Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* 143). Other (questionable) charters apparently profess to emanate from the same Council (ib. 139, 140). [A. W. H.]

**BRENNACENSE CONCILIUM.** [BRAINE, COUNCIL OF.]

**BRENTFORDENSE CONCILIUM.** [BREGENTFORD, COUNCIL OF.]

**BREVIARY** (*Breviarium*). This word, in its ecclesiastical sense, denotes an office book of the Church, containing the offices for the canonical hours, as distinguished from the missal, which contains those of the mass. The name, which Meratus derives from *breve horarium*, explaining it as *compendium precum*, indicates that the book is an abbreviation or compilation; and it is so called, according to some, because the existing form is an abbreviation of the ancient office: according to others, because it is a short summary of the principal portions of Holy Scripture, of the lives of the greatest saints, and of the choicest prayers of the Church; or, again, because in its arrangement the various parts of the office, such as prayers, hymns, lessons, &c., are only once given in full; and afterwards only indicated by the first words, or by references.\* Some, again, have thought that the breviary was originally an abbreviation of the missal *pleniarius*; and mainly distinguished from it by the partial omission or abbreviation of the rubrics, and by the first words alone of the psalms, sections, &c., being given. It is supposed that this abbreviated book was originally compiled as a directory for the choir, and that on its general adoption in convents, in which the canonical hours took their rise, these were inserted, and hence the name breviary came to

signify the book containing those offices in distinction to the missal: a few short offices, not directly connected with canonical hours, and in some breviaries the ordinary and canon of the mass, with a few special masses, still remaining in it.

The contents of the breviary, in their essential parts, are derived from the early ages of Christianity. They consist of psalms, lessons taken from the Scriptures, and from the writings of the Fathers, versicles and pious sentences thrown into the shape of antiphons, responses, or other analogous forms, hymns, and prayers. The present form of the book is the result of a long and gradual development. During a long time a great diversity existed in the manner in which the psalms and their accompanying prayers were recited in different dioceses and convents; but from the 5th century onwards a marked tendency to uniformity in this part of divine worship may be observed, till in later days the only very striking difference which remains, with the exception of the Mozarabic breviary, which has a special character of its own, is between the office books of the East and the West. The name breviary is confined to those of the West.

The books used in the daily office which contained the materials that were afterwards consolidated into the breviary, were—(1) the *Psalter*, containing the psalms and canticles arranged in their appointed order; (2) the *Scriptures*, from which lessons for the nocturns were taken; (3) the *Homiliary*, containing the homilies of the Fathers appointed to be read on Sundays and other days indicated; (4) the *Passionary*, or *Passional*, containing the history of the sufferings of the saints, martyrs, and confessors; (5) the *Antiphonary*, containing the antiphons and responsories; (6) the *Hymnal*; (7) the *Collectaneum*, or *Collectarium*, or *Liber Collectarius*, or *Orationale*, containing the prayers, and also the *Short Chapters* read at the several hours; (8) the *Martyrology*. There were also *Rubrics* giving the directions for reciting the various offices.

Various digests of offices from these and similar sources have been attributed with more or less probability to Leo the Great, Gelasius, and Gregory the Great. Gregory VII. [†1085] compiled the book which is the basis of the present Roman breviary. A MS. copy of this book was preserved in the monastery of Casini, from about the year 1100 A.D. This was inscribed "Incipit Breviarium s. Ordo officiorum, &c.;" and hence Benedict XIV. derives the probable origin of the name. An abbreviation of this book made in 1244 by Michael Haymon, general of the Minorites, obtained the approbation of Pope Gregory X., and was introduced by Pope Nicholas III. in 1278 or 1279 into all the churches of Rome.

Originally different dioceses and monastic orders had their own special breviaries, varying one from the other. There is a marked difference between the secular and the monastic breviaries, but the individual members of these two families, while they vary much in detail, agree closely in their arrangement and general features. After the edition by Pius V., the Roman breviary thus revised was imposed on the whole Roman obedience to the exclusion of those hitherto in use, with an exception in favour of those which had then been in use for 200 years.

\* There is great variety of practice in this respect between different breviaries, and even different editions of the same breviary.

The breviary is usually divided into four parts, called after the four seasons of the year, "Pars hiemalis, vernalis, aestivalis [v. aestiva], autumnalis." When this fourfold division was first adopted is doubtful. Traces of it have been found in the 11th century. Each of these parts, in addition to the introductory rubrics, calendar, and other tables, has four subdivisions: (1) the *Psalter* [Psalterium], comprising the psalms and canticles arranged according to the order of their weekly recitation, and also other subordinate parts of the office which do not vary from day to day; (2) the *Proper of the Season* [Proprium de tempore], containing those portions of the offices which vary with the season; (3) the *Proper of the Saints* [Proprium Sanctorum]; i. e., the corresponding portions for the festivals of saints; and (4) the *Commun of the Saints*. [See HOURS OF PRAYER; OFFICE, THE DIVINE; PSALMODY.] [H. J. H.]

**BRIBERY.** The Old Testament is so full of warnings against "the gift" that "blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous" (Ex. xxiii. 8), of denunciations of those that "judge for reward" (Micah iii. 11), that we could not expect otherwise than to find the like teachings embodied in the more spiritual morality of the New Testament. It may indeed be a question whether the qualification required of bishops and deacons by the Pastoral Epistles, that they should not be "given to filthy lucre" (*αἰσχροκερδεῖς*), 1 Tim. iii. 3, 8; Tit. i. 7, implies proneness to bribery, properly so called, or covetousness generally. If, however, we reckon the Apostolical Constitutions as representing generally the Church life of the 2nd century, we see that the offence was then beginning to take shape. The bishop is directed not to be open to receive gifts, since unconscientious men "becoming acceptors of persons, and having received shameful gifts" will spare the sinner, letting him remain in the Church (bk. ii. c. 9). Another passage speaks of either the bishops or the deacons sinning by the acceptance of persons or of gifts, with the addition of the remarkable words: "For when the ruler asks, and the judge receives, judgment is not brought to an end" (*ib.* c. 17). A third deals with the still more heinous offence of condemning the innocent for reward, threatening with God's judgment the "pastors" and deacons who, either through acceptance of persons or in return for gifts, expel from the Church those who are falsely accused (*ib.* c. 42).

There was of course nothing exceptional in this morality. In the Roman law there were numerous enactments against bribery. Theodosius enacted the penalty of death against all judges who took bribes (*Cod. Theod.* 9, tit. 27, s. 5). In Justinian's time, although the penalty of death seems to have been abrogated, the offence is subjected to degrading punishments (*Nov.* viii., cxxiv.).

The law of the Church on the subject of bribery was substantially that of the State. The spiritual sin was looked upon as equivalent to the civil offence, and the Church needed no special discipline to punish the former. One form of bribery indeed, that relating to the obtainment of the orders or dignities of the Church, is considered separately under the head of **SIMONY**. [J. M. L.]

**BRICCIUS, or BRICTIUS.** (1) Bishop,

confessor at Martula in Umbria; is commemorated July 8 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*); July 9 (*M. Adonis*).

(2) St. Brice; succeeded St. Martin as bishop of Tours; commemorated as confessor, Nov. 13 (*Mart. Bedae, Hieron., Adonis*). Proper office in the Gregorian *Liber Responsalis*, p. 835. [C.]

**BRIDAL RING.** That the present use of the ring in marriage has grown out of its use in betrothal, is historically clear. The origin of the latter is, however, obscure, though probably it is the meeting-point of several different ideas and practices. If marriage was originally wife-catching, as seems probable, the ring may be considered as the symbol of the wife's captivity. Again, before money was invented, or before its use became common, a ring would be one of the aptest representatives of wealth, and as such would easily constitute either the actual price of betrothal, or the earnest of it; whilst we know that in some countries the ring has actually taken the place of money, e. g. the "ring-money" of our Teutonic forefathers. Again, as signet-rings came into use, the ring itself would easily grow to be looked upon as a pledge of contracts, a symbol of faith between man and man. Lastly, as men's feelings became more refined, the idea of the ring, (1st) as a symbol of the wife's subjection, (2nd) as the price, or the symbol of the price, of her purchase, (3rd) as the pledge of the contract for her person, would lose itself in that of its spiritual significance as a symbol of endless indissoluble union.

It is certain, at any rate, that the bridal ring of early Christian custom was not derived from Jewish practice, since it appears clearly that its use by way of earnest on betrothal among the Jews was of late introduction, derived from the Gentiles, and depended for its validity on the ring being worth money [ARRHAE]. But the early Christians, as above indicated, found it in use among the Romans, unconnected (as was ordinary marriage itself) with any superstitious practices, and naturally adopted it. Tertullian uses the term *annulus* metonymically for betrothal itself, in that passage of his treatise on Idolatry, in which, examining what transactions among the Gentiles a Christian man may lawfully take part in, he decides that betrothals are among the number, since "the ring" is not derived from the honour paid to any idol (c. 16). The same author shews in his Apology that by his time the use of gold for the betrothal ring must have long replaced that of iron, since he speaks of the woman of old knowing "no gold, save on one finger," which her betrothed "oppignorasset pronubo annulo" (c. 6), with which may be compared Juvenal's "digito pignus fortasse dedisti" (*Sat.* vi. 17).

It will be obvious from the last two passages that the main significance of the betrothal ring in the early centuries of the Christian era was that of a pledge. Hence its abiding significance as representing the *arrhæ*. Its value in this respect was by no means confined to the betrothal contract; thus in the Digest, Ulpian, in reference to the *arrhæ* on an ordinary contract of sale, puts the case of a ring being given by way of earnest and not returned after the payment of the price and delivery of the thing sold (*Dig.* 19, tit. 1, s. 11, § 6; with which compare 14, tit. 3, s. 15).

There is therefore nothing special in the expression "Subarrare annulo," which occurs in a well-known passage of the 34th letter of St. Ambrose, where he represents St. Agnes saying to the governor of Rome, when he pressed her to marry his son, that "another lover" had already "given her earnest by the ring of his faith" (annulo fidei suae subarravit me).

Historically, the bridal ring figures somewhat prominently in the record of the 5th century. In M. Augustin Thierry's 'Histoire d'Athila,' 2nd ed. vol. i. c. 5, or again in his 'Placidie, reine des Gothes,' appended to the 2nd volume of his 'Saint Jérôme,' c. 4 (Gibbon c. xxxv. relates the story somewhat differently), it is told how in A.D. 434, Honoria, the graceless granddaughter of the great Theodosius, in a fit of rebellion against parental authority, sent her ring by a eunuch to the Hunnish king Attila (then recently come to the throne) by way of betrothal earnest, requesting him to make war on her brother Valentinian. The barbarian sovereign (who had a whole harem of his own) took no notice of the ring at the time, but had it put away; and fifteen years after, when about to invade Italy, sent a letter to the Western Emperor, complaining that the princess, his betrothed, had been ignominiously treated on his account, and was kept in prison, and requiring her to be set free and restored to him with her dowry, which he reckoned at half the personalty of the late emperor Constantius, and half the Western Empire; and he forwarded by his envoys at the same time her ring, to avouch the justice of his claim,—which however he afterwards did not care, and probably never intended to press,—indeed Honoria was married at the time, as was stated to him in reply, and as no doubt he knew already.

The received position of the ring on the fourth finger is explained by Isidore of Seville, on the ground that "there is in it, so they say, a vein of blood which reaches to the heart" (*de Offic.* bk. ii. c. 19). The quaint reason assigned for the choice of the finger will be observed, as well as the indication that the ring was only given in first marriages. A simpler origin for the use of the fourth finger is that the Greeks and Romans wore of old their rings on that finger (Macrobius, *Saturn.* 7, l. 13, quoted by Selden in his *Uxor Hebræica*).

The bridal ring is referred to both in the Visigothic and the Lombard Codes. The former speaks of it as constituting by delivery an enforceable marriage contract without writing: "where a ring has been given or accepted in the name of earnest, though no writings should pass between the parties, that promise should be in nowise broken with which a ring has been given and terms (definitio) fixed before witnesses" (bk. iii. t. i. c. 3). The Lombard law is to the same effect: when a man betroths to himself a woman, "with a ring only, he gives earnest for her and makes her his" (cum solo annulo eam subarrat et suam facit), "and if afterwards he marry another, he is found guilty to the amount of 500 solidi" (bk. v. c. i.; law of Liutprand, A.D. 717).

As late as the 9th century, it is clear that the ring was constitutive of betrothal, not of marriage. This is shown by Pope Nicolas's answer to the Bulgarians, where he says that "after the future bridegroom has betrothed to himself the

future bride by earnest, placing on her finger the ring of affiance . . . either soon or at a fitting time . . . both are led to the marriage (nuptialia foedera) . . . and thus at last receive the benediction and the heavenly veil." From this it follows that all Western Church *formulae* of blessing rings must belong to a still later period; and indeed the use of the ring in marriage is supposed to have come in during the 10th century.

On the other hand, since, as observed under the head ARRHAE, Pope Nicolas's reply expressly distinguishes Latin from Greek usage, it is perfectly possible that the blessing of rings, which occurs in the betrothal liturgy of the Euchologium may be of earlier date: "By a ring was given authority to Joseph in Egypt. By a ring was Daniel glorified in the land of Babylon. By a ring was shewn the truthfulness of Tamar. By a ring our heavenly Father shewed mercy towards his son, for 'having slain the fatted calf and eaten let us rejoice' [he said] . . . Thou therefore, O Lord, bless this placing of rings with a heavenly blessing," &c. The Greek ceremony, it may be observed, requires two rings, one of gold and one of silver. [J. M. L.]

BRIDGET, or BRIGIDA, virgin, of Ireland, martyr in Scotland, A.D. 523, wonder-worker, is commemorated Feb. 1 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Bedae*). [C.]

BRIEFS and BULLS (*Breve, Bulla*). Both these names are applied to the Letters Apostolic of the Pope: the distinction between them being chiefly one of form, and relating to the nature of the instrument in which the letters are contained.

A Papal Brief is ordinarily written in the Latin character, and is sealed, not with lead, but with wax; the seal bearing the impression of the so-called "fisherman's ring," a figure of St. Peter fishing from a boat. It is signed by the Secretary of Briefs, and commonly commences thus: "Pius Papa IX.," &c.

A Bull, on the other hand, is written in the Gothic character, and is sealed with a leaden seal of a globular form (from which, viz. *bulla*, as most suppose, it derives its name, though some deduce it from *βουλή*), which is attached to the document by a string of silk, if the Bull be one of Grace, or by a hempen cord, if it be one of Justice. The seal bears on one side a representation of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and on the other the name of the reigning Pope. Bulls are issued from the Papal Chancery, and commence in this form: "Pius Episcopus, servus servorum Dei," &c.

Some Bulls have not only the Papal seal, but also a second one in the form of a cross. These are Consistorial Bulls, and are issued with the assent and advice of the Cardinals in Consistory, by whom they are subscribed.

Briefs and Bulls are of equal force, but the former are supposed to have greater brevity of expression (whence perhaps the name), and as a general, though not invariable, rule, to be employed in matters of lesser moment. Before his coronation, a Pope ought not to issue Bulls, but only Briefs. Or if he issues a Bull, it does not bear his name on the seal.

A Brief, on the whole, may be said to correspond in some respects to a Writ of Privy Seal in England, as distinguished from Letters Patent



of the Crown, which would answer to a Bull. It may be added that a Brief may be suppressed, as it is not issued in the same open form as a Bull; and there are, it is said, instances of Briefs being suppressed altogether. It may also be cancelled or superseded by a subsequent Brief, whereas a Bull can be cancelled only by a Bull. For the most part also a Brief is of less extensive application than a Bull, the latter being sometimes binding on the entire Christian world in communion with Rome.

It must be stated, however, that some of the particulars just specified, though characteristic of Bulls and Briefs at this day and for a long period, are not observed in very early documents. Thus, for instance, in the *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, a work probably of the 8th century (printed in Migne's *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*, vol. cv.) forms of commencements of Papal letters are given, in which the name of the Pope follows instead of preceding that of the great person to whom the letter is addressed.

Thus to a Patrician the letter begins "Domine excellentissimo, atque precellentissimo filio [name] patricio, [name of Pope] Episcopus servus servorum Dei." And to the archbishop of Ravenna—"Reverendissimo at Sanctissimo fratri [name of archbishop] Coepiscopo, [name of Pope] servus servorum Dei." And even to a Presbyter we have—"Dilectissimo filio [name of presbyter], [name of Pope] servus servorum Dei." In a Dissertation annexed to the edition of the *Liber Diurnus* of 1860, the Jesuit Gieseler states that the custom of putting the Pope's name first does not seem to have come in until about the 9th century. It will thus probably be nearly contemporaneous with the appearance of the *Forged Decretals*, and will appropriately mark the era when the Pope first put forward regal and ultra-regal pretensions.

*Authorities*.—Ferraria, *Bibliotheca Canonica* vol. i. edit. 1844, sub vocibus "Breve, Bulla;" Ayliffe's *Paragon Juris canonici*, tit. "of Bulls Papal;" Burn's *Eccles. Law*, tit. "Bull;" Twiss *On the Letters Apostolic of Pope Pius IX.* London, 1851, p. 2. [B. S.]

BRITAIN, COUNCILS IN. [BRITANNICUM CONCILIUM.]

BRITANNICUM CONCILIUM; i.e. Councils of the Welsh Church. See CAERLEONWEN; LLANDWY-BREFF; LUGU VICTORIAN; AUGUSTINE'S OAK; VERULAMUM.

2. Breton Councils [BRITTANY].

The Councils called "Britannica," in Cave, Wilkins, Labbe, &c. are either those above named (mostly misdated and incorrectly described), or are pure fables; while Cave has chosen to add to them the Northumbrian Synod of Onestredfeld of A.D. 702, which are under its proper title. [A. W. H.]

BROTHERHOOD. The origin of brotherhoods or fraternities in the Christian Church and world, whether clerical, lay, or mixed, is far from being satisfactorily ascertained. The history of monastic fraternities will be found under their appropriate headings, though we may here remark that the formation of such fraternities was in direct opposition to the very impulse which produced monachism itself, and sent the *penitens*, or solitary, as a "hermit" into the wilderness (*spangor*). Yet such fraternities were

practically in existence in the Egyptian *lavra*, when Serapion could rule over a thousand monks; they received their first written constitution from St. Basil (326-379), and both Basil and Jerome (who had himself been a hermit) having declared their disapproval of solitary monachism, the social or fraternal type must be considered to have become fully impressed on the monastic system during the course of the 4th and 5th centuries.

Dr. Brentano, in his work *On the History and Development of Gilds* (London, Trübner, 1870), expresses indeed the opinion "that the religious brotherhoods of the middle ages, and as they still exist in Catholic countries, have their origin in a connexion with monasticism, and in an imitation of it . . . and that this origin is to be sought in Southern lands, in which Christianity and monasticism were first propagated" (p. 9). If this be so, it must be admitted that the imitation was almost coeval with its model, for he himself ascribes to the 3rd century—the age of the Egyptian hermits—the "Christian brotherhood for nursing the sick" of the *Parabolani*,—which Muratori was the first to point out as a sort of religious fraternity, in opposition to various writers quoted by him (in the 75th Dissertation of his *Antiquitates Medii Aevi*, vol. vi.), who had held that such fraternities date only from the 9th or even the 13th centuries. [PARADOLANI.] Muratori also suggests that the *lecticarii* or *decani*, who are mentioned in the Code (1 tit. 2, c. 4), and in Justinian's 43rd and 59th Novels, by the latter as fulfilling certain functions at funerals, must have been a kind of religious fraternity. On the other hand, the old *adulitas*, or its equivalent the Greek *phratra* (henceforth Latinized as "phratra" or "fratria"), appears to have become more and more discredited, since the 18th canon of the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) requires the cutting off of all clerics or monks forming "conjuraciones vel sodalitates" (Lisdore Mercator translates "phratras vel factiones"); for if "the crime of conspiracy or of *sodalitas* is wholly forbidden even by external laws, much more should it be so in God's Church." A decree of the Vandal king Gundemar (to be found in the 10th vol. of Labbe and Mann's *Councils*, p. 510), about A.D. 510, directed to the priests of the city of Carthage, speaks in like manner of *fratras et conjuraciones* against the Metropolitan Church. So again the 6th Oecumenical Council, that of Constantinople in *Trullo*, A.D. 680-1, has a canon (34) against clerics or monks *conjurantes* & *conjurantes* (translated in the Latin *conjurantes vel sodalitates inuicem*), who are to lose their rank; and other similar enactments could be adduced.

In the 8th century we find a disposition on the part of the Church to confine the idea of fraternity to clerical and monastic use. We may take as an instance of this in our own country the 'Dialogue by question and answer on Church government' of Archbishop Egbert of York (middle of the century), in which the terms *frater* and *coror* will be found applied both to clerics and monks or nuns, but never apparently to laymen. But there is at the same time ground for surmising that the term "fraternity," which in the 12th and 13th centuries is used ordinarily as a synonym for "gild," was already current in

the 8th or 9th to designate these bodies, the organization of which Dr. Brentano holds to have been complete among the Anglo-Saxons in the 8th century (Brentano on Gilds, pp. 11-12), and the bulk of which were of lay constitution, though usually of a more or less religious character. The connexion between the two words is established in a somewhat singular manner. A Council of Nantes of very uncertain date, which has been placed by some as early as 658, by others as late as 800, has a canon (9) which is repeated almost in the same terms in a capitulary of Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, of the year 852 or 858 (c. 16). But where the canon speaks of "those gatherings or confraternities which are termed *consortia* (de collectis vel confratriis quas *consortia* vocant)," the archbishop has "de collectis quas *geldonias* vel *confratrias* vulgo vocant,"—"gatherings which are commonly called gilds or confraternities." Whilst the faithful are authorized to unite "in oblations, in lights, in mutual prayers, in the burial of the dead, in alms and other offices of piety," those feasts and banquets are forbidden, where "undue exactions, shameful and vain merriment and quarrels, often even hatred and dissensions are wont to arise;" the penalty assigned being for clerics deprivation, for laymen or women exclusion from communion till they have given due satisfaction.

But the term "gild" itself was already in use to designate fraternities for mutual help before the days of Hincmar. We meet with it in a capitulary of Charlemagne's of the year 779, treated by Canciani and Muratori as enacted for Lombardy, but by Pertz on the contrary (in his *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*) as enacted for France, which bears "As touching the oaths mutually sworn by a gild (per *gildoniam*, Canc.; *gildonia*, Pertz), that no one presume to do so. Otherwise as touching their maintenance ('*alimoniis*; or "alms," *elemosynis*, Pertz), or fire, or shipwreck, though they may make covenant (*quamvis convenientias faciant*) let none presume to swear thereto" (see also bk. v. of the general collection, c. 200, "de sacramentis pro *gildoma* (*gildonia*) *invicem conjurantibus*"; and the 4th "Addition," c. 134, "*ne aliquis pro gildonia sacramentum facere audeat*." It is thus clear that the gilds of the latter half of the 8th century existed for purposes exactly the same as those which they fulfilled several centuries later. So far indeed as they were usually sanctioned by oath, they were obviously forbidden by the capitulary above quoted, as well as by several others against "conjurations" and conspiracies which Dr. Brentano refers to from Pertz, the last (the Thionville Capitulary of 805) of a peculiarly ferocious character.

It may be suspected that the subject of religious or quasi-religious brotherhoods or fraternities in the early Church (apart from monastic ones) has been but imperfectly investigated as yet. It may at least be said that specific bodies are found apparently answering to the character, attached to particular churches, during the 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries. In the West, however, we seem first to discern them under the Teutonic shape of the gild, which in its freer forms was palpably the object of great jealousy to the political and spiritual despots of the Carolingian era. [J. M. L.]

BUCOLUS, Bishop of Smyrna, consecrated by St. John; commemorated as "Holy Father," Feb. 6 (*Cal. Byzant.*) [C.]

BULLS. [BRIEFS AND BULLS.]

BURDIGALENSE CONCILIUM. [BORDEAUX, COUNCIL OF.]

BURFORD, COUNCIL OF (BERGHFORD-ENSE CONCILIUM), provincial, "juxta vadum Berghford," at Burford in Oxfordshire, A.D. 685, witnesses a grant by King Berhtwald, an under-king of Ethelred of Mercia, to Aldhelm and the abbey of Malmesbury (charter in *Will. Malm. G. P. A. V.*, and Kemble, *Cod. Dipl.* 26; the latter correcting the impossible date DCXXXV into DCLXXXV, and thus removing the main objection to the genuineness of the document, which however he still marks as spurious; Haddan and Stubbs, *Couns.* iii. 169). [A. W. H.]

BURIAL OF THE DEAD. Among the many points of contrast between the Christian Church and the systems which it supplanted, the treatment of the departed furnished one of the most conspicuous. Side by side with their unexampled hospitality and their austere purity of life, Julian enumerates their care for the burial of the dead as one of the means by which the Christians against whom he strove, had succeeded in converting the Empire (*Epist. ad Arsac.* xlix., Opp. ed. Spanheim). That which was characteristic of the new faith was not only its belief in the resurrection of the body, but its reverence for that body as sharing in the redemption, and this showed itself in almost every incident connected with the funeral rites.

1. *Mode of Burial.* In Egypt and in Palestine the Christian Church inherited the practice of embalming. It had prevailed from the earliest period of which we have any record. It had originated in a belief which Christians recognised as analogous to their own (*August. Serm. de Div.* cxx. 12). So the patriarchs and kings of the Old Testament had been interred, so had been their Lord himself. It was natural that those who found the practice in existence should not discard it, even though they no longer looked on it as essential. The language of Tertullian implies that it was in general use in Western Africa (*Apol.* c. 42); that of Augustine (*l. c.*) shows that it was adopted in Egypt. In Greece, on the other hand, the dead had been consigned to the funeral pyre, and the ashes collected in an urn of bronze or clay, from the heroic age downward. Rome, which in the earlier days of the Republic had interred its dead, had adopted the Greek usage in the time of Sulla (the dictator is said to have been the first Roman whose body was so disposed of) and had transmitted it to the Empire (*Plin. Hist. Nat.* vii. 54; *Cic. de Legg.* ii. 25). Against this usage Christian feeling naturally revolted. Even while contending that no variation in the mode of burial could affect the resurrection of the body, Christian writers protested against cremation as wanting in reverencing, and suggesting a denial of the truth which they held so precious. We, they said, "*veterem et meliorem consuetudinem humandi frequentamus*" (*Minuc. Felix, Octav.* c. 39; *August. de Civ. Dei*, i. 12, 13). And accordingly, when their persecutors sought to inflict the most cruel outrage on their feelings, they added to the tortures by which they inflicted

death, that of burning the bodies of the dead. In this way, they thought, they should rob the Christians of that resurrection which they hoped for, or at least trample on that which they held sacred (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1, *ad fin.*). As a rule, accordingly, it may be held, that interment, with or without embalming, according to local custom or the rank of the deceased, obtained from the first in all Christian Churches.

2. *Place of Burial.* At first, in the nature of things, it was not in the power of Christians to transgress the laws of the Empire which forbade interment within the walls of cities (Cic. *de Legg.* ii. 58). The Jewish custom had in this respect agreed with that which prevailed throughout the heathen world, strengthened by the feeling that contact with the graves where the dead reposed brought with it a ceremonial defilement. The tomb of Christ, *e.g.*, was in a garden high unto the city, but outside the gates (Matt. xxvii. 60), and the same holds good of the burial at Nain (Luke vii. 12), and of that of Lazarus (John xi. 30). The demoniac of Gadara had "his dwelling in the tombs," because they were remote from human habitations (Mark v. 5). Commonly, as on the Appian way, and the road from Athens to the Piræus, the strip of ground on each side of the most frequented highway, beginning at the city gate, became the burial-place of citizens. Slaves and foreigners were laid in some less honourable position. The Jews at Rome and in other cities had burial-places of their own.

The wish to avoid contact with idolatrous rites, and to escape interruption and insult in their own funeral ceremonies, would naturally lead Christians to follow the example of the Jews, and to secure, as soon as possible, a place where they could bury their dead in peace. The earliest trace of this feeling is found in an inscription, which records the purchase by Faustus, a slave of Antonia, the wife of Drusus, from Jucundus, a Christian, of the "jus ollarum," the right, *i.e.* of burying the remains of the dead in a *columbarium*. The Christian, *i.e.* will no longer burn the bodies of those for whom he cares, nor have his own body to be burnt, but sells his interest in the pagan sepulchre, and provides another for himself (Muratori *MDCLXVIII.* 6). So in like manner Cyprian (*Ep.* 68) makes it a special charge against Martialis, bishop of Astura, that he had allowed his sons to be "apud profana sepulcra depositos." During the long periods in which they were exempt from persecution, they were allowed in many cities to possess their burial-grounds in peace. At Carthage, *e.g.*, they had their *areae*, and it was only in a time of popular fury that their right to them was disputed (Tertull. *ad Scap.* c. 3). At Alexandria they had what they had been the first to call *κοιμητήρια*, and it was not till the persecution under Valerian and Gallienus that they were forbidden to have access to them (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 11). [CEMETERY.] Soon afterwards, however, they must have been restored, as we find Diocletian and Maximian again closing them. Special edicts of this nature are, of course, exceptions that prove the rule. Where, as at Rome, Naples, and Milan, the nature of the soil lent itself readily to subterraneous interment, this was caught at as giving at once the privacy and security which the Chris-

tians needed. As Christianity spread, it was not difficult, by payment or by favour—often, perhaps, through a secret sympathy—to obtain from the owners of the land which was thus excavated a prescriptive right to its use; and, as a matter of fact, the sanctity of the catacombs never seems to have been violated. [CATACOMBS.] Whatever other purposes they might serve, as meeting-places or refuges, this was, beyond question, their primary and most lasting use.

During persecution, especially in localities where there was not the facility for concealment presented by the catacombs, the Christians had, of course, to bury their dead as they could. When the conversion of Constantine restored free liberty of choice, the places which had been made sacred by the bodies of saints and martyrs were naturally sought after. The tomb became the nucleus of a basilica. The devout Christian wished to be helped by the presence and protection of the martyr (August. *de Cura ger. pro Mort.* c. 1 and 7). The phrases *POSITOS AD SANCTOS, AD MARTYRES*, are found frequently on monumental inscriptions in Italy and Gaul (Le Blant, *Inscriptions Chrétiennes*, i. 83). Gradually, through the influence of this feeling, the old Roman practice of extramural interment fell into disuse. Burial within the basilica was reserved for persons of the highest rank. Constantine was the first to set the example, and was followed by Theodosius and Honorius (Chrysost. *Hom.* 26 in 2 *Cor.*). The distinction was eagerly sought after, and the desire to obtain it had to be placed under restrictions both by imperial laws, as by those of Valentinian and Gratian, and by the canons of councils (Conc. Bracar. A.D. 563, c. 18). During the transition period many cities seem to have adhered to the old plan, and to have refused their sanction to any intramural interment (*ibid.*). Where that sanction was given, the precincts of the church, sometimes its atrium or courtyard, where it was constructed after the type of a basilica, became the favourite spot. In the 9th century Gregory of Tours supplies the first instance of a formal consecration of a churchyard for such a purpose (*De Glor. Confess.* c. 6). A special prohibition against the use of the baptistery for interments is found in Gaul about the same period (Conc. Antissiod. c. 14).

FUNERAL RITES. The details of Christian burial present, as might be expected, points both of resemblance and contrast to heathen practices. Wherever the usage was the expression of natural reverence or love, there it was adopted. Where it was connected with any pagan superstition it was carefully avoided.

(1.) Starting from the moment of death, the first act of the by-standers, of the nearest of kin who might be present, was to close the eyes and mouth of the corpse (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 22). Among the Romans this had been followed by reopening the eyes when the body was placed upon the pyre (Plin. *Nat. Hist.* xi. 37), probably as symbolizing the thought that though they had ceased to look upon the world which they were leaving, they were yet on the point of passing to another state of being where they would see and be seen again. Of this latter custom we have no trace in Christian history. Then followed the washing, the anointing, sometimes the embalming. In the society around

them this had been left to the *pollinctores*, who made it their business. With Christians it was a work of love, done for friends and kindred, or even for strangers and the poor (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 22).

(2.) In Palestine and throughout the East generally interment followed upon death after an interval of a few hours, during which the hired mourners made their lamentations (Matt. ix. 23; 2 Chron. xxxv. 25; Jerem. xxii. 18). This was due in part, of course, to the rapidity with which decomposition sets in under such a climate, but still more to the feeling common to both Jew and heathen, that the presence of the dead body brought defilement to the house and its inmates. Here also Christian thought shewed itself in contrast, and the interval between death and burial was gradually prolonged to three or four days. The body was swathed in white linen, sometimes with the insignia of office, or with ornaments of gold and gems, placed in the coffin or sarcophagus, and laid out, sometimes in the chamber of death, sometimes in the church, that friends might come and weep and take their last look (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iv. 66, 67; Ambros. *Orat. in obit. Theodos.*; August. *Conf.* ix. 12). Vigils were held over it, accompanied by prayers and hymns. Hired mourners, like those of the East or the *præficiae* of the Romans, were not allowed.

(3.) The feeling that a funeral was a thing of evil omen for the eye to fall on led the Romans to choose night as the time for interment.<sup>a</sup> The Christian Church, on the contrary, as soon as it was able to develop itself freely, and was free from the risk of outrage, chose the day, and gave to the funeral procession somewhat of the character of a triumph. The coffin was borne on the shoulders of the nearest friends and kinsmen. Where, as in the case of Paula (Hieron. *Ep.* 27 *ad Eustoch.*), honour was to be shewn to some conspicuous benefactor of the Church, it was carried by the bishops and the clergy. The leading clergy of a diocese took their place as bearers at the funeral of a bishop, as, e. g. in that of St. Basil (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xx. p. 371). They and the others who took part in the ceremonial carried in their hands branches, not of the funereal cypress, as among Greeks and Romans, but of palm and olive, as those who celebrate a victory. Leaves of the evergreen laurel and ivy were placed in the coffin in token of the hope of immortality (Durand. *Rit. dir. off.* vii. 35). Others, again, in like token of Christian joy, carried lighted lamps or torches (Chrysost. *Hom. IV. in Hebr.*; Greg. Nyss. *Vit. Martin.* ii. p. 201). The practice of crowning the head with a wreath of flowers was rejected,<sup>b</sup> partly as tainted with idolatry, partly as associated with riotous revels or shameless effeminacy (Clem. Alex. *Pædag.* ii. 8; Tertull. *de Cor. Milit.* c. 10), but flowers were scattered freely over the body. Others, again, carried thuribles, and fragrant clouds of incense rose as in a Roman

<sup>a</sup> Julian, in his edict against the practice of funeral processions, occasioned by those which had been held at Antioch in honour of the martyr Babylas, falls back upon the old superstition: "Qui enim dies est bene auspiciatus a funere? Aut quomodo ad Deos et templa veniatur?"—*Cod. Theod.* ix. tit. 17, l. 5.

<sup>b</sup> The denial of what had come to be a recognized mark of honour was turned in the earlier ages of the Church into a ground of attack. "Coronas etiam sepulchris

triumph (Baron. *Annal.* A.D. 310, n. 10; Chrysost. *Hom.* cxvi. l. 6). Nor did they march in silence, but chanted as they went hymns of hope and joy. "Right dear in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints;" "Turn again unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath rewarded thee;" "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God"—were among the favourite anthems (*Const. Apost.* vi. 30; Chrysost. *Hom.* 30, *de Dorm.*). Bells were not tolled till the eighth or ninth century, nor can the practice of carrying the cross in the procession be traced beyond the sixth (Greg. Turon. *Vit. Patr.* c. 14). When they reached the grave, hymns and prayers were renewed, and were followed by an address from the bishop or priest.<sup>c</sup>

(4.) Either in the church or at the grave it was customary, as early as the fourth century, to have a celebration of the eucharist in token of the communion that still existed between the living and the dead. (123 C. Carth. iii. c. 29). With this were united special prayers for the soul of the departed. The priest first, and afterwards the other friends, gave the corpse the last kiss of peace (Dionys. Areop. *Hierarch. Eccles.* c. 7). For some centuries, in spite of repeated prohibitions by councils of the Church, the practice prevailed, in Western Africa, in Gaul, in the East, of placing the consecrated bread itself, steeped in the wine, within the lips of the dead (C. Carth. iii. c. 6; vi. c. 83; C. Antissiod. c. 12; C. Trullan. c. 133). Another practice, that of burying the Eucharistic bread with the dead, though not between the lips, had a higher sanction. St. Basil is reported, on one occasion, after consecration, to have divided the Eucharist into three parts, and to have reserved one to be buried with him (Amphilochius in *Spicilej.* vii. p. 81); and St. Benedict, in like manner, ordered it to be laid upon the breast of a young monk, as he was placed in the grave. (Greg. *Dialog.* ii. 24; cf. Martene *de Ant. Eccles. Rit.* i. 162, ed. 1.) The old union of the Agape and the Supper of the Lord left traces of itself here also, and the Eucharist was followed by a meal, ostensibly of brotherhood, or as an act of bounty to the poor, but often passing into riotous excess (August. *de Mor. Eccl.* c. 34).

When the body was lowered into the grave it was with the face turned upwards, and with the feet towards the east, in token of the sure and certain hope of the coming of the Sun of Righteousness and the resurrection of the dead (Chrysost. *Hom.* cxvi. t. vi.). Other positions, such as sitting or standing, were exceptions to the general rule (Arringhi, *Roma subt.* c. 16, p. 33). The insignia of office, if the deceased had held any such position—gold and silver ornaments, in the case of private persons—were often hung into the open grave, and the waste and ostentation to which this led had to be checked by an imperial edict (*Cod. Theodos.* xi. tit. 7, l. 14), which does not appear, however, to have been very rigidly enforced. The practice

"denegatis" is the language of the heathen in the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix; and the Christian in his reply acknowledges "nec mortuos coronamus" (c. xii. xxxviii.). Flowers were however scattered over the grave (Prudent. *Cathemerinon*, x. 177.)

<sup>c</sup> The funeral orations of Eusebius at the death of Constantine, of Ambrose on that of Theodosius, are the most memorable instances; but we have also those of Gregory of Nazianzum on his father, brother, and sister.



retained in our English service, of a solemn prayer while the first handful of earth was thrown upon the coffin, is not traceable to any early period. In the Greek *Euchologion* the earth is cast in by the bishop or priest himself. When the grave was closed the service ended with the Lord's Prayer and Benediction.

There were, however, subsequent rites connected more or less normally with the burial. On the third day, on the ninth, and on the fortieth, the friends of the deceased met and joined in psalms or hymns and prayers (*Constit. Apost.* vii. c. 42).

The feeling that death in the case of those who fell asleep in Christ was a cause not for lamentation but for thanksgiving, shewed itself lastly in the dress of the mourning apparel which was common among the Romans, of the ashes and rent garments, which were signs of sorrow with the Jews. Instead of black clothes, men were to wear the dress which they wore at feasts. The common practice was denounced as foreign to the traditions and the principles of the Christian Church (Cyprian, *de Mortal.* p. 115; August. *Serm. 2, de Consol. Mort.*). Here, however, the natural feeling was too strong to be thrust out, and gradually the old signs of a sorrow, which could not but be felt, even though it were blended with hope, made their way into use again.

It was characteristic of the religious care with which the Church regarded every work connected with the burial of the dead, that even those whose tasks were of the lowest kind, the grave-diggers (*κομιδάρι, fossarii*), the *sandapillarii*, and others, whose functions corresponded to those of the undertaker's men in our own time, were not merely a class doing their work as a trade, but were reckoned as servants of the Church, and as such took their place as the lowest order of the clergy.

The more developed and formal ritual of interment in the Eastern Church is given at some length by the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, and contained, as its chief elements, the following:—(1) The body was brought to the bishop or priest by the next of kin, that he might offer thanksgiving as for one who had fought the good fight, and the relations sang triumphant and rejoicing hymns. (2) The deacons recited the chief Scriptural promises of the resurrection and of eternal life, and sang creeds and hymns of like tenor. (3) The catechumens were then dismissed, and the archdeacon spoke to the faithful who remained, of the bliss of the departed, and exhorted them to follow their example. (4) The priest then prayed that the deceased might find a resting-place with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the land where sorrow and sighing should flee away. (5) The bishop, followed by the kindred or friends, then gave the corpse the kiss of peace. (6) When this was over, the bishop poured oil upon the dead body, and it was then placed in the grave. The anointing of baptism was to prepare the athlete for his conflict: that of burial was a token that the conflict was over, and the combatant at rest. (*Eccles. Hierarch.* vii. p. 359.) [E. H. P.]


**BURIAL OF THE LORD.** Easter-Eve in the Armenian Calendar is called the *Burial of the Lord* (Neale, *Eastern Ch. Intro.* p. 798). [C.]

## BYZATIUM, COUNCIL OF


**BUTTA, BUTTO or BUTRO.** (Several hundred forms are given by Du Cange, s. v. *Butta*.) In some MSS. of the *Liber Pontificalis* we read that Leo III. (795-816)

caused to be made for the venerable monastery of St. Sabas, "butronem [al. buttonem] argenteum cum canistro suo pensantem libr. xii." Leo IV. (847-855) is also reported by the same authority to have placed in the church of St. Peter, "butronem ex argento purissimo, qui pendet in presbyterio ante altare, pensantem libr. cxlix"; and another, also of pure silver, "cum gabbatis argenteis pendentibus in catenulis septem."

These buttones seem to have been suspended cups used for lamps. [Compare CANISTRUM, GABATHA.] The illustrations are from the *Hierozicon*; the first represents a single suspended *butto*, from an ancient representation; the second, a corona with three hanging *buttones*, from an ancient painting once existing in St. Peter's at Rome.



Single Butto, as Lamp.



Buttones used as Lamps.

The form *butrista* is used, apparently in the same sense, by Alcuin, *Poem.* 165. (Du Cange's *Glossary*; Macri *Hierozicon*, s. v. *Butto*.)

Martens (*de Ant. Eccl. Rit.* iii. 96) describes a *buta* as used for fetching and preserving the CHRISM, according to an ancient custom, in the church of St. Martin at Tours. [C.]

**BYBLINUS**, in Caesarea; commemorated Nov. 5 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**BYZACENUM CONCILIIUM.** (BYZATIUM, COUNCIL OF.)

**BYZATIUM, COUNCIL OF (BYZACENUM CONCILIIUM)**, provincial, at Byzantium in Africa. (1) A.D. 387, to confirm the canons of the Council of Hippo of A.D. 383: its Synodical Letter is in the Acts of the Third Council of

Carthage of the same year, 397 (Mansi, iii. 875).—(2) A.D. 507, a numerous Council, which insisted on filling up vacant bishoprics, King Theodoric having forbidden this in order to extinguish the orthodox Church (Ferrand. *Diac.*, V. *Fulgent.* xvi.; Labbe, iv. 1378–1380).—(3) A.D. 541, sent a deputation to the emperor Justinian, who in reply confirms all the canonical privileges of the metropolitan of Carthage (Dacianus), and of the African primates (*Rescripts of Justinian to the Council and to Dacianus*, in Baron. *ad an.* 541; Labbe, v. 380).—(4) A.D. 602, in the cause of Crementius, or Clementius, or Clementinus, primate of the province, held at the instigation of Gregory the Great (*Epist.* xii. 32), who exhorts the comprovincial bishops to inquire into, and adjudge upon, certain accusations that were current against their metropolitan (Labbe, v. 1612).—(5) A.D. 646, under Stephen the metropolitan, against the Monothelites (Labbe, v. 1635, vi. 133). [A. W. H.]

## C

**CABERSUSSA, COUNCIL OF.** [AFRICAN COUNCILS.]

**CABILLONENSE CONCILIUM.** [CHILONS-EUR-SAÛNE.]

**CAECILIA**, virgin-martyr at Rome, is commemorated Nov. 23 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Usuardi). [C.]

**CAECILIANUS**, martyr at Sragossa, commemorated April 16 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

**CAECILIUS**, with others "qui Romae ab apostolis ordinati sunt," is commemorated May 15 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

**CAESAR-AUGUSTANUM CONCILIUM.** [SARAGOSSA.]

**CAESAREA, COUNCILS OF.** (1) In Palestine, A.D. 196, according to Cave (*Hist. Lit.* i. 97) on the Easter controversy that had arisen between Pope Victor and the churches of Asia Minor.—Narcissus of Jerusalem. Theophilus of Caesarea, Cassius of Tyre, and Clarus of Ptolemais being present, as we learn from Eusebius (v. 25). They beg, in what he has preserved of their letter, to be understood as keeping Easter on the same day as the Church of Alexandria. But, curiously enough, several versions of the acts of this Council have been discovered in the West, beginning with that ascribed to Beke (*Migne's Patrol.* xc. 607; comp. Mansi i. 711–714) at much greater length: the only question is, are they in keeping with the above letter?

(2) In Palestine (Mansi ii. 1122), summoned A.D. 331, to inquire into the truth of some charges brought against St. Athanasius by his enemies, but not held till 334, when he was further accused of having kept the Council appointed to try them, waiting thirty months. He knew too well to what party the bishop of the diocese, and father of ecclesiastical history, belonged, to appear even then; and on his non-appearance, proceedings had to be adjourned to the Council of Tyre the year following.

(3) In Palestine, A.D. 357 or 358 apparently, under Acacius its Metropolitan, when St. Cyril

of Jerusalem was deposed (Soz. iv. 25). Sozocrates (ii. 40) adds that he appealed from its sentence to a higher tribunal, a course hitherto without precedent in canonical usage; and that his appeal was allowed by the emperor.

(4) In Pontus, or Neocaesarea, A.D. 358, according to Pagi (Mansi iii. 291), at which Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, was deposed; and Melatius, afterwards bishop of Antioch, set in his place.

(5) In Cappadocia, A.D. 370 or 371, when St. Basil was constituted bishop in the room of Eusebius, its former Metropolitan, whom he had been assisting some years, though he had been ordained deacon by St. Meletius. The *Libellus Synodicus*, a work of the ninth century (Mansi i. 25, note) makes St. Basil anathematise Dianius, the predecessor of his own predecessor at this synod; but St. Basil himself (*Ep. li. al. lxxvi.*) denies ever having done so. Further on in his epistles (xviii. al. cclix.) he seems to speak of another synod about to be held in his diocese, to settle the question of jurisdiction between him and the Metropolitan of Tyana, consequent on the division of Cappadocia by the civil power into two provinces. St. Basil stood upon his ancient rights: but eventually the matter was compromised, as we learn from his friend St. Gregory (*Orat. xliii.* § 59 al. xx.), by the erection of more sees in each, the carrying out of which, however beneficial to their country, proved so nearly fatal to their friendship. The date assigned to this Council by Mansi (iii. 453) is A.D. 373. [E. S. F.]

**CAESARIUS.** (1) Bishop of Arles, commemorated Aug. 27 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Deacon and martyr, is commemorated Nov. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Usuardi).

(3) Martyr under Decius, is commemorated Nov. 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi). [C.]

**CAINICHUS**, abbat in Scotland, commemorated Oct. 11 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

**CAIUS.** (1) Gaius of Corinth is commemorated Oct. 4 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr at Bologna, Jan. 4 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) Palatinus, martyr, March 4 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(4) Martyr at Apamea under Antoninus Verus, March 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

(5) Martyr at Militana in Armenia, April 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

(6) Pope, martyr at Rome under Diocletian, April 22 (*Kal. Bucher.*, *Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Usuardi).

(7) Martyr at Nicomedia, Oct. 21 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

(8) Martyr at Memina, Nov. 20 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi). [C.]

**CALCHUTHENSE CONCILIUM.** [CALCHUTHNE.]

**CALCULATORES**, or according to Pertz, **CAUCULATORES**, casters of horoscopes. This term does not appear to figure in church history till the time of Charlemagne. An ecclesiastical capitulary of 789, dated from Aix-la-Chapelle, referring to the precepts of the Pentateuch against witchcraft and sorcery, enacts that "there shall be no calculators, nor enchanter, nor storm-raisers (*tempestarii*), or *obligatores* (f); and wherever they are, let them amend or be condemned"—the punishment being apparently

left to the discretion of the judge (c. 64). The term figures again, and in much the same company, in a similar enactment contained in certain "Capitula Excerpta" of the year 802, also dated from Aix-la-Chapelle (c. 40). [J. M. L.]

**CALENDAR** (*Kalendarium*, *Computus*, *Distributio Officiorum per circulum totius anni*, *μηναι-ον ἑορταστικόν*, *ἡμερολόγιον*, *ἐφημερίς*: later, *καλεντάριον*.) It does not belong to this article to treat of the calendar except in its ecclesiastical form as used for liturgical purposes during the first eight centuries of the Christian era. The early Christian communities continued to use the mode of reckoning and naming days and years which existed in the countries in which they had their origin. The distinctive church calendar exists for the purpose of denoting the days, either of a given year, or of any year, which are marked for religious celebration.

First among these liturgical requirements is the specification of the Lord's Day. This was facilitated by a contrivance borrowed from the heathen Roman calendar. [SUNDAY LETTER.]

But together with the week of seven days, of which the first day or Sunday was assigned to the celebration of the Lord's Resurrection, there existed from the earliest times a yearly commemoration which, eventually, by general consent of the churches, at first divided on this point (EASTER), was assigned to the Sunday next after the day on which, according to certain calculations, the Jews were, or should have been, celebrating their Passover, that is, the day of the full moon nearest to the vernal equinox. Hence the year of the Christian calendar is partly solar of the Julian form, partly lunar. All the Sundays which are related to Easter, i.e. all from our Septuagesima Sunday to the last Sunday after Trinity, change their places year by year: the rest, i.e. from 1 Advent to the Sunday before Septuagesima shifting only to a place one day later; in leap-years, two. About the middle of the 4th century, the Nativity of Christ, until then commemorated, if at all, on the 6th January, was fixed to the 25th December [CHRISTMAS]. And as other days, commemorative of bishops, martyrs, and apostles came to be celebrated, these also were noted in the fixed calendar.

The calendar existed in two forms: one, in which all the days of the year were noted, with specification of months and weeks: the other, a list of the holy days, with or without specification of the month date. Of the full calendar, what seems to be the earliest extant specimen is furnished by a fragment of a Gothic calendar, composed, probably, in Thrace in the 4th century, edited by Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio*, v. i. 66-68. Comp. de Gabelentz, *Ulphilas*, ii. i, p. xvii. Krafft, *Kirch. Gesch. der germanischen Völker*, i. 1, 371, 385-387. This fragment gives only the thirty-eight days from 23 October to 30 November. It assigns the festivals of seven saints, two of the New Testament, three of the Universal Church, two local, namely Gothic. Not less ancient, perhaps, is a Roman calendar, of the time of Constantius II., forming part of a collection of chronographical pieces written by the calligrapher, Furius Dionysius Filocalus, in the year 354; edited, after others, by Kollar, *Analect. Vindobon.* i. 961, sqq. This, while retaining the astronomical and astrological notes

of the old Roman calendars, with some of the heathen festivals, is so far Christian that, side by side with the old nundinal letters A-H, it gives also the dominical letters, A-G, of the ecclesiastical year; but it does not specify any of the Christian holy days. (Comp. Ideler, *Hdb.* 2, 140.) Next in point of antiquity is the calendar composed by Polemeus Silvius, in the year 448, edited by the Bollandists, *Acta Sanctorum* Januar. vii. 176 ff. This is a full Roman calendar adapted to Christian use, not only as that of A.D. 354, just noticed, by specification of the Lord's Days, but with some few holy days added, namely, four in connexion with Christ, and six for commemoration of martyrs.

Of the short calendar, the most ancient specimen is that which was first edited by Bucherius, *de Doctrina Temporum*, c. xv. 266 sqq. (Antwerp, 1634)—a work of Roman origin dating from about the middle of the 4th century, as appears from the contents, as also from the fact that it is included in the collection of Filocalus, thence edited by Kollar, u.s.; also with a learned commentary by Lambecius, *Catal. Codd. MSS. in Biblioth. Caesar. Vindobon.* iv. 277 ff., and by Graevius *Thes.* viii. It consists of two portions, of which the first is a list of twelve popes from Lucius to Julius (predecessor of Liberius), A.D. 253-352; not complete, however, for Sixtus (Xystus) has his place among the martyrs, and Marcellus is omitted. The other part gives names and days of twenty-two martyrs, all Roman, including besides Xystus, those of earlier popes, Fabianus, Callistus, and Pontianus. Together with these, the Feast of the Nativity is noted on 25th December, and that of the *Cathedra Petri* assigned to 22nd February.

A similar list of Roman festivals with a lectionary (*Capitularium Evangeliorum totius anni*) was edited by Fronto (Paris, 1652, and in his *Epistolae et Dissertat. ecclesiasticae*, p. 107-233, Veron. 1733), from a manuscript written in letters of gold, belonging to the convent of St. Geneviève at Paris. This seems to have been composed in the first half of the 8th century. Another, also Roman, edited by Martene, *Thes. Analect.* v. 65, is perhaps of later date.

A calendar of the church of Carthage, of the like form, discovered by Mabillon, by Ruinart appended to his *Acta Martyrum*, is by them assigned to the 5th century. It contains only festivals of bishops and martyrs, mostly local. It opens with the title, "Hic continentur dies natalitiorum martyrum et depositiones episcoporum quos ecclesiae Carthaginis anniversaria celebrant."

As each church had its own bishops and martyrs, each needed in this regard (i.e. for the days marked for the *Depositiones Episcoporum* and *Natalitia Martyrum*) its separate calendar. It belonged to the bishop to see that these lists were properly drawn up for the use of the church. And to this effect we find St. Cyprian in his 36th epistle exhorting his clergy to make known to him the days on which the confessors suffered. "Dies eorum, quibus excedunt, nunciate ut commemorationes eorum inter memorias martyrum celebrare possimus. Quamquam Tertullus . . . scripserit et scribat et significet mihi dies, quibus in carcere beati fratres nostri ad immortalitatem gloriosae mortis exitu transeunt, et celebrentur hic a nobis oblationes et sacrificia ob commemorationes eorum." Out

of these calendar notices grew the **MARTYROLOGIES** which, however, they greatly surpass in authority and importance. For the calendar, being essential as a liturgical directory, was therefore composed only by the bishop or by some high officer of the church appointed by him. Nothing could be added to, or altered in, the calendar but by his authority. It was accordingly prefixed or appended to the Sacramentaries and other liturgical books. As an example of an early form of this liturgical calendar, the following is here given from the *Responsoriale* and *Antiphonarium* ascribed to St. Gregory the Great (ed. Thomasius):—

Specimen distributionis officiorum per circulum anni.

Dominica I. Adventus Domini.	Dom. V. Responsoria de Psalmis.
Dominica II. ante Nativ. Domini.	Diebus Dominicis Antiphonae.
Natale S. Lucae Virginia.	Vigilia S. Sebastiani.
Dom. III. ante Nativ. Domini.	Natale S. Agnetis.
Dom. proxima ante Nat. Dom.	Purificatio S. Mariae.
Vigilia Nat. Dom.	Vigilia et Natale S. Agnae.
Nativitas Domini.	Adunatio S. Mariae.
Natale S. Stephani.	Dominica in LXXma.
" S. Joannis.	Dom. in LXma.
" SS. Innocentium.	Dom. in Lma (seu Carnisprivii et excarnaliorum).
Dom. I. post Nat. Dom.	Dom. I. in XLa.
Vigilia Octavae Nat. Dom.	Dom. II.
Epiphania (seu Theophania).	Dom. III.
Octava Epiphaniae.	Dom. in medio XLmae (seu de Jerusalem).
Dominica I. post Theophaniam.	Laetare (vel de Rosa).
Dom. II.	Dom. de Passione Domini (seu Mediana).
Dom. III.	Dom. in Palmis (seu Indulgentiae).
Dom. IV.	Vigilia Coenae Domini.
Parasceve.	Dominica post Ascensum Domini (seu Item de Rosa).
Sabbatum sanctum.	Pentecoste.
Vigiliae S. Paschae.	Octava Pentecostes.
Dominica S. Paschae.	Vigilia Nativitatis S. Joannae Baptistae.
Dom. octava Paschae (seu, post albas paschales).	(Sic sequuntur officia propria de Sanctis usque ad Adventum).
Dom. I. post Pascha.	Communia Officia.
Dom. II.	Responsoria de libro Regum, Sapientiae, Job, Tobia, Judith, Esther, de historia Machabaeorum de Prophetis.
Dom. III.	Antiphonae ad hymnum trium puerorum.
Dom. IV.	De Cantico Zachariae. S. Mariae.
Litania major.	Antiphonae dominicis diebus post Pentecosten a L. usque ad XXIV.
Vigilia Apostol. Philippi et Jacobi.	
Dom. III. et IV. in Pascha R. R. de Auctoritate.	
Dom. V. et VI. in Pascha R. R. de psalmis.	
In Natalitiis Sa. infra Pascha.	
In Natalitiis unius Martyris sive Confessoria.	
In S. Crucis Inventione.	
In exaltatione S. Crucis.	
Ascensio Domini.	

A knowledge of the calendar, being indispensable for the due performance of the liturgy, was one of the essential qualifications for the priestly office. It is a frequent injunction in the capitula of bishops, "presbyteri computum discant." A canon of the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, A.D. 789, c. 70, and the *Capitulare Interrogationis*, A.D. 811, of Charlemagne, i. 68, enjoin (with a view to the supply of qualified persons) "ut scholae legentium puerorum fiant, psalmos, notas, cantum, computum, grammaticam . . . . discant." For instruction in this department of clerical education and ecclesiastical learning, treatises more or less copious were provided. An elaborate work of this kind is the *de Computo* of Ratannus Maurus, archbishop of Mayence (A.D. 847), edited by Baluzius, *Miscellan.* t. i. p. 1, sqq. Yearly, on the feast of Epiphany, the

bishop announced the date of Easter for that year, as enjoined e.g. by the 4th Council of Orleans, A.D. 541, can. 1 (Bruns, ii. 201): and from him the clergy, together with this announcement, received notice of any new festival appointed, in order that the same might be entered in their calendar, and made known to the people.

It results, partly from these subsequent additions made to the original texts of the calendars, which cannot always be discriminated in the MSS. by difference of handwriting, colour of the ink, and other palaeographical criteria, that it is not always easy to say to what age, or to what province of the Church, a given calendar belongs. It is doubtful whether any of them contains the genuine materials of such lists existing in times earlier than the beginning of the 4th century. For of these lists, scarcely any can be supposed to have escaped, in the Diocletian persecution, from the rigorous search then decreed for the general destruction not only of the copies of the Scriptures, but of all liturgical and ecclesiastical documents, among which the calendars, lists of bishops and martyrs, and acts of martyrs, held an important place (Euseb. *H. E.* viii. 2; Arnob. *adv. Gentes*, iv. 36). Some rules, however, which may help to determine the relative antiquity of extant calendars, may be thus summarized, chiefly from Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, v. i. 20, sqq. :—

1. Brevity and simplicity in the statement concerning the holy-day are characteristic of the earlier times. Only the name of the martyr was given, without title or eulogy; even the prefix S. or B. (*sanctus, beatus*) is sparingly used. Sometimes the martyrs of a whole province are included under a single entry. Thus the Calendar of Carthage, in which eighty-one days are marked, has, at 2 Kal. Jan. *Sanctorum Temidensium*; 15 Kal. Aug. *SS. Scilitanorum*. In several other calendars, one name is given, with the addition, *et sociorum* (or *comitum*), *ejus*.

2. To one day only one celebration is assigned in the oldest calendars. "Commemorationes" were unknown or very rare in the earlier times. These seem to have come into use in the 9th century, by reason of the increasing number of saints' days.

3. The relative antiquity of a calendar is especially indicated by the paucity, or entire absence, of days assigned to the B. Virgin Mary. Writers of the Church of Rome satisfy themselves in respect of this fact with the explanation, that the days assigned to the Lord include the commemoration of the Blessed Virgin Mother. Thus, for example, Morcelli (*Afr. Christiana*, cited by Binterim, u. s. p. 14) accounts for the entire silence of the *Calend. Carthag.* concerning the days of the V. Mary; and the like explanation is given of the fact that of St. Augustine we have no sermon preached for a festival of the Virgin.

4. Another note of antiquity is the absence of all saints' days and other celebrations from the period during which Lent falls. Thus March and April in the Carthaginian Calendar exhibit no such days; and the like blank appears in the calendars of Bucherius and Fronto. For the 51st canon of the Council of Laodicea (cir. A.D. 352) enjoins: *ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν τεσσαρακοστῇ μαρτύρων γενέθλιον ἐπιτελεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων μνήαν ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σαββάτοις καὶ*



supra: "a martyr's day must not be kept during the quadragesima, but must (at that time) be reserved for sabbaths and Lord's-days" (Bruna, i. 78). And with this agreed the rule of the Latin Church, as expressed in the 1st canon of the 10th Council of Toledo, A.D. 656 (Bruna, i. 290), where, with especial reference to the falling of Lady-day (F. of Annunciation, 25 Mar) in Lent, or on Easter-day itself, it is said: "eadem festivitas non potest celebrari condigna, cum interdum quadragesimae dies vel paschale festum videtur incumbere, in quibus nihil de sanctorum sollemnitatibus, sicut ex antiquitate regulari consuevit, convenit celebrari."

5. Before the 5th century, no day of canonised bishop or other saint is marked to be kept as festival, unless he was also a martyr. The occurrence of any such day is a sure indication that the calendar is of later date than A.D. 400; or, that the entry is of later insertion. To the bishops is assigned the term *Depositio*; to the martyrs, *Natiuitas* or *Natiuitum*.

6. Vigils are of rare occurrence in the oldest calendars. Not one vigil is noted in the *Kal. Bucherianum* and *Kal. Carthagenense*. The *Kal. Frontonianum* (*supra*) has four. A Gallian Calendar of A.D. 636, edited by d'Achery (*Specul.* x. 130), has five; and another, by Martene, for which he claims an earlier date (*Thes. Anecd.* v. 65), has nine.

For the determination of the Province or Church to which a Calendar belongs, the only criterion to be relied on is the preponderance in it of names of martyrs and saints known to be of that diocese or province. Naturally, each Church would honour most its own confessors and champions of the faith. Especially does this rule hold in respect of the bishops, whose names, unless they were also martyrs or otherwise men of highest note in the Church, would not be likely to obtain a place in the calendars of other than their own Churches.

The Greek Church had its calendars, under the title *ἐφημερίδις* (*ἐφημερίς*), *μηναίων* (*μεναίον*); later, *καλενδριών*, which, as containing the offices for each celebration, grew into enormous dimensions. One such, with the designation, *Μηνολόγιον τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἐορτασμάτων* sive *Kalendarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, edited from a manuscript in the Albani Library by Murcelli, fills two quarto volumes, Rome, 1788. But the title *μηνολόγιον* corresponds not with the Latin *Kalendarium*, but with the Martyrologium. Cave, in a dissertation appended to his *Historia Literaria*, part ii. (*de Libris et officio ecclesiasticis Graecorum*, p. 45) describes the *καλενδριών* or *Ephemeris ecclesiastica* in *nomine totius anni*, as a digest of all church festivals and fasts for the twelve months, day by day, beginning with September. "That calendars of this kind were composed for the use of the churches is plain from Biblioth. Vindobon. *Cod. Hist. Eccl.* xcvi. num. xlii., which gives a letter written by the head of some monastery in reply to questions concerning monastic observance of holidays; to which is appended a complete Church Calendar." [H. B.]

CALEPODIUS, aged presbyter, martyr at Rome under the emperor Alexander Severus, commemorated May 10 (*Mart. Rom. V. et.*, Bedae, Usuardi). [C.]

CALF. Irrespectively of its meaning as symbol of an EVANGELIST, the image of the calf or ox is held by Aringhi (lib. vi. ch. xxii. vol. ii. p. 320) to represent the Christian soul, standing to Christ in the same relation as the sheep to the shepherd. He also takes the calf or ox to represent Apostles labouring in their ministry, quoting various Fathers, and finally St. Chrysostom's idea, that the oxen and fatlings spoken of as killed for the Master's feast are meant to represent prophets and martyrs. The calf or ox, as a sacrificial victim, has been taken to represent the Lord's sacrifice; for which Aringhi quotes a comment on Num. xviii. These similitudes seem fanciful, and pictorial or other representations hardly exist to bear them out. A calf is represented near the Good Shepherd in Buonrotti (*Vetri*, tav. v. fig. 2); and Martigny refers to Allegranza (*Mon. antich. de Milano*, p. 123) for an initial letter at Milan, where the animal is represented playing on a lyre: typifying, he thinks, the subjugation of the human nature to the life of faith. He also refers to St. Clement of Alexandria (*Pedagog.* lib. i. c. 5) for a comparison of young Christians to sucking calves (*μαρυγάς γαλαθῆρας*), connected perhaps in the Father's mind in the same way as in his own; though, as Bishop Potter remarks in his note (*ad loc.*), no such comparison exists in Scripture. The plate in Allegranza is of considerable interest, being from a "marble" belonging to the ancient pulpit of S. Ambrogio. The calf is lying down, and turning up its forefoot to hold the lyre, or "antica octra." It is engraved in the loop of an initial D. The preceding "marble" is a representation of an Agape, from the posterior parapet of the pulpit; and Allegranza considers the calf to be a symbol connected with the Agape. See above, Clem. Alex. *Pedagog.* i. 5. See also a v. LYAN, that instrument being held typical of the human body in its right state of harmony with, and subjection to, the divinely-guided soul. For oxen with Dolia see Bottari, iii. 155, 184.

[R. St. J. T.]

CALIGAE. These were stockings, made of various material, serving for a defence against cold, and as such worn at times by soldiers (Cassiodorus on Suetonius); by monks, if infirm or exposed to cold (Cassianus, lib. i. c. 10; S. Benedictus, *Regula*, c. 62; Gregor. Magnus, *lib. de*, cc. 2, 4); and by bishops in out-door dress (Gregor. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* lib. vi. c. 31). The *Rule of St. Ferreolus* (quoted by Ducange, s. v.), c. 32, has an amusing passage forbidding the elaborate cross-gartering of these *caligae*, out of mere coxcombry. The earliest writer who mentions the caligae as among the "sacred vestments" to be worn by bishops and cardinals is Ivo Carnotensis (†1115). "Antequam induantur sandaliis vestiuntur caligis bysantinis vel lineis, usque ad genus protentis et ibi bene constructis" (*Sermo de significationibus ecclesiasticorum sacerdotum, apud Hittorpium de Dio. Off.*). [W. R. M.]

CALIXTUS [CALLISTUS].

CALL TO THE MINISTRY is more a matter of Christian ethics than of Church canons; and in that point of view it became mixed up, in the Church of the 4th century and onwards, with the parallel case of the adoption of the monastic or the calistate life. The temper that ought to

animate those who are to be ordained was held to be, on the one hand, a sincere and pure desire to serve God in some special way, but on the other, also, a shrinking from the fearful responsibility of the ministry; on the one hand, obedience to the call of superiors, and faith to undertake duties which came by no self-seeking, on the other, humility, that was really the more worthy the more it felt its own unworthiness. In a word, the true *melo episcopari* spirit was held to extend, in measure, to the lower orders also. Compare Rom. x. 13, and Heb. v. 4. 5. Under this view of the case, it was not indeed the absolute law, but it naturally came to pass, and so was the common rule, that the bishops, or the right-ful electors (which included, of course, the bishop or the bishops, and even in the case of the presbyterate, up to at any rate the 3rd century, the clergy and people also) should choose at least to the higher orders, and in such case the canons enacted that any one already in orders in any degree could not refuse to accept. A like rule would apply in a less degree to the first entry into the ministry; the supply in both cases being supplemented by voluntary candidates, from the necessity of the case, but it being held the best that the call should come from others, who had authority. A Carthaginian canon among the *Cod. Can. Afric.* (Græc. c. 31) rules that "quicumque clericus vel diaconus pro nequitatibus ecclesiarum non obtemperaverint episcopis suis volentibus eos ad honorem amplius in sua ecclesia promoveri, esse illic ministrant in gradu suo, unde recedere noluerunt." And for the case of the episcopate, in particular, see under BISHOP. On the other hand, the call certainly needed not of necessity to originate with the bishop. It was open, and it was held a pious act, for parents to devote their children to the ministry, not compelling, but exhorting and encouraging them so to devote themselves. See, e.g. Gaudent. BRIT. (virm. 2), and St. Augustin (*Epist.* 199); the former speaking also of virgins and the latter of monks, but both likewise of the ministry. *Conc. Tolet.* II. A. D. 531, regulates the education of those, "quos voluntas parentum a primis infantine annis in clericatus officio mancipiant." Pope Siricius (*Epist.* I. cc. 9, 10) had, before that (A. D. 385-390), regulated the several periods of years during which such should remain successively in each order of clergy. And *Conc. Eborac.* A. D. 666, can. 18, bids the "parochiani presbyteri" choose promising young people, and "de ecclesie sue familia clericos sibi faciant." Nor was this restricted to young people with their parents' consent. Setting aside special exceptions, &c. which constituted a disqualification for holy orders altogether, it was open to other men also to offer themselves for the ministry; but under certain conditions, in order to ensure purity of motive. Pope Siricius (as above) permits the "secrete jam grandævus" to hasten "ex loco ad sacram militiam pervenire;" but he is only to obtain the presbyterate or episcopate "accessu temporum, . . . et cum cleri auctoritate fuerit electus." A couple of centuries later, Gregory the Great required in like case a probation in a monastery (*Jo. Diac. lib. ii. c. 16*). The Council of Constantinople, A. D. 869 (can. 5), prohibited only those (of senatorial rank or other worldly occupation) who sought to be tonsured from ambitious or worldly motives, expressly

excepting others of a different temper. And canons like those of the Council of Rome in 1079 must be understood with a like exception, which sentences those "clerici" to be deposed "qui non electi nec vocati aut neciente episcopo sacris ordinibus se intramittunt." In short, the words of Hincmar express the Church's view of the subject, who praises certain clergy, who "non importune ad ordinationem . . . se ingerunt . . . sed electi et vocati obediunt" (*Hincm. Epist. ad Nicolaum Papam*, Opp. II. 308); and those of St. Augustin, "Honor te quaerere debet, non ipsum te" (*Rom. 13, in Quinquagesima*), proceeding to quote the parable about taking the lowest room. See also St. Chrys. *De Sacerd.* I. 3, and in 1 Tim., Rom. 1. The call to the ministry, then, in the earlier Church, meant, in the case of the ministry in general, the invitation, approaching to a command, of the bishop; but this might be anticipated, under certain conditions, by the voluntary offering of himself by the candidate; if possible, in his youth, but allowably at any age. In the case of the higher orders, it was or ought to have been the outward call of the rightful patrons (so to call them) of the parish or diocese. Who occupied this position in respect to presbyters or to bishops at successive periods, will be found under BISHOP, PRIEST; but the bishop did so primarily and properly, and of course had in every case and always the right of examination and (if he thought good) rejection, when it came to the question of ordination. The inward call of later days—i.e. the self-devotion of the candidate himself in real sincerity and earnestness—was assumed throughout. And all regulations on the subject tended to sift and test the reality of that inward call. (Thomassin, *De Benef.* p. ii. lib. i. cc. 23, sq.) [A. W. H.]

**CALLICULAE.** Ornaments for the alb or white tunic, made either of some richly-coloured stuff or of metal. Examples of these may be seen in Perret, *Catéchèses de Rome*, II. pl. 7; and in Garrucci, *Vetri ornati*, vi. 5, xxv. 4. For further particulars see Martigny, *Dict. des Ant. Chréti.*, and Ducange, *Glossarium in voc.* [W. B. M.]

**CALLINICUS.** (1) Martyr at Apollonia under Decius, is commemorated Jan. 28 (*Mart. Usuardi*); July 29 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

(2) Commemorated Dec. 14 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**CALLISTE**, with her brothers, martyr, is commemorated Sept. 1 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**CALLISTRATUS** and the forty-nine martyrs (A. D. 288) are commemorated July 1 (*Cal. Armen.*); Sept. 27 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**CALLISTUS.** (1) With Carisus and seven others, martyrs at Corinth, commemorated April 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*).

(2), or CALIXTUS, pope, martyr at Rome, an. 221, commemorated Oct. 14 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Usuardi*). [C.]

**CALLOCERUS**, or CALOCERUS, eunuch, martyr, commemorated May 19 (*Mart. Bacher., Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*); Feb. 11 (*Mart. Bedae*). [C.]

**CALOYERS.** The monks of the Eastern Church. The word is derived either from *calos* and *yoas*, or, more probably from *calos* and *yoas*, signifying a good old age. Applied at first to the elder monks exclusively, it soon

became the common designation of all. (Suicer. *Thesaur.* s. v., cf. Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* ciii. κάλος, where Innocentius is called δ κάλος γέρων). These Eastern monks have preserved from the first, with characteristic tenacity, the Rule of St. Basil. Thus their fastings are more frequent and more rigorous than those in Western Christendom. Their offices too are more lengthy; but partly from this very circumstance, and partly from the office-books being very costly, some are not infrequently omitted (Helyot. *Hist. des Ordres Relig.* I. xix. 6). They are divided, like their Western brethren, into three kinds, *Caenobitae*, dwelling together under one roof; *Anachoretæ*, scattered round the several monasteries and resorting thither for solemn services on festivals, &c.; and *Eremitæ*, or solitary recluses. The *Caenobitæ*, or monks proper, are again subdivided into *Archarii*, novices; *Microschemi*; and *Megaloschemi*, the highest grade (Helyot. I. xix.).

The "Hours" observed by the Caloyers are much the same as those in the West, being, in fact, derived from a common source. After a prolonged service at midnight they sleep from 2 a.m. to 5 a.m. Then a service corresponding to matins, lauds, and prime, the last portion of which is simultaneous with sunrise. After an interval spent in their cells, they meet again at 9 a.m. for tierce, sext, and mass. At mid-day dinner, with the usual lections, in the refectory. At 4 p.m. vespers; at 6 p.m. supper, followed by the ἀπόδειπνον, a sort of compline; at 8 p.m. to bed (Helyot. I. xix.).

They have four especial seasons of fasting in the year, and their abstinence, as has been said already, is more severe than in Western climes. Besides Lent, as in the West, there are the "Fast of the Apostles," commencing on the 8th day after Whitsunday, and lasting about 3 weeks; the "Fast of the Assumption," lasting 14 days; and "Advent" (Helyot. I. xix.).

Their robes, more flowing and voluminous than those of Western Orders, are marked on the cape with the Cross, and with the letters IC. XC. NC. (Jesus Christus Vincit). The tonsure extends all over the head; but they wear beards (cf. Mab. *Ann.* I. xv. 32). (Helyot. I. xix.). Numerous lay brothers are attached to each monastery, for the field work; and considerable taxes are collected from each by the "exarchs" or visitors, for the Patriarch (Helyot. I. xix.).

The greatest of the Asiatic monasteries is on Mt. Sinai, founded, it is said, by Justinian, and renowned as the residence of St. Athanasius of Mt. Sinai, and of St. John Climacus, whose name figures in Western Hagiologies also. Here, as at Mt. Casino, the abbat exercises a large ecclesiastical jurisdiction: he is archbishop *ex officio*. As a precaution against Arabs there are no doors, and the only gateway is blocked up. Provisions and pilgrims, &c., are all drawn up in a basket to the window. In Europe there are several monasteries; among which that of St. Sabas, in the wilderness near Bethlehem, and those on the isles in the Levant are famous. But the greatest are those on Mt. Athos, where the peninsula is entirely and exclusively occupied by the "Caloyers" (Helyot. I.).

[I. G. S.]

**CALUMNIES AGAINST THE CHRISTIANS.** It was hardly possible that a new

society like the Christian Church should escape misrepresentations. It had enemies on all sides. It offended men by presenting a higher standard of purity than their own, and they revenged themselves by imputing to it their own impurity. The secrecy that attended some portions of its life or worship gave rise to suspicions. Other societies, heretical or fantastic, which were popularly identified with it, brought upon it the discredit to which their defects made them liable. Popular credulity was ready to accept any sensational tale of horror which malice or ignorance might suggest. The result was that the popular feeling of dislike took definite shape, and that the persecutions of the Christians in the first three centuries were stimulated by the general belief that they were guilty of crimes which made them enemies of the human race. But over and above these influences, there was also, if we may trust the statements of many early Christian writers, a system of calumny, organised and deliberate, of which the Jews were the chief propagators. Envoys (ἀπόστολοι) were sent from Jerusalem with circular letters to the synagogues throughout the empire, and these became centres from which the false reports were disseminated among the heathen (Just. M. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 17, p. 234; Euseb. in *Esaiam*, xviii. 1, p. 424). They spread the charge of Atheism, which was so large an element in the accusations to which Christians were exposed, and were active, as in the case of Polycarp, in stirring up the multitude (*Epist. Smyrn.* 9; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 1). The calumnies in question are, of course, the chief subject-matter of the Apologetic treatises of the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Of these, the treatise of Tertullian, *ad Nationes*, as being addressed, not, like his *Apologies*, to emperors and proconsuls, but to the Gentiles at large, is, perhaps, the most exhaustive. It will be convenient to deal with the chief charges singly.

(1.) The Agapæ and the more sacred Supper which was at first connected with them, furnished material for some of the more horrible charges. "Thyesteian banquets and Oedipodean incest" became bye-words of reproach (Athenag. *Apol.* c. 4) side by side with that of Atheism. When they met, it was said, an infant was brought in, covered with flour, and then stabbed to death by a new convert, who was thus initiated in the mysteries. The others then ate the flesh and licked up the blood. This was the sacrifice by which they were bound together (Tertull. *ad Nat.* i. 15; *Apol.* c. 8; Minuc. Felix, *Octav.* c. 9). Two sources of this monstrous statement may be assigned with some probability. (a) To drink of human blood had actually been made, as in the conspiracy of Catilina, a bond of union in a common crime (Sallust, *Catil.* c. 22), and the blood, it was said, was that of a slaughtered child (Dio. Cass. xxxvii. 30). It had entered into the popular imagination as one of the horrors of a secret conspiracy. Christians were regarded as members of a secret society, conspiring together for the downfall of the religion and polity of the empire. It was natural to think that they had like rites of initiation. (b) The language of devout Christians as to the Supper of which they partook would tend to confirm, even if it did not originate, the belief. It was not common bread or common wine which they ate and drank but Flesh and Blood. By

participation in that flesh and blood they became members of one body. It is singular, however, that the Apologists do not meet the charge with this explanation, but confine themselves (*l. c.*) to dwelling on the incredibility of such charges, on the absence of any evidence to support them. Their unwillingness to expose the mysteries of their faith to the scorn of the heathen was, it can hardly be questioned, the cause of this reticence.

(2.) Next in order came the charge of impurity. When the members of a Christian Church met, men and women, it was at night. A lamp gave light to the room, and to its stand a dog was fastened. After they had supped and were hot with wine, meat was thrown to the dog so as to make him overthrow the lamp-stand in his struggles to get at it, and then the darkness witnessed a scene of shameless and unbridled lust, in which all laws of nature were set at nought (Tertull. *Apol.* c. 8; *ad Nat.* c. 16; Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 7-15; Origen, *c. Cels.* vi. 27; Minuc. Felix c. 9). Here, too, we may trace the calumny to two main sources.

(a) In the Bacchanalia and other secret mysteries, revelations of which had from time to time startled the Roman world (comp. Livy, xxxix. 13 for those of B.C. 185), turpitude of this kind had been but too common. Men of prurient imaginations imputed it even where the lives of the accused were in flagrant contradiction to it. (b) The name of the Agapae, interpreted as such men would interpret it, was sure to strengthen the suspicion. They could form no other notion of a "love-feast" held at night. It may be that the "holy kiss," the "kiss of peace," which entered into the early ritual of the Eucharist, was distorted in the same way; and that the names of "brother" and "sister" by which Christians spoke of each other were associated with the thought that the intercourse which was assumed to take place was incestuous in its nature (Minuc. Felix, *l. c.*). (c) It seems probable that in some cases abuses of this kind did actually exist in the Agapae. [AGAPAE.] They became conspicuous for licence and revelry. The language of the later Apostolical Epistles (2 Pet. ii. 13, Jude v. 12) shows that excesses had occurred even then. The followers of Caracalla followed in the same line, and are said by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 2-4, p. 185), and Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 7, § 5) to have been guilty in their Agapae of practices identical with those which were popularly imputed to the Christians at large.

(3.) The charge of Atheism was natural enough as against those who held aloof from all temples and altars, and, though it was a formidable weapon in the hands of their persecutors, can hardly be classed as a distinct calumny. Still less can we group under that head the accusation that they worshipped one who had died a malefactor's death, though this too from the time of the Apostles downward was a frequent topic of reproach (Tacit. *Annal.* xv. 63; Justin M. *Dial.* c. *Tryph.* c. 93; Minuc. Fel. p. 86). It was not strange either that the reverential use which the Christians of the 2nd century made of the sign of the cross should lead to the notion that they worshipped the cross itself. We may wonder rather that the Apologist who speaks of the accusation should be content almost

to admit the fact without any explanation, and to retort with the argument that the framework scaffolding of most of the idols before which the Gentiles bowed down exhibited the same form (Tertull. *Apol.* c. 16). We enter upon the region of distinct slander, however, when we come across statements of another kind, as to the objects of Christian adoration. Of these the most astounding is that they worshipped their God under the mysterious form of a man with an ass's head. It seems strange that such a charge should have been thought even to need denial, and yet it is clear that it was at one time widely received. Tertullian (*Apol.* c. 16 *ad Nat.* c. 11) speaks of a caricature exhibiting such a form, with the inscription "THE GOD OF THE CHRISTIANS"—ONOKOITES.\* And a picture answering to this description has actually been found on a wall of the palace of the Caesars on the Palatine Hill. A man is represented as offering homage to a figure with an ass's head, and underneath is the inscription AΛΕΧΑΜΕΝΟΣ ΣΕΒΕΤΕ (for ΣΕΒΕΤΑΙ) ΘΕΟΝ. The fragment is now in the Kircher Museum, and exhibits the lowest style of art, such as might be found in a boy-artisan bent on holding up some fellow-workman to ridicule.<sup>b</sup> It has to be noted that this was but the transfer to the Christians of an old charge against the Jews, and that there it was connected with the tradition that it was through the wild asses of the desert that the Jews had been led to find water at the time of the Exodus (Tacit. *Hist.* v. 3).

(4.) The belief that Christians were worshippers of the sun obtained even a wider currency, and had more plausibility (Tertull. *Apol.* c. 16, Just. M. *Apol.* i. 68). They met together on the day which was more and more generally known as the *Dies Solis*. They began at an early period to manifest a symbolic reverence for the East; and these acts, together with the language in which they spoke of Christ as the true light, and of themselves as "children of light," would naturally be interpreted as acts of adoration to the luminary itself. With this we may perhaps connect the singular statement ascribed to Hadrian that they were also worshippers of Serapis (Vopiscus, *Hist. Aug.* p. 719). This, however, never rose to the rank of a popular calumny, and seems to have had its beginning and end in the fantastic eclecticism of that emperor, who identified Serapis with the sun, and so reproduced the current belief under this form.

(5.) It was also reported that the members of the new sect worshipped their priests with an adoration which had in it something of a phallic character ("Alii eos ferunt ipsius anstititis ac sacerdotis colere genitalia," Minuc. Felix, *Octav.* c. 9). In this case, as in the charge of immoral excesses, we have probably the interpretation given by impure minds to acts in themselves blameless. Penitents came to the presbytery of the church to confess their sins, and knelt before them as they sat, and this attitude may have suggested the revolting calumny to those who could see in it nothing but an act of adoration.

(6.) Over and above all specific charges there

\* The word was probably meant to signify "Ass-born." Another reading is ONOCHORETES, as if parodying Ἀναχρηστικὸς, and conveying the notion of Ass-herald.

<sup>b</sup> See the woodcut under CCCCIV.



was the dislike which men felt to a society so utterly unlike their own. These men who lived apart from the world were a *facifuga natio*. They were *infructuosi in negotiis*. They were guilty of treason because they would not offer sacrifices for the emperors, and looked for the advent of another kingdom. They were ignorant, rude, uncultivated, and yet they set themselves up above the wisest sages. They led men to a dark fatalism by ascribing to God all their power to act (Tertull. *Apol.* 35-42). They showed a defiant obstinacy in their resistance, even to death, to the commands of civil magistrates (Marc. Aurel. xi. 3). [E. H. F.]

**CALUMNY.** [DETraction; SLANDER.]

**CAMBRICUM CONCILIUM.** A.D. 463, is a fiction, taken from Geoffrey of Monmouth, &c. [A. W. H.]

**CAMELAUCIUM.** A covering for the head, in use chiefly in the East, of very unsettled orthography. We find *camelaucaum*, *camelaucaus*, *camelaucaum*, and in Greek *καμηλαύκιον* and *καμηλαύκιον*. It appears to have been a round cap with ear-flaps of fur,



*Camelaucaum.*

originally camel's hair if the ordinary etymology is to be accepted, or wool, and sometimes adorned with gems. The form and name being preserved, it sometimes became a helmet and was worn in battle. We find it adopted both by royal personages and by ecclesiastics. The head-covering taken from Totila when killed, A.D. 552, and presented to Justinian, is called by Theophanes (*Chron.* p. 193) *καμηλαύκιον διδύμοις*. Constantine the Great appears on his triumphal arch at Rome similarly attired. [See CROWN.] Ferrario (*Costume, Europa* (R.) vol. iii. part i. pl. 30), and Constantine Porphy. (*de Adm. Imp.* c. 13) describe by the same name the sacred cape, preserved at the high-altar of St. Sophia's, traditionally believed to have been sent by an angel's hands to Constantine the Great, and used in the coronation of the emperors of the East.

Its ecclesiastical use in the East seems to have been chiefly confined to the monastic orders. Goar (*Eucholog.* p. 156) tells us that the mitre of the metropolitan of Constantinople had this name only when he was taken from the monastic ranks. It is defined by Allatus (*de utriusque Eccl. Consens.* lib. iii. c. viii. no. 12, apud Ducange), as a round woollen cap worn by monks. It was worn by Armenian bishops when officiating at the altar (*ib.*, Isaac *Insectio secunda in Armen.* p. 414). [MITRE.]

Fuller particulars and authorities may be found in the Greek and Latin *Glossary* of Ducange. For its form, Ferrario u.s., Goar, *Eucholog.* p. 156, and the plates prefixed to Ducange's *Gloss. Med. et Inf. Græc.* may be consulted. [E. V.]

**CAMERA PARAMENTI.** [SACRISTY.]

**CAMISIA.** (Hence the Ital. 'Camicia' a shirt, and 'Camice' an alb; Sp. 'Camisa'; and the Fr. 'Chemise,' in Languedoc 'Camisa.') St. Jerome (*Ep. ad Fabiolam*), in describing the vestments of the Jewish priesthood ("Velo pro-

legentis facilitate abuti sermone vulgato. Solem militantem habere lineas quas camisia vocant sic aptas membris et strictas corporibus ut expediti sint vel ad cursum vel ad praelia," &c.), and a scholiast on Lucan (*ausarum est genus vestimentum quod vulgo camisia dicitur, id est interala*) speak of this word as belonging to the *lingua vulgaris*. St. Jerome's description shews it to have been a shirt fitted to the body so as to admit of active exertion of the limbs, which was not the case with the flowing garments worn by the more wealthy in ordinary life. St. Isidore (*Orig.* xix. 22, 29) derives the word "a camis" ("quod in his dormimus in camis, id est in stratis nostris"). With him it is a night-shirt or bed-gown. The word 'cama' still retains the meaning of a 'bed' in the Spanish language, to which St. Isidore, himself a Spaniard, seems to refer. The Arabic 'kamis' is no doubt connected with the Spanish 'camisa.' See further references in Ménage, *Dict. Étym.* 'Chemise,' and in Ducange, *Glossarium*, 'camisia.' [W. B. M.]

**CAMPAGAE.** (Other forms of the same word are *Campacus*, *Gambacus*, *Campobus*.) A kind of ornamented shoe worn by emperors and kings (Trebellius, in *Gallieno*; Capitolinus, in *Marim. Jun.*) and by various officers of state ("praetoribus Palatinis et quibusvis aliis;" cf. Ducange, *in soc.*). At a later period they were worn by the higher ecclesiastics at Rome, and by others elsewhere, but in disregard of the special privileges claimed in regard of these by Roman authorities. Gregor. Magnus, *Ep. vii. indict. i. ep. 28.* "Peruenit ad nos," &c. [W. B. M.]

**CAMPANA.** [BELL.]

**CAMPANARIUS.** The special office of *Campanarius*, or bell-ringer, in a church is perhaps not mentioned in the literature of the first eight centuries. See, however, the so-called *Excerpta Egberti*, c. 2, and the *Leges Presbyt. Northumb.* c. 36.

In more ancient times the duty of ringing the bells at the proper seasons seems to have been laid upon the priests themselves (*Capitulare Episcop.* c. 8; *Capit. Caroli Magni*, lib. vi. c. 168). To the same effect Amalarius (*de Div. Off.* lib. i. 1) says, speaking of the ringing of bells, "ne despiciat presbyter hoc opus agere." (Ducange s. vv. *Campanum*, *Campanarius*.) In later times the Ostiarius was the bell-ringer (*Martene de R. Eccl.* li. 18, ed. 1783). [C.]

**CAMPANILE.** [BELFRY; TOWER.]

**CAMPIO,** "champion": one whose profession it was to fight for another in cases where single combat was permitted by law to decide the right "*in campo duellum exerceo*." People were allowed their advocate in court, and their champion in the field. But the latter was a mediæval institution, and therefore beyond our limits. He was a superior personage to the gladiator of old Rome, so far in that he fought, not for a mere display of brute force, but for the triumph of justice. See Du Cange, Hoffmann, Spelman, and Blount, s. v. [B. S.]

**CANA, MIRACLE OF.** Representations of this miracle frequently present themselves in Christian art. It was early supposed to be typical of the Eucharist; indeed, Theophilus of Antioch, as far back as the 2nd century, looks on the change of the water as figurative of the

grace communicated in baptism (*Comment. in Evang. lib. iv.*). Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. xiii. 11*) says it represents the change of the wine into the blood of the Lord in the Eucharist; and this idea has been applied with eager inconsequence to the support of the full dogma of transubstantiation. The miracle is represented on an ivory, published by Mamachi, Bottari, and Gori, which is supposed to have formed part of the covering of a throne belonging to the exarchs of Ravenna, and is referred to the 7th century. Bandini (*In Tabulam eburneam Observationes*, 4to. Florentiae, 1746) gives a plate of it: and the present writer saw it in the Duomo of Ravenna in 1871. See woodcut.



In Bottari, tav. xix. and xxxii., our Saviour, wearing the ordinary tunic, and toga over it, touches or points respectively to three and two vessels with a rod. In tav. li. five jars are given, as also in lxxviii.; four in tav. lxxix. The vessels or hydriae are of different, and generally humble forms, on these sarcophagi. Bottari remarks that the sculptors may have been hampered by knowing the water-vessels to have been large, containing a "metreter." But those on Bandini's ivory are gracefully-shaped amphorae. Here the Lord bears a Greek cross on a staff, and motions with the other hand to the bridegroom, or a servant, who is carrying a cup to the master of the feast, gazing steadily at it, and extending his left hand towards the Saviour. The first-quoted of these plates (xix. and xxxii.) of Bottari's are from sarcophagi found in the Vatican, and of high merit in an artistic point of view. The later ones, not much inferior, are from the cemetery of Lucina, in the Callistine catacomb, or from a sarcophagus dug up in 1607, in preparing foundations for the Capella Borghese at Sta. Maria Maggiore. [R. St. J. T.]

**CANCELLI** (*Podium, Pectoralis, Menianus; Κρύαλλοι, Δρόφαρτα, Κάγγαλοι, Κάγκελλοι, Κάγκελλα*). These words are applied to a partition formed of open work in wood or iron, or

even of stone (Papias, in Ducange, s. v. *Cancellus*), especially to the open-work screen or grating which separates the choir from the nave of a church, or the sanctuary from the choir. Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl. x. 4, s. 44*), after describing the thrones of the *ἐπίσκοποι* in the upper part of the great church at Tyre, the benches (seemingly) for the rest of the clerks, and the altar or sanctuary, says, "These again, that they might be inaccessible to the laity, be enclosed with wooden gratings, wrought with so delicate an art as to be a wonder to behold." These cancelli seem to have enclosed the whole of the space occupied by the clergy. Compare CHURCH.

St. Ambrose is said (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl. vii. 25, 317*) to have excluded the emperors from the sanctuary, and to have assigned them a place just outside the rails which enclosed it (*ἐπὶ τῶν θυροφύλακων τοῦ ἱερου*). Here the *ἱερου* seems to correspond with what we call the chancel, including the whole of the space assigned to the clergy, and not merely the sanctuary; for the emperor's position is said to indicate his precedence among the people, and his inferiority to the clergy. The rail seems to have been, in short, a chancel-screen rather than an altar-rail.

Cyprian, in the *Life of Caesarius of Arles* (*Acta SS. Bened. saec. i. App.*) says that the saint did not hesitate to give for the redemption of captives things belonging to the administration of the sacrament, as chalices and censers, and even took down the silver ornaments from the cancelli. In this case, the context suggests that the cancelli were near the altar. Paul Warnefrid (*De Episcop. Metens. in Pertis, Monum. German. ii. 266*) says that Chrodegang caused to be made a church in honour of St. Stephen, and his altar, and cancelli, and a presbytery, where again the rail or grating seems to have been the enclosure of the altar.

Athanasius (*Epistola ad Orthodoxos, Opp. i. 646*) speaks of the *καγκελλοί* of a church as among the things destroyed by Arian fury.

Cyril of Scythopolis, in the *Life of Euthymius* († 673; in *Acta SS. Jan. ii. 302 ff.*), tells how a Saracen, leaning on the screen of the sanctuary (*τῷ καγγέλλῳ τοῦ ἱερου*) while the offering was being made, saw fire descend from heaven and spread itself over the altar. Here the screen clearly enclosed the bema, or sanctuary, and admitted of the altar being seen from without. And again, in the *Life of St. Sabas* (in *Conclerius, Monum. Eccl. Graecae, tom. iii.*), he speaks of the rails of the sanctuary (s. *τοῦ θυροφύλακτου*).

Some have thought that the *RUCAE* frequently mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis* among the presents of various popes to Roman churches were cancellated doors. But see the article.

Germanus of Constantinople\* (*Hist. Eccl. p. 148, ed. Paris, 1560*) says that the rails (*καγκελλα*) mark out the space to the outside of which the people may approach, while inside is the Holy of Holies, accessible only to the priests. Here we must conclude, either that the phrase *τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων* includes choir as well as sanctuary, which is highly improbable, or that the people entered the choir at any rate for the purpose of communicating. Compare CHOR.

\* It is doubtful whether this work is to be attributed to the Germanus of the 6th century, or to his namesake of the 12th.

Durandus (*Rationale*, i. 3, 35) observes that in ancient times the enclosure of the choir was not so high as to prevent the people from seeing the clerks; but that in his own time a curtain or partition was generally interposed between the clerks and the people, so that they could not see each other.

Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v. *Canostus*; Suicer's *Theaurus*, s. v. *ὑποφώνιον*, *κρυαλὴ*, *αἰγυλὴ*; Mabillon, *Comment. Proo. in Ordinem Rom.* c. 20, p. cxxxvii. [C.]

(3) In addition to the use of this word for the lattice-work protecting the altar of a church and the raised area on which it stood, *Canostus* was also employed to designate a railing round a tomb. We find it used in this sense by Augustine (e.g. *Serm. de Diversa*, xxi., de *Civit. Dei* xii. 7, &c.; Gregory of Tours, de *Mirac.* i. 69; ii. 20, 46, 47; id. *Hist.* vi. 10, where thieves are described as breaking into St. Martin's Church at Tours by raising against the window of the apse "cancellum qui super tumulum ejusdem defuncti erat").

Another word used in the same sense from the similarity of its form was *Cataracta*, *καταπέτασμα*, "a porteculla." The letters of the legates to Pope Hormisdas relative to the request of Justinian for some relics of the apostles speaks of the "secunda cataracta." Labbé *Conc.* iv. 1515; and the encyclic of Vigilius, *Ep.* xv. mentions the "cataracta Beati Petri," i.e. the iron railing surrounding his "confessio" (ib. v. 330). [E. V.]

#### CANDELABRUM. [CORONA LUCIS.]

**CANDIDA.** (1) Wife of Artemius, martyr at Rome, is commemorated June 6 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

(2) Virgin, of Rome, is commemorated Aug. 29 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

**CANDIDUS.** (1) Martyr at Rome, is commemorated Feb. 2 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Sebaste in Armenia, March 9 (*Mart. Bedae*); March 11 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr, one of the Theban Legion, commemorated Sept. 29 (*Mart. Bedae, Usuardi*).

(4) Martyr at Rome, Oct. 3 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

#### CANDLE. [LIGHTS: TAPER.] [C.]

#### CANDLEMAS. [MARY, FESTIVALS OF.]

**CANISTER, or CANISTRUM.** (1) A basket used for holding consecrated bread, or perhaps EULOGIAK. Compare ARCA. St. Jerome (*Ep. ad Rustic.* c. 20), speaking of the practice among Christians in his day of carrying home the consecrated elements both of bread and wine, uses the expression, "Qui corpus Domini in canistro vimineo et sanguinem portat in vitro;" from which it appears that a wicker basket was used for holding the consecrated bread.

This passage is remarkably illustrated by a fresco discovered in the crypt of St. Cornelius by Cavaliere de' Rossi. This represents a fish swimming in the water, bearing on its back a basket having on the top several small loaves, and inside a red object, clearly visible through the wicker-work, which seems to be a small glass flask of wine. This is marked in the engraving by a somewhat darker tint. We have thus the FISH, the well-known symbol of the Redeemer, combined with the representation of the sacred bread and wine.

In another painting of the same cemetery is represented a tripod table, on which are laid three loaves and a fish, and round which are placed seven baskets full of loaves. Here, also, it cannot be doubted that the loaves are eucharistic, either as being the loaves actually consecrated, or those blessed for distribution (*EULOGIAK*) (*Martigny, Dict. des Ant. Chréti.* p. 246).



Epiphanius the Presbyter (in *Indicula ad Hormisdas*, quoted by Ducange, s. v. *Canistrum*) says that certain persons proved themselves to be heretics by the very fact that on the approach of what they called persecution, i.e. the predominance of the orthodox Church, they consecrated great quantities of sacramental bread, and distributed full baskets (*canistra plena*) to all, that they might not be deprived of communion. Ducange refers this to the eulogiae; but the eulogiae would scarcely have been regarded as a substitute for communion, and the passage may probably be referred, like that of St. Jerome, to the distribution of bread actually consecrated.

(2) The disk or tazza placed under a lamp. This sense is frequent in the *Liber Pontificalis*. For instance, Pope Adrian (772-795) is said to have given to a church twelve silver *canistra*, weighing thirty-six pounds. Leo III., his successor, gave a silver *canister* with its chains, weighing fifteen pounds. Gregory IV. gave two *canistra* of nine lights (*canistra ennasolia = ὀρεαφώρια*). In the latter case, the lights were probably distributed round the circumference of the tazza. (Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v.) [C.]

**CANON.** *Κανὼν*, a rule; applied ecclesiastically to many very diverse things, but with the one notion of fixity or regularity underlying all of them: as—

1. The Holy Scriptures, as, i. themselves a rule; ii. in respect to the rule by which to determine what is Holy Scripture, the latter being the sense in which the word was first applied to them. [CANONICAL BOOKS.]

2. The Creed. [CREED.]

3. The Roll of the clergy in a particular church (*ὁ ἐν τῷ κανόνι* = clergyman), from a time prior to the Nicene Council (can. 16, 17, 19), = *ὁ ἕως κανόν* (*Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, can. 1), *Κανὼν τοῦ ἐπαρχίου* (*Can. Apost.* 14, 50), Albus (*Sidon. Apollin.* lib. vi. ep. 8), *Matticula* (*Conc. Aqth.* A.D. 506, can. 2), *Tabula Clericorum* (*St. Aug. Rom.* 50 de *Disc.*). Hence *Canonici*, and *Canonicæ*; and later still, *Canons Secular* and *Canons Regular*. [CANONICI.]

4. The rules, either invented or improved by Eusebius after the *Monotessaron* of Ammonius, for ascertaining the parallel passages of the four Gospels.

5. *Canon Paschalis* = the rule for finding Easter. [EASTER.]

6. The fixed portion of the Eucharistic service [CANON OF THE LITURGY.]

7. The hymns which formed invariable portions of services in the Greek office books, *e.g.* ὁ Μέγας Κανὼν, Κανὼν ὁ τῆς Ὑψώσεως, Κανὼν νεκρώσιμος, Κανόνες Ἀναστάσιμοι, &c. &c. (Du Cange, Meursius, Suicer, Cave.) [CANON OF ODES.]

8. A Lectionary, according to Gothofred (see Bingham XIII. v. 6); but this seems doubtful.

9. A synodical decree. [CANON-LAW.]

10. A monastic rule,—κανὼν τῆς μοναχικῆς πολιτείας (Cave, *Diss. in fin. Hist. Litt.*). So also used by the Pseudo-Egbert.

11. A PENITENTIAL (Cave, *ib.*). "Incidere in canona" came to mean "to incur penance" (Du Cange).

12. The epithet *canonicae* was also applied to,—

i. The *Canonical Letters* given by bishops to the faithful who travelled to another diocese. [EPISTOLAE.]

ii. The *Canonical Hours* of prayer. [HOURS.]

iii. "*Canonical Pensions*," granted to a retired bishop out of the revenues of his former see. [BISHOP; PENSION.]

The word is used also, politically, of an ordinary as opposed to an extraordinary tax; whence St. Athanasius speaks of himself as accused of getting a *κανὼν* imposed upon Egypt (*Apol.* ii. *Opp.* i. 178), which Sozomen (vi. 21) calls *φόρος*: and also of a pension or fixed payment (Du Cange, Suicer). [A. W. H.]

**CANON LAW.** The term Canon Law, as commonly used at the present day, is generally understood to relate to that complex system of ecclesiastical jurisprudence which grew up in the Church of Rome during the Middle Ages.\* Of this system, however, it hardly falls within our limits to speak. The Decretum of Gratian, which is the first part of the Corpus Juris Canonici, was not drawn up until the 12th century, and even the Decretals of the Pseudo-Isidore, which form to so large an extent the basis of the canon law of Rome, did not appear till some time after the year 800. We have, therefore, to confine ourselves to the earlier collections of church law

"It is not to be supposed (says Ayliffe, in his Introduction to his *Parergon Juris Canonici*) that the communion of the Church could long subsist after the death of the Apostles, without some other laws and obligations, holding men to peace and concord among themselves, than those contained in holy writ; considering the pride and passions of men, and an overweening conceit of their own particular ways in point of Divine worship, and the ceremonies of it."

The earliest approach to a *lex scripta* other than and beyond the Scriptures, probably consisted partly of letters of eminent bishops in reply to questions put to them on disputed topics (a kind of "*responsa prudentum*")—partly of traditional maxims, "*coutumes*," as Hansen calls them (*Christianity and Mankind*, vol. ii. 421), reduced to writing, and generally accepted, with or without synodical sanction—

partly of decisions of local councils, in which certain neighbouring dioceses met together and agreed upon rules for their observance in common.

The so-called apostolical canons, and apostolical constitutions [see APOST. CANONS and APOST. CONSTITUTIONS] probably contain fragments derived from this early period. The ancient pieces edited in Lagarde's *Reliquiae Juris Ecclesiastici Antiquissimae*, and in Bickell's *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, also perhaps reflect to some extent the state of things at a primitive stage, with more or less of subsequent accretion and interpolation.

Eusebius mentions synods or meetings of the orthodox on the subject of the Easter controversy as early as the close of the 2nd century (*H. E.* v. 23; see Bickell, i. 38). In the 3rd century like assemblies were held on the question of baptism by heretics, and on the condition of the *lapsi*. Of letters of bishops received as having weight in ecclesiastical questions, few or none remain of a very early date. The epistle of Clement of Rome, and the epistles of Ignatius, hardly fulfil this character, and the pretended letters of early popes in the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals are forgeries. But in the 3rd century we have a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria, and one of Gregory Thaumaturgus, which were written in reply to questions put to them, and which find a place in the Codex Canonum of the Greek Church. It is therefore possible that similar epistles of other bishops may have exercised more or less influence in regulating the affairs of infant churches during the previous period.

At the beginning of the 4th century, provincial councils became numerous. Before the year 325 we have, for instance, councils at Elvira, Arles, Ancyra, and Neocaesarea. Then begins the series of general councils, that of Nice being the first, followed, in 381, by the first Council of Constantinople, minor councils having been held in the interim. [COUNCIL.] It is not surprising, therefore, that some effort was now made to collect the laws of the Church. We begin with the Eastern Church.

The first collection of which we hear has not come down to us in its original form. It appears to have contained at first only the canons of Nice, and those of the provincial councils of Ancyra, Neocaesarea, and Gangra. As the three last mentioned councils were connected with the diocese of Pontus, it has been conjectured, from the prominence given to them, that the collection originated there.

By degrees other councils were added, and this *Codex Ecclesiae Orientalis*, thus enlarged, became a work of recognized authority, and was quoted at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. Justellus edited in 1619 a *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Universae*, which he professed to be the collection quoted at Chalcedon, and to have been the work of Stephen, bishop of Ephesus, at the end of the 4th century. In point of fact, however, the work published by Justellus contains much additional matter, and cannot be considered as an exact representation of the early form of the collections in question.<sup>b</sup> Subsequently to

\* It is sometimes also applied to the provincial canons and constitutions passed by domestic synods in this country. It is to these that the act 25 Hen. 8, c. 19, relates. But these also belong to a time subsequent to the year 800, and do not therefore fall to be noticed here.

<sup>b</sup> "Notus est error Justelli, qui codicem suum canonum ecclesiae universae pro lubitu composuit et pra collectione a concilio Chalcedonensi confirmata, nunc



the Council of Chalcedon, divers collections appear to have been made, varying from one another more or less in the order and character of their contents. Meanwhile, another element had been added to church law by the decrees of the Christian emperors, collected in the Codes of Theodosius and Justinian (Biener, p. 14).

In the middle of the 6th century, John, surnamed Scholasticus, a priest of Antioch, and subsequently Patriarch of Constantinople, made a more systematic and complete collection, introducing into it sixty-eight passages from the works of Basil, which the Oriental Church receives as authoritative.<sup>c</sup> At the same time he also extracted and put together, from the legislation of Justinian, a number of laws bearing on ecclesiastical matters. These two collections, when afterwards combined (probably by another hand), obtained the name of *Nomocanon*.

We now come to the council in Trullo, held A.D. 692, the decree of which furnishes a list of what was then received. The council acknowledges 85 apostolic canons, and those of Nice, Ancyra, Neocaesarea, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, Sardica, and Carthage,<sup>d</sup> also of the Synod of Constantinople under Nectarius.<sup>e</sup> It further recognizes the so-called canons taken from the works of Dionysius and Peter, archbishops of Alexandria, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nysen, Gregory Theologus, Amphilochius, Timothy, Theophilus and Cyril of Alexandria, and Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople. Lastly, it confirms the Canon of Cyprian as to the baptism of heretics, which it states to have been recognized by the usage of the Church.

Not quite two centuries later appeared the great *Nomocanon* of Photius, patriarch of Constantinople. This comprehended a digest of the canons according to their subject matter, and of the laws of Justinian on the same subjects. A close connexion was thereby practically established between the decrees of councils and those of emperors (Biener, p. 22). It seems to be the aim of this work to embrace the same canons in the main as were recognized by the Trullan Council, and to add them to the Trullan decrees, and those of the following councils:—

The so-called 7th Council, or 2nd Nicene; the so-called *Primo secunda*, held A.D. 861; that of St. Sophia, called by the Greeks the 8th Council, A.D. 879.<sup>f</sup>

The council styled by the Latins the 8th, viz., that held against Photius A.D. 869, not being acknowledged by the Greeks, did not appear in this collection.

In the 11th century the work of Psellus, in

the 12th, the commentaries of Zonaras and Balsamon, and of Aristenus, and later still, the labours of Blastares, would require special mention, as forming marked eras in the growth of canon law in the East, as distinguished from the mere collection and publication of existing canons.

But we have already passed our chronological limit, and we therefore turn to the churches of the West.

The canons of Nice appear to have been speedily translated into Latin, and to have been circulated in the West, together with those of Sardica. Soon after the Council of Chalcedon, a further collection called the "*Prisca translatio*" appeared, which began with the Council of Ancyra, and comprehended those of Chalcedon and Constantinople. We hear also of a Gallic collection. The African church, too, as it had numerous councils, appears to have collected their decrees [see *CODEX CANONUM Ecclesiae Africanae*]. In or about A.D. 547 Ferrandus, a deacon of Carthage, published his *Breviatio Canonum*, which was not merely a compilation, but a systematic digest, and comprehended also the Greek Councils to which he appears to have had access through a Spanish version.

Spain, indeed, had at an early period a collection of her own. The fact that a Spanish bishop presided at the Council of Nice would ensure a prompt entrance into that country for the Nicene decrees. The canons of other councils followed, some of which were held in Spain itself. An old *Codex Canonum* appears to have existed, though not now extant in its original form. It is said to have been cited at the Council of Braga, A.D. 591.

Martin, archbishop of Braga, also compiled extracts from Greek councils, which became a valuable contribution to the canon law of the Spanish church. In the seventh century we come to the collection which goes by the name of Isidore of Seville, and which seems to be of his date, though perhaps not his work. This was edited at Madrid in 1808 and 1821 from a Spanish MS. This collection is a very full one, and at once attained to a high position. It contains not only canons of councils but decretals of popes. In its composition use was no doubt made of the Roman work of Dionysius of which we are about to speak.

We must now go back a few years in order to trace the state of things at Rome. The decrees of Nice and Sardica were speedily accepted and acted upon by the popes, but the history of any regular collection of canons is obscure until the end of the 5th century, when the Scythian monk Dionysius Exiguus settled at Rome, and not long afterwards undertook to edit a systematic compilation. That his work is not entirely new is clear because he states that one of its objects was to give a new and better translation of the Greek canons. This seems to refer to the defective nature of the "*Prisca translatio*" above mentioned. The labours of Dionysius resulted in a collection both more accurate and more complete than any previously existing at Rome. It comprised 50 of the apostolical canons, 27 canons of Chalcedon, 21 of Sardica, and 138 of various African councils. The work gave so much satisfaction that its author proceeded to make a second and further one, into which the

demum restituta, venditavit." Biener, p. 10; comp. Phillips, p. 15.

<sup>c</sup> It contained the Apostolic Canons, and those of Nice, Ancyra, Neocaesarea, Sardica, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and the so-called Canons of Basil.

<sup>d</sup> I. e. probably the same *excerpta* from the Council, A.D. 419, which Dionysius Exiguus received into his collection.

<sup>e</sup> I. e. that held in 394 in relation to Agapius and Bagadius.

<sup>f</sup> For an account, however, of certain varieties and omissions, not easily to be accounted for, and possibly due in part to subsequent copyists and editors, see Biener, § 4.

former was interwoven. He now collected and edited the decretal letters of the popes down to Anastasius II.<sup>5</sup> As the first systematic editor of decretals, Dionysius gave a new prominence to that branch of Canon Law (assimilating it to the *Rescripts of the Emperors*), and thus contributed much to strengthen the Papal pretensions.<sup>6</sup> That in a work which no doubt was much valued and widely circulated, the epistles of popes should be placed on a level with the canons of councils, was no light matter. Accordingly the Spanish collection of Isidore, of which we have just spoken, borrowed and republished these decretals from the work of Dionysius, thus giving them standard authority in the code of the church of Spain. The way was thus prepared for the systematic interpolation of the Isidorean collection with a host of forged decretals purporting to be the genuine letters of early popes, but being in reality fictitious documents framed to advance the extravagant papal pretensions then rising into notice. This, indeed, did not take place until the ninth century, and the *Pseudo-Isidorean* work must not be confounded with the earlier collection of Isidore.<sup>1</sup>

The work of Dionysius became extensively known as the standard repository of canon law. Cresconius appears to have reproduced its contents for the use of the church of Africa; Chirprie in Gaul is said to have been acquainted with it; and in England, Theodore is believed to have quoted from it at the Synod of Hertford in 673. It is thought to have made its way even into the East. Its most important recognition, however, was that which was accorded to it by Pope Adrian I. when he transmitted a copy (augmented by certain additions) to Charlemagne; and by Charlemagne himself when he caused the work to be solemnly received by the synod held at Aix-la-Chapelle. From this period it is frequently spoken of by the title of *Codex Hieronymus*, sometimes also by the name of *Codex Canonum*.

At this point we pause.<sup>2</sup> The next century saw the *Pseudo-Isidorean* collection foisted upon the church.

A new era then commenced; the era of extravagant papal claims, and of canonical sub-

<sup>5</sup> Last of all he published a revised and corrected edition, which however has perished.

<sup>6</sup> In connexion with the word "decretal," the following explanation of terms, as used in the later canon law, may not be out of place:—"A canon is said to be that law which is made and ordained in a general council or provincial synod of the Church. A decree is an ordinance which is enacted by the pope himself, by and with the advice of his cardinals assembled, without being consulted by any one therein. A decretal epistle is that which the pope decrees either by himself or else by the advice of his cardinals. And this must be on his being consulted by some particular prince or private person. A dogma is that determination which consists in and has a relation to some canonical point of doctrine, or some doctrinal part of the Christian faith." Ayliffe, xxiiv.

<sup>1</sup> The letter of Pope Siricius to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona, A.D. 393, seems the first authentic Papal *Rescript*.

<sup>2</sup> It may be well to add a word as to *Pseudo-decretals*. These were designed to regulate the pretensions to be canonically infirmed on popes. They do not appear to have had general sanction, but were locally adopted owing to the partial and influence of their authors. Thus we have the *Pseudo-decretals* of Gregory the Great, of Theodore of Besse, and others. See Ayliffe, xv.

ties engendered by ecclesiastical, whose professional labours and commentaries developed the law of the church into a system more artificial and intricate than that of the state. But these things lie beyond our present province, and it is only necessary to draw attention to the new phase which from this period the whole subject of canon law assumes.

From this time forward, the student has to do not merely with a collection of statutes but with a fabric of jurisprudence—not merely with a *Codex Canonum*, but with a *Corpus Juris*.

Authorities:—*Parergon Juris Canonici*, by Ayliffe. London, 1726. Biener, *De Collectionibus Canonum Ecclesiarum Græcorum*. Berlin, 1827. Bickell, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*. Gießen, 1845. Beveridge, *Pandectæ Canonum Sanctorum Apostolorum et Conciliorum ab ecclesiâ Græcâ receptarum*. Oxon. 1872. Phillips, *De Droit Ecclésiastique dans ses Sources*, traduit par Crouzet. Paris, 1852.—[A useful book but ultramontane in tone.] In these works, particularly in the first and last, references will be found to the older authors for the benefit of such students as desire to investigate the subject more fully. [B. S.]

**CANON OF THE LITURGY.** That portion of the Liturgy which contains the form of consecration, and which in the Roman and most other rites is fixed and invariable, is called the Canon.

I. *Designations.* The word *kanon* designates either the standard by which anything is tried, or that which is tried by such standard (see Westcott on the Canon of the N. T., App. A). It is used in the first sense by Clement of Rome (1 Cor. 41), where he desires the brethren not to transgress the set rule of their service (*τὸν ἀποκριπὸν τῆς λειτουργίας κανόνα*); in the second, when it is applied by liturgical writers to the fixed series of Psalms or Troparia for a particular day. It is in the second sense that the word *canon* is applied to the fixed portion of the Liturgy. As the names of certain saints were recited in this canon, the word *kanon* came to designate the act of entering a name in a liturgical list or *diptych*, and saints whose names were so entered were said to be *canonised*.

It is also called *Actio* (see the article), and the title *Infra Actum* (*infra* being used for *infra*), is not uncommonly placed over the prayer *Communicantes* in ancient MSS. See Le Brun, *Exposition de la Messe*, tom. i, pt. iv, art. 4.

Pope Vigilius (*Epist. ad Projeratrum*) and Gregory the Great (*Epist. vii. 84*) call the canon *Proceram*, *Præcæm* *Communium*, as being the prayer by pre-eminence.

It is also called *Secreta* and *Secretum Missæ*, from being said in a low voice. [SECRET.]

Tertullian appears to use the word *Benedictio* (= *eulogia*) to designate that portion of the Eucharistic service, or *Actio*, which included consecration. See *De Pudic.* c. 14; *Ad Uxorem*, ii. c. 6.

II. *Early notices of this portion of the Liturgy.* On the scriptural notices it is not necessary here to dwell.

In Justin Martyr's account of the celebration of the Eucharist for the newly-baptized (*Apol. I. c. 65*), this portion of the service is described as follows. "Then is presented (*προστίθεται*) to

the brother who presides, bread, and a cup of water and mixed wine (κράματος), and he, receiving them, sends up praise and glory to the Father of All, through the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit, and offers a thanksgiving (εὐχαριστίαν) at some length for that He has vouchsafed to us these blessings. And when he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present respond by saying *Amen* . . . And after the president has given thanks and the people responded, those who are called among us deacons give to each of those who are present to partake of the bread and wine and water over which thanks have been given, and carry them to those not present. And this meal is called with us eucharistia, of which none is permitted to partake, except one who believes that the things taught by us are true, and who has passed through the washing for remission of sins and new birth, and so lives as Christ commanded. For we receive these not as common bread or common drink, but as Jesus Christ our Saviour being incarnate by the Word of God possessed both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we were taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been made by the utterance in prayer of the word derived from Him (τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν) is the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus. For the Apostles, in the memoirs which they wrote which are called Gospels, transmitted to us that Jesus Christ thus charged them; that after taking bread and giving thanks, He said, 'Do this in remembrance of me; this is my Body;' and that, in like manner, after taking the cup and giving thanks, He said, 'This is my Blood;' and that He gave to partake to them alone."

The same ceremony is more briefly described in the following chapter, in the account of the ordinary Sunday services, with the addition that the president sends up prayers and thanksgiving, "δὴ δύναμις αὐτοῦ," according to his ability; for, as F. Xavier Schmid observes (*Liturgik*, i. 44), "even the prayers of the sacrifice of the mass depended for their contents and length on the pleasure of the several presidents, though they might often be moulded on a type given by some apostle or apostolic man."

Justin connects the notion of sacrifice with the Eucharist. In the *Dialogue* (c. 117, p. 386) he speaks of the acceptableness of the sacrifices (θυσίας) which Christ ordained, "that is, over the Eucharist or thanksgiving (ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ) of the bread and the cup;" and he regards the offering of fine flour (Lev. xiv. 10) as a type of the EUCHARIST.

In Irenaeus, with many passages interesting in a dogmatic point of view (with which at present we are not concerned) are several which contain liturgical indications. He dwells (*Haeres.* iv. 18, § 4, p. 251) on the difficulty which they, who do not believe Christ to be the very Word of God through Whom all things were made, must experience in receiving the truth that the bread over (or, by occasion of) which thanks have been given ("panem in quo gratiae actae sint") is the Lord's Body. And again he says (*Haeres.* v. 22, § 3, p. 294) that natural bread receives over it the word of God, and the thank-offering becomes the Body of Christ (ὁ γεγωνὸς ἕως ἐπιδέχε-αι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ γίνε-

ται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ). [EUCHARIST.] Speaking of the heretic Marcus (*Haeres.* i. 13, § 2), he says, that he pretended to perform a eucharistic service, and that by uttering a long form of invocation (ἐπὶ πλεον ἐκτείνων τὸν λόγον τῆς ἐπικλήσεως) he caused the liquid in the cups to appear red and purple. This was no doubt in imitation of the EPI-CLESIS of the orthodox. In *Fragment* 38, we read: "The offering (προσφορά) of the Eucharist is not fleshly, but spiritual, and therein pure. For we offer (προσφέρομεν) unto God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving thanks (εὐχαριστοῦντες) unto Him, for that He bade the earth bring forth these fruits for our sustenance; and at that point, after completing our offering, we call forth (ἐκκαλοῦμεν) the Holy Spirit, to declare (ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ) this sacrifice and the bread the Body of Christ and the cup the Blood of Christ, that they who partake of these figures (ἀντιτύπων) may obtain remission of their sins and everlasting life." And again (*Haeres.* iv. 18, s. 5, p. 251) we read, that bread produced from earth, receiving over and above its proper nature the invocation or calling-forth of God (προσλαβόμενος τὴν ἐκκλησιν τοῦ Θεοῦ) is no longer common bread, but Eucharistia.

It is supposed by some that Clement of Alexandria describes the great eucharistic thanksgiving of his time, when he says that Christians thank God for the blessings of creation and for the gifts of nature (*Cohortatio ad Gentes*, pp. 7 and 92, ed. Potter); for His mercy in redeeming us by His Word from the misery of the Fall; for Christ's life and works (*ib.* pp. 6 and 8; compare p. 87). This is not quite evident; nor is it clear that the allusions to the Cherubic hymn of Isaiah (*Strom.* v. 6, p. 668; vii. 12, p. 880) relate to the use of that hymn in the liturgy. But Clement is clearly referring to the Eucharist, when he insists, against the Eucratites, on the use of wine [ELEMENTS], and says (*Paedag.* ii. 2, p. 186) that the Lord "blessed (εὐλόγησεν) the wine, saying, 'Take, drink; this is My blood,' the blood of the vine; under the figure of the holy stream of gladness He describes the Word shed forth for many for the remission of sins (τὸν λόγον τὸν περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχεόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εὐφροσύνης ἁγίον ἀλληγορεῖ νῆμα)." He gives no details of the form of consecration.

Tertullian's works contain many eucharistic allusions. The intercessions which, according to his testimony, Christians made on behalf of emperors and the peace of the empire (*Apol.* cc. 30, 39), on behalf of enemies (*Apol.* c. 31), and for fruitful seasons (*ad Scapulam*, c. 4); the commemoration of and intercession for the dead (*De Exhort. Cast.* c. 11; *De Monogamia*, c. 10) probably all took place in connexion with the sacrifice of the Eucharist (*ad Scapulam*, c. 2). According to the Marcionite theory, he says (*adv. Marcion.* i. 23), the eucharistic giving of thanks is performed over alien bread to another than the true God ("super alienum panem alii Deo gratiarum actionibus fungitur"), implying that a giving of thanks to the true God over the eucharistic bread, took place in the service of the Church. He describes (*De Anima*, c. 17) the blessing of the Cup in the Last Supper as "consecration;" and the consecration of the bread to be a representation ("figura") of the Lord's

Body he held to have been accomplished by the words, "Hoc est corpus meum" (*adv. Marcion.* iv. 40; cf. *de Orat.* c. 6). Prayers which are called "orationes sacrificiorum" followed communion (*de Orat.* c. 14).

St. Cyprian says (*Epist.* 63, c. 17), that in the eucharistic action, "because we make mention of His Passion in all our sacrifices (for the Passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer) we ought to do no other thing than He did; for scripture says that so often as we offer the cup in commemoration of the Lord and His Passion, we should do that which it is evident that the Lord did." He is arguing here especially for the mixed chalice [ELEMENTS], but his words clearly have an application to the eucharistic office in general. We find also from Cyprian that in the eucharistic action ("in sacrificiis nostris"), as well as in prayers ("orationibus") intercession was made for brethren suffering affliction (*Epist.* 61, c. 4), whose names were recited (*Epist.* 62, c. 5), as were also the names of those who made offerings (*Epist.* 16, c. 2) and of the dead who had departed uncensured in communion with the Church (*Epist.* 1, c. 2). The liturgical office of a priest seems to be summed up (*Epist.* 65, c. 4) in sanctifying the oblation, in prayers and supplications ("orationes et preces"); and the brethren are admonished, that when they come together to celebrate the divine sacrifices with the priest of God, they should not indulge in noisy and unseemly prayers (*De Orat. Dom.* c. 4); a passage which seems to imply that the congregation took a prominent part in the eucharistic service.

Origen has more than one passage bearing upon the hallowing of the elements in the Eucharist. We read (*contra Celsum*, lib. 8, p. 399, ed. Spencer, 1658), "Let Celsus, as one who knows not God, pay his thank-offerings (χαριστήρια) to demons; but we, doing that which is well-pleasing to the Maker (δημιουργῷ) of the universe, eat the loaves offered with thanksgiving and prayer over the gifts (τοὺς μετ' εὐχαριστίας κ. εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθεῖσι προσαγομένους ἄρτους), loaves which are made, in consequence of the prayer, a certain body, holy and hallowing those who use it with sound purpose." Again, in the Comment on St. Matthew (c. 14), Origen speaks of the bread being hallowed by the word of God and prayer. It is worthy of notice, that in the Alexandrian Liturgy, the priest in administering the bread says, σῶμα ἅγιον, not σῶμα Χριστοῦ (*Daniel, Codex Lit.* iv. 168).

Firmilian (†269), bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (*Cypriani Epist.* 75, c. 10, p. 818, Hartel) describes an ecstatic woman who performed a mock eucharistic act and sanctified the bread with an invocation of considerable power ("invocatione non contemptibili"), and offered the sacrifice to the Lord without the mystic words of the accustomed form ("sine sacramento solitae praedicationis"). In this passage invocatio probably corresponds to ἐπικλῆσις, and praedicatio to κήρυγμα, a word used by St. Basil (*Epist.* 141) for a liturgical form. It seems to be here implied that the form of the epiclesis used by the ecstatica was her own effusion; while the usual "praedicationes" of the sacred act were

"mysteries," and either unknown to her, or rejected as not satisfying her aspirations.

In the liturgical directions of the second book of the *Apostolical Constitutions* (c. 57, §§ 13, 14) no explicit account is given of the central portion of the service. After describing the bidding-prayer, or PROSPHONESIS of the deacon, and the prayer, with benediction, of the priest, the writer proceeds: "And after this let the sacrifice be made (γινέσθω ἡ θυσία), all the people standing and praying in a low voice; and when the offering has been made (ὅταν ἀνεχθῇ), let each order partake severally of the Lord's Body and the precious Blood." No details are given of the sacrifice or anaphora, perhaps in consequence of the silence imposed in that respect by the "Disciplina Arcani." The eighth book contains what is commonly called the Clementine Liturgy, which is considered elsewhere.

Cyril of Jerusalem gives us a description (*Catech. Mystag.* V.) of the liturgy as it was actually celebrated at Jerusalem in the early part of the 4th century. After describing the *Sursum Corda*, Preface, and *Sanctus*, he proceeds (§ 7): "Then, after hallowing ourselves by these spiritual hymns, we beseech the merciful God to send forth His Holy Spirit upon the elements displayed on the table (τὰ προκειμένα), to make the bread the Body of Christ and the wine the Blood of Christ. For most certainly, whatsoever the Holy Spirit may have touched, that is hallowed and transformed (ἡγιασται καὶ μεταβέβληται). Then, after that the spiritual sacrifice, the unbloody service (λατρεία) is completed, over that sacrifice of propitiation we beseech God for the common peace of the churches, for the welfare of the world, for kings, for soldiers and allies, for those in infirmity, for those in special trouble, and, generally, we all pray for all who need help; and this sacrifice we offer. Then we make mention also of those who have gone to rest before us, first patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs; that God at their prayers and intercessions would receive our supplication (ὅπως ὁ Θεὸς ταῖς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβείαις προσδέξηται τὴν ἡμῶν δέησιν); then also on behalf of the holy fathers and bishops who have gone to rest before us, and generally all of our body who have gone to rest before us; believing that the greatest benefit will accrue to their souls for whom the supplication is offered (ἡ δέησις ἀναφέρεται) while the holy and most awful sacrifice is displayed (προκειμένης)." Then follows the Lord's Prayer, the τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, and communion.

St. Basil, in a remarkable passage (*De Spiritu Sancto*, c. 27 [al. 66], p. 54) speaks of some of the ceremonies of the Eucharist as having been derived from unwritten tradition. "The words of the Invocation [EPICLESIS] at the displaying or dedicating (ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναδείξει) of the bread of thanksgiving and the cup of blessing, which of the saints left behind for us in writing? For, you know, we are not content with the things which the Apostle or the Gospel relate, but we prefix and suffix other expressions (προλέγομεν καὶ ἐπιλέγομεν ἕτερα) which we regard as highly important for the mystery, having them handed down to us from unwritten tradition (ἐκ τῆς ἀγράφου διδασκαλίας παραλαβόντες)." This clearly indicates that the general form of consecration in the time of St. Basil corresponded

\* The "non" which is here inserted in some texts is a conjecture not supported by any MS.



to that in the existing Greek Liturgies, in that the portion actually taken from Scripture was preceded and succeeded by forms not scriptural, reputed to be taken from apostolic tradition, and that an Epiclesis was an essential part of the form.

St. Chrysostom informs us (on 2 Cor. *Hom.* 18) that after the Kiss of Peace there followed the blessing of the priest, to which the people responded, "And with thy spirit;" then, it is implied, came the "Lift up your hearts," &c., with the response "It is meet and right," and the cherubic hymn. As to the petitions of the great intercession, he tells us (on St. Matt. *Hom.* 25 [al. 26]) that the priest bids us make the eucharistic offering (εὐχαριστεῖν) on behalf of the world, of those who have gone before and those who are to follow after us; and again (on 2 Cor. *Hom.* 2) for bishops, for presbyters, for kings and rulers, for land and sea, for wholesome air, for all the world. It appears also that founders of churches, and the village for which a church was founded, were specially named in the sacred service (*In Acta*, *Hom.* 18, c. 5). It also appears that the *Agnus Dei* was repeated in connexion with the eucharistic intercession: (ὕπὲρ αὐτῶν πρόσμεν, δεόμενοι τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ κειμένου τοῦ λαβόντος τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου; on 1 Cor. *Hom.* 41; compare on St. John, *Hom.* 24, and on Acts, *Hom.* 21), and that the Lord's Prayer formed part of the canonical prayers (*In Genes.* *Hom.* 27). The τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις [SANCTA SANCTIS] formed the transition to COMMUNION (Pseudo-Chrys. on Hebr. *Hom.* 17).

St. Augustine, at the end of the 4th century, testifies to the general order of the canon in his time in the North-African churches, which probably differed little in this respect from the Italian. Thus we find (*ad Infant. de Sacramentis*, p. 227) that the *Sursum Corda* formed the introduction to the more solemn part of the service, which is called "sanctificatio sacrificii Dei," and that this was followed by the Lord's Prayer. Again, that the intercessions at the altar included prayer for unbelievers, that God would convert them to the faith; for catechumens, that He would inspire them with a longing for regeneration; for the faithful, that they may persevere in that which they have begun (*Epist.* 217, *Ad Vital.*; *De Bono Perseverant.* c. 7); and for the dead (*De Cura pro Mortuis*, cc. 1 and 4). That the North-African Church exercised special care in regard to the prayers to be used at the altar, even while strict uniformity was not insisted upon, is indicated by the provision (III. *Conc. Carth.* c. 23, circ. A.D. 397) that the altar-prayers should always be addressed to the Father ("cum altari adsistitur semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio"), and that the celebrant is not to adopt prayers from extraneous authorities, "nisi prius eas cum instructoribus fratribus contulerit." A nearer approach to uniformity is indicated by the decree of a somewhat later council (Rheinwald's *Archäol.* p. 355), "ut preces quae probatae fuerint in concilio, sive praefationes sive commendationes seu manus impositiones, ab omnibus celebrentur."

The pseudo-Ambrosius *de Sacramentis*, writing probably in the 4th century, discusses (iv. c. 4) the question of consecration in the Eucharist. "By what words," he says, "and whose expressions (sermonibus) is consecration effected? By

those of the Lord Jesus. For in the rest of the service praise is given to God, prayer is made for the people, for kings, for the rest. When the point of completing the venerable sacrament is reached, the priest no longer uses his own expressions, but the expressions of Christ."

*Summary.*—We find, then, that from the middle of the 2nd century, the presentation of the elements was regarded as a thank-offering or sacrifice [EUCCHARIST], especially for the fruits of the earth; that thanks were given to God over the bread and mixed wine, with prayer, which probably included the Lord's Prayer; that this was done in especial commemoration of the Lord's death, though it is not absolutely certain that the words of Institution were in all cases recited over the elements; and that there was in many churches an Invocation of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, it is clear that from the time of Tertullian at least intercession was made in the eucharistic service for the dead as well as the living. In the 2nd century, the details of the prayers and thanksgivings seem to have depended upon the president of the assembly, though a general type was probably in all cases followed; in the 4th century, the canon of the liturgy was evidently fixed, both in East and West, in forms not materially differing from those found in extant liturgies. From this point we proceed to consider these latter. For the discussion of their respective dates and mutual connexion, see LITURGY.

III. *The Canon in existing Liturgies.* In the extant Liturgies we find the Canon (which corresponds nearly to the ANAPHORA of the Eastern ritual) consisting in all cases of nearly the same elements, variously arranged. We have in nearly all canons, after the *Sanctus*, commemoration of the Lord's Life and of the Institution, Oblation, prayer for living and dead, leading on to the Lord's Prayer, with Embolismus. In the Eastern liturgies always, sometimes in the Gallican and Mozarabic masses, but not in the Roman or Ambrosian, we have an EPICLESIS, or prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit on the elements. The annexed analytical table shows the principal differences of arrangement. The *Canon* is generally understood to exclude the *Sanctus*, while the *Anaphora* includes both the *Sursum Corda* and the *Sanctus*.

[See Table opposite.]

The portion between the *Sursum Corda* and the *Sanctus* will be described under PREFACE. In the Alexandrian (St. Mark's) Liturgy alone, the prayers for the living and the dead, and for acceptance of the sacrifice, are inserted in the midst of it. The arrangement of St. James's liturgy is typical of that usual in the orthodox Eastern Church, from which the Nestorian arrangement differs mainly in having the intercession for living and dead *before* the Epiclesis. The Gregorian (which is nearly identical with the modern Roman) and the Gallican (the arrangement of which is nearly the same as that of the Mozarabic) represent the principal Western types.

The canon of the Roman or Gregorian liturgy is divided into ten portions, which are usually known by their first words. These are as follows: 1. *Te igitur*, for acceptance of the sacrifice to be offered. 2. *Memento*, commemorating the living. 3. *Communicantes*, commemorating

ST. JAMES (Greek).	ST. MARK.	NESTORIUS.	AMBROSIAN AND GREGORIAN.	GALLICAN.
Sursum Corda.	Sursum Corda.	Sursum Corda (peculiar form).	Sursum Corda.	Oblation of Elementa. Prayer for Living and Dead. Collectio post Nomina. Kiss of Peace. Oratio ad Pacem. Sursum Corda.
Preface.	Preface. Prayer for Living and Dead; and for acceptance of the Sacrifice. Preface resumed. Sanctus.	Preface.	Preface.	Preface.
Sanctus. Commemoration of the Lord's life.	Sanctus.	Sanctus. Commemoration of the Lord's life.	Sanctus. Prayer for the Living; and for acceptance of the Sacrifice.	Sanctus. Collectio post Sanctus (short).
Commemoration of Institution. Oblation.	Commemoration of Institution. Oblation.	Commemoration of Institution. Oblation. Prayer for Living and Dead.	Commemoration of Institution. Oblation. Prayer for the Dead.	Commemoration of Institution.
Prayer for Descent of Holy Spirit.	Prayer for Descent of Holy Spirit.	Prayer for Descent of Holy Spirit.		"Post Secreta" (sometimes containing Invocation of Holy Spirit). Priest. Fraction and commixtion.   Choir. Confractorium (an Antiphon.)
Prayer for Living and Dead. Preface to Lord's Prayer. Lord's Prayer. Embolismus.	Preface to Lord's Prayer. Lord's Prayer. Embolismus.	Prayer for Peace.  Fraction.	Preface to Lord's Prayer. Lord's Prayer. Embolismus.	Preface to Lord's Prayer. Lord's Prayer. Embolismus.

the Virgin Mary and other saints. 4. *Hanc igitur*, for peace and salvation. 5. *Quam oblationem*, that the oblation may become to the worshippers the Body and Blood of the Lord. 6. *Qui pridie*, commemorating the Institution. 7. *Unde et memores*, the Oblation. 8. *Supra quae propitio*, for a blessing on reception. 9. *Memento etiam*, commemorating the dead. 10. *Nobis quæsumus peccatoribus*, for the priest and people present. The most remarkable peculiarity of the Roman rite is, that the commemoration of the living is separated from that of the dead, and precedes consecration, while in the Eastern liturgies the intercessions for living and dead form one prayer, and follow the recitation of the words of Institution. It seems probable that originally the *Memento etiam* followed the *Memento* immediately, just as in Greek liturgies the *μνήσθητι* is followed by *μνήσθητι καὶ*; and in fact in Gerbert's text of the Gelasian Sacramentary a *Memento etiam*, in a form differing considerably from the Gregorian, does follow immediately upon the *Memento*, so that both precede the *Communicantes*; while a *Memento etiam* in the Gregorian form follows the *supra quæ propitio* (Daniel's *Codex Lit.* i. 15, 19; Gerbert, *Vetus Liturgia Alemannica*, i. 365). This arrangement may perhaps represent the state of transition from one form to the other, the earlier *Memento etiam* having been struck out when another nearly identical was introduced in another place.

The Gallican canon has peculiarities which show that it belongs to a wholly different family from the Roman. The prayers for living and dead, with the kiss of peace, precede the *sursum corda* and *sanctus*: the *sanctus* is immediately

followed by what is called the "*collectio post sanctus*" (sometimes called the *canon*), which is again immediately followed by the recitation of the words of Institution. While the Roman canon is invariable, the Gallican, which is very short, changes with every mass. To give one by way of example, the *canon* for the eve of the Nativity in the Gallo-Gothic missal (Daniel, *Cod. Lit.* i. 83) is

"Vere sanctus, vere benedictus Dominus Noster Jesus Christus Filius tuus manens in coelis manifestatus in terris. Ipse enim pridie quam pateretur, etc."

The same form, *Vere sanctus, etc.*, follows the *sanctus* also in the Mozarabic liturgy. This is not, however, immediately followed by the words of Institution, but by a prayer commencing "Adesto, adesto Jesu bone pontifex," containing a petition for the sanctification of the oblation, which is followed by "Dominus Noster Jesus Christus, in qua nocte tradebatur, accepit panem, etc.," reciting the Institution.

In Mabillon's *Sacramentarium Gallicanum* the Roman canon is given with the first mass, and perhaps served, as Mabillon remarks (p. 453, Migne) for all; he supposes, however, that at an earlier period the Gallican had its own canon, and that the introduction of the Roman canon was the beginning of the supersession of the Gallican rite by the Roman, which was afterwards completely established (*Prefat.* § iv.).

The *Commemoration of the Lord's Life* begins in most cases, with taking up the ascription of holiness to the Almighty already set forth in the *sanctus*. For instance, in the Greek St. James, the *ἅγιος* of the preceding hymn is repeated in "Ἄγιος εἰ, Βασιλεὺ τῶν αἰώνων . . . ἅγιος καὶ ὁ μονογενὴς σου Υἱὸς . . . ἅγιον δὲ καὶ τὸ

Πνεῦμά σου το Ἅγιον (Daniel, *Cod. Lit.* iv. 109) which commences the commemoration; and the variable *Post Sanctus* of the Gallican and Mozarabic liturgies begins very commonly with the words "Vere sanctus, vere benedictus Dominus Noster Jesus Christus." The "commemorations" in St. James and St. Basil (Daniel iv. 427) recite with great dignity and beauty the creation of man, his state in Paradise, his fall, and redemption by God's mercy; so leading on to the commemoration of the Lord's death and the Institution of the supper. That of St. Chrysostom is much shorter. St. Mark (Daniel iv. 158) has in this place a mere allusion to the manifestation of the Lord, and a prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit to bless the sacrifice. The *Post Sanctus* of the Gallican and Mozarabic canon contains, at least on the Lord's festivals, a commemoration of some portion of His Life; a feature entirely absent from the Roman. Some liturgies contain in this portion allusions to peculiar opinions with regard to the person of Christ; the Armenian, for instance, after reciting (*Liturgy of the Armenian Church*, tr. by Rev. S. C. Malan, p. 39) God's mercy in the prophets and the law, speaks of the Son as having taken a body "by union without confusion from the Mother of God and Holy Virgin Mary."

The Aethiopic liturgy agrees with the Coptic St. Basil and St. Gregory (Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.* i. 13, 29, 516) in breaking this portion of the office with responds. That of St. Gregory, for example, thrice inserts the "Kyrie Eleison."

The transition from the preceding prayer or ascription to the *Commemoration of Institution* is generally made in the Eastern liturgies by the words "ὅς τῇ νυκτὶ ἡ παρεδίδουτο," or some equivalent formula; those of St. James and St. Chrysostom add "μᾶλλον δὲ ἑαυτὸν παρεδίδου;" but this addition is not found in the Syriac St. James. The Coptic St. Basil (Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.* i. 14) has a wholly different form: "He instituted this great mystery of piety and worship, when He had determined to deliver Himself to death for the life of the world." The usual Western form is "Qui pridie quam pateretur;" but the Mozarabic has here "Dominus Noster Jesus Christus in qua nocte tradebatur," approaching in this, as in other respects, more nearly to the Eastern type. It has indeed been contended that this form is a comparatively recent interpolation, inasmuch as the prayer which follows is called the "Post Pridie" as if the usual formula had preceded (Krazer, *De Liturgiis*, 615; Neale, *Eastern Church*, Int. 472). But in fact the title "Post Pridie" is probably not so ancient as Isidore's time, who calls the prayer which follows consecration the "Confirmatio Sacramenti"; and it is surely very much more probable that the heading "Post Pridie" should have been inserted by some revisor familiar with Roman liturgical diction, than that the form "Qui pridie," common to the whole of Western Christendom, should have been displaced by one entirely unheard of, and that in the most solemn part of the Liturgy.

In no liturgy, in the narrative of institution, is any one Gospel followed, and the form adopted is such as to suggest rather an independent tradition than an artificial arrangement from the Gospels. Many of the forms add epithets expressive of veneration for the Person of the Lord.

Very many liturgies contain a reference to the Lord's raising his eyes to Heaven before breaking the bread. This is the case in those of St. James and St. Mark, but not in that of St. Chrysostom or in the kindred Nestorian forms; it is the case in all the Western forms, except the Mozarabic. St. Mark and St. James insert the raising of the eyes to Heaven before the blessing of the cup also. St. James and St. Basil mention the displaying or dedicating (ἀναδείξας) of the bread to God the Father.

The mingling of the wine with water is a well-known and almost universal custom; but in none of the Western liturgies is any mention of it made in the canon, while in the East it constantly appears. The Basilian has simply "mingling" (κεράσας) (Daniel, iv. 429); St. James the fuller form, "mingling of wine and water." So also Coptic St. Gregory (Renaudot i. 30); and many of the Syro-Jacobite liturgies, as for instance that of St. John (*Ib.* ii. 164). St. Chrysostom has no reference to the mixing; but it is nevertheless found in the liturgy of Nestorius, which is in a great measure derived from that of Constantinople.

It is an ancient belief that the Lord Himself partook of the bread and the cup in the Last Supper. This, however, appears but rarely in the Liturgies. The Coptic forms of St. Basil and St. Gregory refer to the Lord's tasting the Cup (Renaudot, i. 15, 31); and some of the Syro-Jacobite liturgies refer to His partaking of the Bread: for instance, St. James of Edessa (*Ib.* ii. 373). That of Nestorius (*Ib.* ii. 629) makes the Lord partake both of the bread and the wine.

Some of the Syro-Jacobite liturgies, drawn up at a time when the controversy was rife as to the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist, [ELEMENTS] introduce into the canon such expressions as "common" or "leavened" bread. For instance, those of James Baradaï and Matthew the Pastor (Renaudot, ii. 335, 348); and some, as that of Dioscorus (*Ib.* 495) speak of His accomplishing the Mosaic Passover; as does also Nestorius (*Ib.* ii. 629).

With regard to the actual words said over the bread, the usual Latin form is simply, "Hoc est Corpus Meum." The Ambrosian, in one text adds "quod pro multis confringetur;" in Pamelius's text, "quod pro vobis confringetur" (Daniel's, *Codex* i. 86); the Mozarabic, "quod pro vobis tradetur."

In the Greek, St. James has, "This is my Body, which is broken and given for you for the remission of sins," and with this the principal liturgies agree, except that few give *both* the words "broken" and "given." The words found in St. Luke and St. Paul, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, or κλάμενον, appear indeed in all Eastern liturgies with the exception of that of the Syrian Eustathius (Ren. ii. 236). Many of the Syro-Jacobite liturgies amplify the solemn words of the Lord by the insertion of peculiar expressions.

Of the words said over the wine, the Clementine Liturgy (*Const. Apost.* viii. 12, § 16) has the simplest, as probably the most ancient form—"This is My Blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." St. Chrysostom has a form identical with that in the English Prayer-Book; St. James and St. Mark have "shed and distributed" instead of the simple

"shed." The Roman, which in the case of the Bread has the shortest form, in the case of the Wine has the longest—"For this is the Cup of my Blood, of the new and eternal Testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many for the remission of sins"—where the words "eternal" and "mystery of faith" are peculiar to the Roman form. The Mozarabic has, "For this is the Cup of the New Testament in my Blood, which shall be shed for you and for many for the remission of sins."

In the Intercession for the world and the Church on earth, the petitions enumerated by St. Cyril are always found, with more or less of expansion in detail, and often with the addition of interesting local peculiarities. Thus in the Liturgy of St. James (i.e. of Jerusalem) we have special intercession on behalf of the Holy City and other sacred places visited by the Lord; St. Mark (Alexandrian) has a special prayer for the due rise of the Nile; so also the Coptic St. Basil (Renaudot, i. 17); and the Alexandrian St. Gregory (*Ib.* i. 109). Both St. James and St. Mark have intercessions for prisoners; the former enumerating "those in bonds, in prisons, in captivities (*αλχουλασσίαις*), and banishments, in mines and tortures, and bitter slaveries" (Daniel's *Codex*, iv. 118), phrases which originated in a time of persecution. In the Roman liturgy this portion of the intercession is treated much more briefly than is usual in the Eastern Church; the intercessions are for the Holy Catholic Church, for the pope and the bishop of the diocese *nominatim*, and for all faithful worshippers; the Ambrosian adds, after the bishop, the king by name (Daniel, i. 82). Most of the liturgies contain a special intercession for those who have made the offerings and those who are present at the service; thus in St. Basil (Daniel, iv. 433) is a prayer for the people here present (*τοῦ παριστάμενου λαοῦ*) and the priest who presents (*προσκομίζοντος*) the holy gifts; St. Chrysostom mentions the priest in the same terms, but not the people; St. James (Dan. iv. 119) mentions not only those who have made the offerings on that day, but those on whose behalf they made them (*ὅπερ ὁ ἕκαστος προσήνεγκεν*); St. Mark (Dan. iv. 156), in which this prayer precedes consecration, prays that God will receive the thank-offerings (*εὐχαριστήρια*) of those who offer, as He received the gifts of Abel, the sacrifice of Abraham, the incense of Zacharias, the alms of Cornelius, and the two mites of the widow; the Roman (Dan. i. 14, 15) has a petition for all God's servants, and, in the Gelasian form, "omnium circumstantium quorum tibi fides cognita est et nota devotio, qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis pro se suisque omnibus, pro redemptione animarum suarum, pro spe salutis et incolumitatis suae;" in the Gregorian form, which is that at present in use, after the word "devotio," we have "pro quibus tibi offerimus vel . . .," probably an addition of St. Gregory's own age.

A more particular account of the remaining portions of the canon will be given under DIPTYCHS, LORD'S PRAYER, and EMBOLISMUS.

#### *Ceremonies which accompanied the Anaphora or Canon.*

1. We may take the ritual of the liturgy of St. Chrysostom as a type of the oriental ceremonies

CHRIST. ANT.

of the anaphora or canon, which are there more fully described than in other Eastern liturgies. It is no doubt possible that some of the ceremonies here described did not originate within the first eight centuries; but on the whole it may be said to represent fairly enough the highest ritual development attained in the East within our period.

At the opening of the anaphora, the elements have already been brought into the sanctuary, and placed on the holy table, covered with the *aer*, or veil. The deacon cries, "The doors! the doors!"—a phrase intended originally to exhort the attendants carefully to exclude the uninitiated (*Constt. Apost.* viii. 10)—and then desires the people to stand (Daniel, *Codex Lit.* iv. 356 ff.). The priest lifts the *aer*, or veil, from the elements, and the deacon approaching guards them from pollution with his feather-fan [FLABELLUM]. Then follow the Sursum Corda, Preface and Sanctus. After this the deacon takes the ASTERISCUS from off the Paten, and again uses the feather-fan. The commemoration of Institution then proceeds, the deacon pointing out to the celebrant the paten and chalice at the proper moment. At the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, the deacon lays aside his fan, draws nearer to the priest, and both make three reverences or prostrations (*προσκυθήσεις*) before the Holy Table, praying silently; then the deacon, with bowed head, points to the holy bread, and the priest rising signs it thrice with the cross; the chalice is signed in like manner, and then both elements together; after which the deacon, after bowing his head to the priest, resumes his place and his fan. At the recitation of the Diptychs the deacon censens round the holy table, and then recites, standing by the door of the Sanctuary, those portions of the prayer which were to be heard by the choir without. At the prayer of Inclination he bids the people to bow (*κλίνειν*) their heads. After the prayer the priest elevates the holy Bread, saying the *Sancta Sanctis*; the choir then sings the communion-anthem (*κοινωνική*) of the day, and the Fraction, Commixtion, and Communion follow.

The rubrical directions of the other Greek liturgies correspond generally with these, so far as they go, but contain very much less detail.

2. In the Roman rite, at the commencement of the canon, the celebrant stood before the altar, probably at first with hands expanded shoulder-high in the ancient attitude of prayer (Gerbert, *Lit. Aleman.* i. 342), while the attendant clergy stood with bowed heads, as venerating the Divine Majesty and the Incarnation of the Lord introduced in the *Sanctus*. (Amalarius, *De Eccl. Off.* iii. 22; compare *Ordo Rom.* I. c. 16; and II. c. 8). At the words *Te igitur*, with which the canon strictly commences, the priest made a profound inclination and kissed the altar; frequently also he kissed the T at the commencement of the canon, which was made to represent a cross, or in later times a crucifix. (Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.* iv. p. 839; Gerbert, *Lit. Aleman.* i. 341).

From very ancient times also at each of the words *donis*, *munera*, *sacrificia*, the priest made the sign of the cross, blessing the oblation, as gifts, bounties, sacrifices. This is the first of the six groups of crosses mentioned in the *Ordo Romanus* II. c. 10; (compare Amalarius, *u. s.*). The due use of the crosses in the canon was held

T



to be of so much importance that St. Boniface (about 750) consulted Pope Zacharias on the subject, who in answer sent him a copy of the canon with the crosses inserted in the proper places. This copy has unfortunately perished. Innocent the Third (*De Myst. Missae*, v. c. 11) states the correct number of crosses in the canon as twenty-five, the number still used in the Roman rite.

The prayer *Hanc igitur* has long been recited by the priest with hands extended over the Host and Chalice, in imitation of the gesture of a sacrificing priest under the Mosaic Law (Lev. iv. 4, &c.). But the more ancient practice was for him to recite this prayer profoundly inclined to the altar, as is clear from the testimony of Amalarius (*Eclogae*, c. 30, p. 1331 A, Migne): and this practice continued as late as the end of the 13th century (Durandus, *Rationale*, iv. c. 39).

In the prayer *Quoniam oblationem*, at the words *benedictam, scriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem*, occurs the second group of crosses of the *Ordo Rom. II.*, which however defines nothing as to the number of crosses, or the manner of signing the oblation. The *Ordo* published by Hittorp at this point directs the priest to stand upright, blessing (i.e. signing with the cross) the bread only; then, at the words, *Ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat*, to bless both the Host and the Chalice. The present custom, according to which the priest at the words *Benedictam, &c.* makes three crosses over the Host and Chalice together, is at least as old as the 11th century (*Microlog. De Eccl. Observ.* c. 14).

At the words *Qui Prædic, &c.* the priest takes the Bread into his hands. In this prayer is introduced the third group of crosses of the *Ordo R. II.*, at the words *accipiens panem . . . benedixit, and item gratias agens benedixit.*

Amalarius (*Ecl.* 31, p. 1331) expressly states that in his time the whole of the Canon was said *secretè* (see further under SECRETA). Of the ELEVATION of the Bread and Wine immediately after Consecration no mention is found in the old Sacramentaries, in the most ancient of the Roman *Ordines*, or in the early commentators on the rite, Amalarius, Walafrid Strabo, Florus, Remigius of Auxerre, Pseudo-Alcuin, and the *Micrologus*. The only indication of elevation in those of the *Ordines Romani* which are older than the 12th century, is that at the words *Per quem hæc omnia*, noticed later.

At the words *Hostiam puram*, says the *Ordo Rom. II.* (c. 10), is introduced the fourth group of crosses. Amalarius (*Eclogae*, c. 30, p. 1331) says, "Here the priest makes the sign of the Cross four times over the Host, and a fifth over the Chalice only;" a practice somewhat different from that of modern times.

After the prayer *Supra quæ propitio*, the priest inclines himself with bowed head before the altar, and recites the *Suppliciter Te rogamus*, in which he inserts a private prayer (Amalarius, u. s., c. 31); a direction for which is also found in some ancient MSS. of Sacramentaries. No crosses are noted by the *Ordo Rom. II.* at the words *Sacrosanctum Filii Tui &c.*, whence we may conclude that the crosses now used there are of later introduction than the 9th century. That they were introduced into the Roman rite not later than the 12th century is clear from the

testimony of Innocent III. (*De Myst. Missae*, v. c. 11).

The beginning of the prayer *Nobis quoque peccatoribus* was anciently said with the voice somewhat raised, that the congregation might be able to join in it (*Ordo Rom. II.* c. 10). The priest beats his breast, as bewailing his sinfulness.

At the words *sanctificas, vivificas, benedixit, &c.* comes the fifth group of crosses, according to *Ordo Rom. II.* The *Ordo Rom. IV.* (p. 61) is more explicit, desiring the priest to sign Host and Chalice three several times, making three several crosses. Compare Amalarius, *Ecl.* p. 1332. It is thought by some (as Bona, *De Reb. Lit.* ii. 14, s. 5) that at the words of this prayer which refer to God's creating and vivifying power, an offering of the fruits of the earth, if any were to be blessed, was placed on the altar by the attendant deacon. There is no doubt that a benediction of fruits of the earth is in some few ancient Sacramentaries prescribed in this place; but it is hard to say whether this is a relic of what was once an universal custom, or a peculiar observance of a few churches.

At the words, *Per quem hæc omnia, &c.*, the archdeacon rose, the other deacons still standing with bowed heads, drew near to the altar, removed the fold of the corporal which covered the chalice, wrapped the offertorium or veil round the handles, and at the words *Per ipsum, &c.* raised the chalice by the handles. The celebrant touched the chalice, still held by the archdeacon, with the consecrated wafers, making two crosses, and saying, *Per ipsum et cum ipso . . . per omnia sæcula sæculorum.* He then restored the wafers to their place on the altar, and the archdeacon placed the chalice by them (*Ordines Rom.* i. c. 16; ii. c. 10; iii. c. 15: compare Amalarius, *Ecl.* p. 1332). These directions respecting the crosses were changed in later times.

For the manner of saying the *Pater Noster*, see LORD'S PRAYER. Here it may suffice to say that, while in the Eastern, Gallican, and Spanish Churches this prayer was said by the whole people, in the Roman, from the time of Gregory the Great at least (see *Epist.* vii. 64) it was said by the priest alone, yet in an audible voice, so that the people (or the choir) might "acclaim" at the last petition. The *Amen* is not commonly found in ancient Sacramentaries; nor does it seem in place here, as the Lord's Prayer is prolonged in the *Libera nos* [EMBOLISMUS] which follows.

When the celebrant (in a papal mass) reached the words *Ab omni perturbatione securi*, the archdeacon (*Ordo Rom. I.* c. 18) took the paten<sup>b</sup> from the regionary sub-deacon, who was standing behind him, kissed it, and passed it to the second deacon. So *Ordo Rom. II.* 11, and *III* 16. The fifth *Ordo Rom.*, probably of considerably later date, desires the deacon to present the patens to the celebrating bishop to kiss.

For the remaining portion of the liturgy, see KISS, FRACTION, COMMUNION. [C.]

CANON (IN MUSIC). 1. The peculiar form of musical composition called by this name was

<sup>b</sup> It must be borne in mind that the Host was not consecrated on the paten, but was, at the date of *Ordo Rom. I.* broken upon it; a custom subsequently changed.

unknown to the ancients, the earliest example extant being of the 13th century, we believe.

2. The accepted values of the several notes constituting the musical scale expressed philosophically. The reader is referred to Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities* [MUSICA] for a general description of the sounds assumed by the Greeks, and the systems in which they were arranged. The assumptions of the Greek writers were of course adopted by the Latins, and appeared throughout the whole of the early and middle ages as the basis on which all their music rested. Considerable uncertainty is caused in this subject by the fact that there were two somewhat conflicting schools, the Aristoxeneans and the Pythagoreans. Pythagoras having discovered the simple ratios of  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{2}{3}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ,  $\frac{8}{9}$ , for the Octave, the Fifth, the Fourth, and the Tone (major), which last is the difference between the Fourth and Fifth, his disciples maintained that all sounds should be defined by determinate ratios, while Aristoxenus discarded this idea altogether, and maintained that the Tetrachord or Fourth should be divided into intervals, the values of which were to be determined by the ear only. This is probably the germ of the dispute which has lasted to the present day respecting the temperament of instruments with fixed tones: and as the true measure of an interval is a logarithm, it was of course impossible to reconcile at all completely these two opinions. Ptolemy examined the matter and established the truth of the Pythagorean views: Euclid seems to have endeavoured to combine them, that is, if the two treatises attributed to him, the *Introductio Harmonica* and the *Sectio Canonis*, are both genuine. The latter of these is usually considered genuine, and it is purely Pythagorean and rigidly exact; while the former, which is certainly Aristoxenean, and perhaps written *ad populum*, is considered more doubtful.


The canon of the scale then is the system of ratios into which a resonant string is to be divided so as to produce all the notes which are assumed; or, which is the same thing, the relative lengths of strings for these notes which are to be fixed in an instrument and stretched with the same tension.

The description of the intervals given in Smith's *Dict. of Antiq.*, from the *Introductio Harmonica*, is of course Aristoxenean: it supposes a tone to be divided into twelve equal parts, and the tetrachord therefore into thirty, and the intervals in the tetrachord, taken in ascending order, to be as follows:—

In the Syntonous or ordinary Diatonic system .. ..	Parts.
.. Soft Diatonic (μαλακόν) ..	6, 12, 12
.. Tonal or ordinary Chromatic (τονιαῖον) ..	6, 9, 15
.. Sesquialter Chromatic (ἡμιόλιον) ..	6, 6, 18
.. Soft Chromatic (μαλακόν) ..	4½, 4½, 21
.. Enharmonic ..	4, 4, 22
..	3, 3, 24

This makes a Fourth equal to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  tones, a Fifth  $3\frac{1}{2}$ , and an Octave 6 tones. But in the *Sectio Canonis* Euclid has proved that the Fourth, Fifth, and Octave are each of them less than these magnitudes (Theor. 11, 14); and also that the second sound in the Chromatic and Enharmonic Tetrachords is not equally removed from the first and third (Theor. 18): it would therefore appear most reasonable that he meant that Aristoxenus's hypothetical division of the tone and tetrachord gave results which might be treated as equal for practical purposes or by unphilosophical men, but that this was not rigidly exact.

In Theorems 19 and 20 of the *Sectio Canonis*, Euclid gives the divisions of the string (which he calls also the canon, and assumes for the Proslambanomenos) according to the Diatonic system. The results are the following:—



	Length =
A. Proslambanomenos .. ..	1
B. Hypate hypaton .. ..	$\frac{8}{9}$
C. Parhypate hypaton .. ..	$\frac{27}{32}$
D. Lichanos hypaton .. ..	$\frac{3}{4}$
E. Hypate meson .. ..	$\frac{2}{3}$
F. Parhypate meson .. ..	$\frac{81}{128}$
G. Lichanos meson .. ..	$\frac{9}{16}$
a. Mese .. ..	$\frac{1}{2}$
b. Paramese .. ..	$\frac{4}{9}$
c. Trita diezeugmenon, or Paranete synemmenon .. ..	$\frac{27}{64}$
d. Paranete diezeugmenon, or Nete synemmenon .. ..	$\frac{3}{8}$
e. Nete diezeugmenon .. ..	$\frac{1}{3}$
f. Trita hyperbolaeon .. ..	$\frac{81}{256}$
g. Paranete hyperbolaeon .. ..	$\frac{9}{32}$
aa. Nete hyperbolaeon .. ..	$\frac{1}{4}$

The Trita synemmenon (bb) does not appear; its length will be  $\frac{243}{512}$ . It is worth noticing that this differs from our modern canon in the values of C, D, F, G, bb, c, d, f, g; these are at present assumed to be  $\frac{5}{6}$ ,  $\frac{20}{27}$ ,  $\frac{5}{8}$ ,  $\frac{5}{9}$ ,  $\frac{15}{32}$ ,  $\frac{5}{12}$ ,  $\frac{10}{27}$ ,  $\frac{5}{16}$ ,  $\frac{5}{18}$  (taking A to be 1): all these notes then are flatter by a comma ( $\frac{80}{81}$ ) than ours.

In Theor. 17 Euclid gives a method of determining the Lichani and the Paranetae of the enharmonic system; and if the direction in which he takes his Fifths be reversed, the Chromatic Lichani and Paranetae would seem to be determined: but beyond that he has given us no information further than the rough description of Aristoxenus's division.

It is not surprising then that various canons of the scale have been assigned by different writers, just as in more modern times various systems of temperament have been advocated.

Ptolemy gives the following canons for any tetrachord: say, for example, that from the Hypate hypaton (B) to the Hypate meson (E).

ARCHYTAS'S CANONS.

Diatonic: 1,  $\frac{27}{28}$ ,  $\frac{27}{32}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, D, E.  
Chromatic: 1,  $\frac{27}{28}$ ,  $\frac{8}{9}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, C<sup>#</sup>, E.  
Enharmonic: 1,  $\frac{27}{28}$ ,  $\frac{15}{16}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, C, E.

ERATOSTHENES'S CANONS.

Diatonic: 1,  $\frac{243}{256}$ ,  $\frac{27}{32}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, D, E.  
Chromatic: 1,  $\frac{19}{20}$ ,  $\frac{9}{10}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, C<sup>#</sup>, E.  
Enharmonic: 1,  $\frac{39}{40}$ ,  $\frac{19}{20}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, B, C, E.

DIDYMUS'S CANONS.

Diatonic: 1,  $\frac{15}{16}$ ,  $\frac{27}{32}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, D, E.  
Chromatic: 1,  $\frac{15}{16}$ ,  $\frac{9}{10}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, C<sup>#</sup>, E.  
Enharmonic: 1,  $\frac{31}{32}$ ,  $\frac{15}{16}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, B, C, E.

PTOLEMY'S OWN CANONS.

Diatonic intense: 1,  $\frac{15}{16}$ ,  $\frac{5}{6}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, D, E.

Diatonic syntonous:	Ratios	1, $\frac{243}{256}$ , $\frac{27}{32}$ , $\frac{3}{4}$ ;	B, C, D, E.
Diatonic soft:	Logarithms	0, .02499, .06247, .12494.	
	Ratios	1, $\frac{243}{256}$ , $\frac{6}{7}$ or $\frac{13}{16}$ , $\frac{3}{4}$ ;	B, C, D, E.
Chromatic tonal:	Logarithms	0, .02499, .04938, .12494.	
	Ratios	1, $\frac{16}{17}$ or $\frac{17}{18}$ or $\frac{243}{256}$ , $\frac{8}{9}$ , $\frac{3}{4}$ ;	B, C, C <sup>#</sup> , E.
Chromatic sesquialter:	Logarithms	0, .01874, .03758, .12494.	
	Ratios	1, $\frac{22}{23}$ or $\frac{23}{24}$ , $\frac{11}{12}$ , $\frac{3}{4}$ ;	B, C, C <sup>#</sup> , E.
Chromatic soft:	Logarithms	0, .01666, .03332, .12494.	
	Ratios	1, $\frac{25}{26}$ or $\frac{26}{27}$ , $\frac{12}{13}$ or $\frac{13}{14}$ or $\frac{25}{27}$ , $\frac{3}{4}$ ;	B, C, C <sup>#</sup> , E.
Enharmonic:	Logarithms	0, .01249, .02499, .12494.	
	Ratios	1, $\frac{37}{38}$ or $\frac{38}{39}$ , $\frac{16}{17}$ or $\frac{17}{18}$ or $\frac{243}{256}$ , $\frac{3}{4}$ ;	B, B, C, E.


The values of the Meson tetrachord (E, F, G, a) will be obtained in any one of these systems by multiplying the corresponding ratios by  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; those of the Synemmenon tetrachord (a, bb, c, d) by multiplying them by  $\frac{9}{16}$ ; those of the Diezeugmenon tetrachord (b, c, d, e) are half those of the Hypaton tetrachord; and those of the Hyperbolaeon (e, f, g, aa) are half those of

Diatonic ditonal: 1,  $\frac{243}{256}$ ,  $\frac{27}{32}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, D, E.  
Diatonic tonal: 1,  $\frac{27}{28}$ ,  $\frac{27}{32}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, D, E.  
Diatonic soft: 1,  $\frac{20}{21}$ ,  $\frac{6}{7}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, D, E.  
Diatonic equable: 1,  $\frac{11}{12}$ ,  $\frac{5}{6}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C<sup>#</sup>, D, E.  
Chromatic intense: 1,  $\frac{21}{22}$ ,  $\frac{7}{8}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, C<sup>#</sup>, E.  
Chromatic soft: 1,  $\frac{27}{28}$ ,  $\frac{9}{10}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, C, C<sup>#</sup>, E.  
Enharmonic: 1,  $\frac{45}{46}$ ,  $\frac{15}{16}$ ,  $\frac{3}{4}$ ; B, B, C, E.


The canons according to Euclid or Aristoxenus can be reproduced with pretty considerable accuracy by means of logarithms and converging fractions: there will of course be a little discrepancy according as the 30th part of a Fourth or the 12th part of a Tone is taken for the element, these not being exactly equal: the former seems preferable; and it gives for the logarithm of the element .004165; and the following results in the cases not as yet determined:—

the Meson, or  $\frac{3}{8}$  of those of the Hypaton. All these will be expressed in terms of the Proslambanomenos (A) by multiplying each of them by  $\frac{8}{9}$ .

The Greek Chromatic Scale then will be, expressed in modern musical notation as nearly as possible, the following; Didymus's canon being taken for the sake of simplicity of notation:



And the Enharmonic Scale will be, according to Didymus's canon, this:



\* The notation C is adopted to mean a C slightly flattened, C somewhat flatter still, and so for C: the actual amount of flattening or sharpening is determined by the

ratio given. At present we have no notation to express these things; in the 16th century the symbol X was used to indicate the enharmonic diesis, but as it is now used for a double sharp, it has been thought prudent to avoid employing it here.

It will be observed from the above that, while Pythagoras and Euclid allowed only the Fourth, Fifth, and Octave, with their replicates, to be consonances, the later writers had discovered the consonances of the Major Third ( $\frac{4}{3}$ ) and Minor Third ( $\frac{3}{4}$ ), also the Minor Tenth ( $\frac{9}{8}$ ), and perhaps also the Harmonic Flat Seventh ( $\frac{7}{4}$ ) and Sharp Eleventh ( $\frac{11}{4}$ ), which are now heard in instruments of the Horn kind.

There were no alterations made in this until

1.  $\frac{2}{1}$ ,  $\frac{3}{2}$ ,  $\frac{4}{3}$ ,  $\frac{5}{4}$ ,  $\frac{6}{5}$ ,  $\frac{7}{4}$ ,  $\frac{8}{3}$ ,  $\frac{9}{2}$ ,  $\frac{10}{3}$ ,  $\frac{11}{2}$ ,  $\sqrt{1}$  or  $\frac{1}{1}$ ,  $\frac{2}{1}$ ,  $\frac{3}{2}$ ,  $\frac{4}{3}$ ,  $\frac{5}{4}$ ,  $\frac{6}{5}$ ,  $\frac{7}{4}$ ,  $\frac{8}{3}$ ,  $\frac{9}{2}$ ,  $\frac{10}{3}$ ,  $\frac{11}{2}$ .  
 C, C, D, D, D, E, E, F, F, F, G, G, G, A, A, A, B, B, B, C.

Mr. A. J. Ellis, in a memoir read before the Royal Society, 1884, states that the Pythagorean canon has been developed into an Arabic scale of 17 sounds. "No nation using it," he adds, "has shown any appreciation of harmony." It is in fact next to impossible to conceive any satisfactory harmony existing with the non-diatonic canons, a consideration which has scarcely enough been dwelt on in discussing whether harmony was known to the ancients. It must never be forgotten that what is now called the chromatic scale is no representation of and has no connexion with the ancient chromatic canon (a fact noticed by Morley, annotations to his *Plains and Esie Introduction*); it is merely a combination of various diatonic scales, whose canons are, if necessary, accommodated to each other: the only case then in practice in which chromatic or enharmonic harmonies or melodies (in the old sense) can now be heard is in the tuning of an orchestra before a performance, unless indeed peals of bells may have sometimes been tuned in those ways, which, according to Dr. Holder, there seems some reason to believe. It may not be irrelevant to add that the modern canon, to which reference has several times been made above, is in some respects open to dispute, as it scarcely explains the phenomena which are accepted as musical facts.

The writer has made use of the *Introduction Harmonica* and *Sectio Canonis* of Euclid; Morley's *Plains and Esie Introduction to Practical Music*; Sir John Hawkins's *History of Music*; Holder's *Treatise on the Natural Grounds and Principles of Harmony*; and the Memoir of Mr. Ellis mentioned above. Other authorities on the subject are the *Antiquæ Musicae Auctores Septem*, ed. Meibomius; Ptolemy, ed. Wallis; Boethius, *De Musica*; Salinas; Zarline; Kircher; Mercurius; Colonna. [J. R. L.]

**CANON OF ODES (Edmon).** This word is applied to a part of the office of the Greek Church, sung to a musical tone, for the most part at Lauds, and which corresponds to the hymns of the Western Church. A canon is usually divided into nine *odes*, each ode consisting of a variable number of stanzas or *troparia*, in a rhythmical syllabic measure, prosody being abandoned except in three cases. The canon is headed by an iambic, or occasionally an hexameter line containing an allusion to the festival or the contents of the canon, or a play upon the saint's name, which forms an *Acrostich* to which the initial letters

the developments of Guido Aretime in the 11th century.

S. Ambrose decreed the use of the Diatonic genus alone in church music; and it is probable that the chromatic and enharmonic genera soon fell into general desuetude, or only existed as curiosities for the learned.

The Jews are believed to have used a canon proceeding by thirds of tones, thus giving 18 notes in the octave. Approximating to these in the same manner as for Euclid's chromatic and enharmonic canons, we obtain the following:—

of each troparion correspond. This acrostical form is thought with probability to be derived from Jewish practice. The nine odes have generally some reference to the corresponding odes at Lauds (v. CANTICLE), especially the seventh, eighth, and ninth. In practice the second ode of a canon is always omitted, except in Lent. The reason given is, that the second of the odes at Lauds (the song of Moses from Deut.), which is assigned to Tuesday, is more a denunciation against Israel than a direct act of praise to God, and is on that account omitted except in Lent. Hence the second ode of a canon, which partakes of the same character, is also omitted except on week days in Lent. It is not said on Saturday in Lent (v. Gear. Rit. Graec.; in San. Mei. Offm. not. 14). The tone to which the canon is sung is given at the beginning, and each ode is followed by one or more *troparia* under different names. After the sixth ode the *Synaxarion*, or the commemorations which belong to the day, are read.

Among the principal composers of canons were John of Damascus, Joseph of the Studium, Cosmas, Theophanes, St. Sophronius of Jerusalem, &c.; and as examples of canons, may be mentioned "the Great Canon," the composition of St. Andrew, archbishop of Crete (born A.D. 860), which begins *ὁ ἁγίος ἄγγελος ἔφησε κ.τ.λ.*, and is said on Monday of the first week in Lent. This canon is not acrostical. Also that for orthodox Sunday, i.e. the first Sunday in Lent, of which the acrostic is *ὁ ἁγίος ἄγγελος ἔφησε*: *ἁγίος ἄγγελος* ἔφησε *αὐτῶν*, and that for Christmas-day by Cosmas, beginning *χριστὸς γεννᾶται*, *ἁγίος ἄγγελος*, with the acrostic *χριστὸς ἁγίος ἄγγελος* *ἁγίος ἄγγελος* *ἁγίος ἄγγελος*, and another for the same day by St. John Damascene, in trimeter iambics, beginning *ἁγίος ἄγγελος ἁγίος ἄγγελος ἁγίος ἄγγελος*, the acrostic of which consists of four elegiac lines. This is one of the three canons which retain the classical prosody. The two others are by the same author, and said on the Epiphany and on Whitsunday. The construction of a canon much resembles that of a choral ode of the Greek dramatists, the strophe, antistrophe, &c., being represented by the odes and the various kinds of *troparia* by which they are separated. The name canon is probably applied to these hymns from their being completed in nine odes, nine being looked upon as a perfect number (Zonaras in Hymn.: Exp.: quoted by Gear). Others, however, derive the name from



the fixed rhythmical system on which they are constructed; while mystical reasons for the name have been assigned by some writers.

The word *canon* is applied in the Armenian rite to a section of the psalter, which in that rite is divided into eight sections called *canons*.

[H. J. H.]

**CANONICAL BOOKS** (*Libri Canonici, Ecclesiastici*; Βιβλία κανονιζόμενα, ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα). The question of the determination of the CANON, both of the Old and the New Testament, has been already fully treated in the *DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE* (pp. 250 ff.). The present article relates mainly to the authoritative promulgation of lists or catalogues of books to be read, under the name of Scripture, in the services of the Church. The canon of books to be publicly read is not wholly identical with the canon of books from which the faith is to be established (see Westcott, u. s.).

1. Athanasius (*Ep. Festal*. tom. i. pt. ii. p. 962, ed. Ben.) divided all the books which claimed the title of Holy Scripture into three classes. (1.) Βιβλία κανονιζόμενα, books which belonged in the fullest sense to the canon, and were the standard of the faith. (2.) 'Αναγιγνωσκόμενα, books which, though not belonging in the strictest sense to the canon, might be read in time of divine service, and recommended to catechumens, "for example of life and instruction of manners." (3.) 'Απόκρυφα, spurious books claiming authority under venerable names. This distinction between the books truly canonical and the books proper to be read has been perpetuated in the Greek Church to this day; and it is the present rule of the English Church, which, in the sixth Article, after enumerating the books of the Hebrew canon, proceeds to say that "the other books (as Hierom saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine."

2. In the Latin Church also at the same period a distinction was drawn by some between the books of the Hebrew canon and the later additions. Rufinus (*Expos. in Symb.* cc. 37, 38) divides the books into three classes: "*Canonici . . . quos patres intra canonem concluserant, ex quibus fidei nostrae assertiones constare voluerunt; . . . ecclesiastici . . . quos legi quidem in ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam; . . . caeteras vero scripturas apocryphas nominarunt, quas in ecclesiis legi voluerunt.*" Here, the *ecclesiastici* are exactly equivalent to the ἀναγιγνωσκόμενα of Athanasius. Jerome, in the *Prologus Galeatus*, enumerates the twenty-two books of the Hebrew canon, and adds, "quidquid extra hoc est inter apocrypha ponendum," giving the word *apocrypha* a wider meaning than that adopted by Rufinus, so as to include *all* books claiming to be Scripture not found in the Hebrew canon. This use of the word *Apocrypha*, which seems in ancient times to have been peculiar to Jerome, was adopted by the English and other Reformers in the sixteenth century, and so has become familiar to us. It is not, however, used in the sixth Article, where, as we have seen, the books read by the Church but not reputed strictly canonical are called simply "the other books."

3. The *Apostolic Constitutions* were probably

intended to give an appearance of apostolic authority to actually existing practices, and the substance of the first six books may be as old as the 3rd century. In the fifty-seventh chapter of the second book (p. 67, ed. Ueltzen), we have an approach to a catalogue of the books to be read as Scripture in public worship. The passage is as follows: "Let the reader, standing in the midst on a raised space, read the Books of Moses, and of Joshua the son of Nun, those of Judges and of Kingdoms (Βασιλείων), those of Chronicles and the Return from Captivity [Ezra and Nehemiah]; in addition to these those of Job and of Solomon and of the sixteen Prophets . . . After this let our Acts [Acts of Apostles] be read and the Epistles of Paul our fellow-worker, which he enjoined on the churches according to the guidance of the Holy Spirit; and after these let a deacon or presbyter read the Gospels which we, Matthew and John, delivered to you, and those which Luke and Mark, Paul's fellow-workers, received and left to you."

In this catalogue (unless Esther be omitted) the canon of the Old Testament is exactly that of the Jews. The Catholic Epistles are possibly included under *Acts*; for in a Syrian version, which places the Catholic Epistles immediately after the Acts, at the close of the Epistles follows the colophon, "The end of the Acts," (Wiseman, *Horae Syriacae*, p. 217, quoted by Westcott, *Bible in Church*, p. 176) as if the term *Acts* included the Epistles. It is not easy to see on what ground A. Ritschl (*Alt-kathol. Kirche*, p. 329, note 1) affirms the sentence relating to St. Paul's Epistles to be "plainly interpolated." It does not appear that there is any variation of MSS. in this place.

The list contained in the eighty-fifth of the *Apostolic Canons*, of the books to be held in veneration by all clergy and laity, is no doubt of much later date; but as it is in itself remarkable, and had a powerful influence on some of the Eastern Churches, it is given in the parallel arrangement opposite..

After the foundation of Constantinople (about A.D. 332), Constantine desired Eusebius to provide fifty splendid copies of the Scriptures for the churches of his new city. How he fulfilled his charge we cannot exactly affirm, as he gives no catalogue of the books he included in the collection, and not one of his copies is known to exist; probably the canon of these books differed little, if at all, from that of Cyril and Laodicea.

A catalogue of the books of Scripture, the authority of which is strictly ecclesiastical and not imperial, is found in the works of Athanasius. That great prelate joined to his "Festal Letter" \* of the year 365 a list of the books which were canonized and traditional and confidently believed to be divine (τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία). In the New Testament, this list gives exactly the books which we receive in the order in which they stand in the oldest Greek MSS. In the Old Testament, Baruch and the Letter are added to Jeremiah; Esther is placed among the Apocrypha; and the books of Maccabees are omitted altogether.

\* The circulars in which the bishop of Alexandria annually announced to the different churches of his province the date of Easter were called "Paschal" or "Festal" letters.

Canons Apost. (c. 85), (Ueltzen's Const. Apost. p. 253.)	Athanasius ( <i>Ep. Fest.</i> , in opp. ed. Ben. I. ii. 962.)	Conc. Laodiceum, can. 60 (Brun's <i>Canones</i> , i. 79.)	Conc. Carthagin. III. can. 47 (Brun's <i>Canones</i> , i. 133.)
Genesis Exodus Leviticus Numbers Deuteronomy Joshua Judges Ruth Kings, four Chronicles, two Ezra, two Esther Maccabees, three Job The Psalter Solomon's Proverbs Ecclesiastes Song of Songs Book of the Twelve Pro- phets, one Isaiah Jeremiah Ezekiel Daniel  For instruction of youth, the Wisdom of Sirach  Gospels, four: Matthew Mark Luke John Epistles of Paul, fourteen Peter, two John, three James, one Jude, one Clement, two Apostolical Constitutions, ( <i>Διατάξεις</i> ), eight Acts of the Apostles	Genesis Exodus Leviticus Numbers Deuteronomy Joshua Judges Ruth I. and II. Kings III. and IV. Kings I. and II. Chronicles I. and II. Ezra Psalms Proverbs Ecclesiastes Song of Songs Job Minor Prophets, twelve Isaiah Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamen- tations, and the Letter Ezekiel Daniel  Gospels, four: Matthew Mark Luke John Acts of Apostles Catholic Epistles of Apostles, seven: James one Peter, two John, three Jude, one Epistles of Paul the Apostle, fourteen: Romans Corinthians, two Galatians Ephesians Philippians Colossians Thessalonians, two Hebrews Timothy, two Titus, one Philemon The Apocalypse of John	1. Genesis 2. Exodus 3. Leviticus 4. Numbers 5. Deuteronomy 6. Joshua 7. Judges and Ruth 8. Esther 9. I. and II. Kings 10. III. and IV. Kings 11. I. and II. Chronicles 12. I. and II. Ezra 13. The 150 Psalms 14. Proverbs of Solomon 15. Ecclesiastes 16. Song of Songs 17. Job 18. The Twelve Prophets 19. Isaiah 20. Jeremiah, Baruch, La- mentations, and the Letter 21. Ezekiel 22. Daniel  Gospels, four: Matthew Mark Luke John Acts of Apostles Catholic Epistles, seven: James, one Peter, two John, three Jude, one Epistles of Paul, fourteen: Romans, one Corinthians, two Galatians, one Ephesians, one Philippians, one Colossians, one Thessalonians, two Hebrews, one Timothy, two Titus, one Philemon, one	Genesis Exodus Leviticus Numbers Deuteronomy Joshua Judges Ruth Books of Kings, four Books of Chronicles, two Job The Psalter of David Books of Solomon, five Books of Prophets, twelve: Isaiah Jeremiah Ezekiel Daniel Tobit Judith Esther Books of Ezra, two Books of Maccabees, two  Gospels, four books Acts of Apostles, one Epistles of Paul the Apostle thirteen The same to the Hebrews, one Peter the Apostle, two John the Apostle, three Jude the Apostle, one James, one  The Apocalypse of John, one book

The earliest conciliar decision on the subject of Canonical Books is that of the provincial synod of Laodicea, about the year 363. As the canons of this council now stand in the printed editions and in most MSS., the fifty-ninth canon enacts that "psalms composed by private persons should not be used in churches, nor uncanonical (*ἀκανόνιστα*) books, but only the canonical books of the New and Old Testament"; and the sixtieth gives a list of the books which should be read [in churches] (*δσα δεῖ βιβλία ἀναγινώσκεισθαι*). But this list is unquestionably a later addition; it is not found in the best Greek MSS., in ancient Syriac versions, in one of the two complete Latin versions, nor in the oldest digests of ecclesiastical canons (see Westcott, *Canon of N. T.* pp. 500 ff.). Yet it is probably a very early gloss, being in fact identical (excepting in the addition to Jeremiah of Baruch and the Letter, in the place occupied by Esther and Job, and in the omission of the Apocalypse) with the list given by Cyril of Jerusalem about A.D. 350 (*Catech. Myst.* iv. 33 [al.

22]), a list which he distinctly describes as the canon of ecclesiastical books, desiring his catechumens not to read other books than those which were read in the churches.

In the Latin Church, as we have seen, a distinction was drawn by Rufinus and Jerome between the books of the Hebrew canon and the later additions; but the distinction drawn by these learned and able doctors was not generally received in the Latin Church. The old Latin translation was made from the LXX. and gave no indication that the different books were not all of the same authority; and when this had obtained general currency, the great leaders of the Latin Church were unwilling to draw distinctions which would shake the received tradition. Hence Ambrose and Augustine, with the great mass of later writers, cite all the books in question alike as Scripture, and Augustine (*de Doct. Christ.* ii. 8) gives a list of the books of which "the whole canon of the Scriptures" consists, without making any clear distinction between the apocryphal and the other

books.<sup>b</sup> The ecclesiastical canon of the Latin Church has in fact from the date of the first Latin translation included what we call the Apocryphal Books, though we not unfrequently meet with expressions which show that the Latin Fathers were conscious that the books of their canon were in fact of very different degrees of authority. Gregory the Great, for instance, speaks of the books of Maccabees as not belonging, in the proper sense, to the canon.

At the third Council of Carthage, at which St. Augustine was present, and at which his influence no doubt predominated, a decree was made which determined the list of canonical Scriptures. The forty-seventh canon (Bruns's *Canones* i. 133) begins thus: "It is also agreed, that besides Canonical Scriptures nothing be read in the Church as Holy Scripture (sub nomine Divinarum Scripturarum)," and a list of canonical writings follows, in which the Apocryphal books are mingled with those of the Hebrew canon, without distinction. Some of the MSS. however omit the two books of Maccabees. The canon ends with saying, in one text, "Let it be made known to our brother and fellow-bishop Boniface [of Rome], or other bishops of those parts, for confirming that canon, that we have received from our fathers these books to be read in churches;" in another text, "The books then amount to twenty-seven; let the churches across the sea [i. e. Italian] be consulted about that canon." In both texts, permission is given to read the Passions of Martyrs on their anniversaries.

The confirmation of Rome was probably obtained, and this canon of Carthage, though of course only binding in its proper force on the churches of a particular province, became the general ecclesiastical rule of the West. "Usage received all the books of the enlarged canon more and more generally as equal in all respects; learned tradition kept alive the distinction between the Hebrew canon and the Apocrypha which had been drawn by Jerome" (Westcott, *Bible in Church*, p. 190).

The Apostolical, Laodicean, and Carthaginian canons were all confirmed by the second canon of the Quinisextine Council, A.D. 692 (Bruns's *Canones* i. 36), no regard being had to their variations. The 68th canon made provision for the reverent treatment of copies of the sacred books.

In these lists, the first and second books of Kings are of course those which we call the first and second books of Samuel, and the third and fourth books of Kings those which we call the first and second books of Kings. It is not always easy to say with certainty what is intended by the first and second books of Esdras. In the Vatican and Alexandrian MSS. of the LXX., "I. Esdras" is the apocryphal book which we call the first book of Esdras, while "II. Esdras" is composed of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah (Westcott, *Bible in Church*, pp. 303 ff.). In the Vulgate, "I. Esdras" is the canonical book of Ezra, and "II. Esdras" the canonical book Nehemiah. Jerome in the *Prologus Galeatus* mentions only one Esdras, which (he says) the Greeks and Latins divided into two books; these two books were, as appears from the *Praef. in Esdras* and the *Ep. ad Paulinum*

(e. 16) the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah. A letter of Pope Innocent I. to Exsuperius, bishop of Toulouse (A.D. 405) contains a list (given by Kirchhofer, *Quellensammlung*, p. 504) identical in contents with that of the Council of Carthage, but differing in the arrangement of the books. There is also a papal list attributed to Gelasius (Pope A.D. 492-496) and another to Hormisdas (514-523). But none of these lists are free from suspicion. They were unknown in the middle of the 6th century to Cassiodorus, who collected the lists of canonical books current in his time, and still later to Isidore of Seville; and different copies of the Gelasian list vary in such a way as to suggest that they were not all derived from the same original. The letter of Innocent is found in the collection of Decretals attributed to Dionysius Exiguus, but that collection, as is well known, contains matter of a much later date than that of its supposed compilation (about 500). It is not, in fact, until the 8th century that we have distinct evidence of its existence, when it formed part of the Code sent to Charlemagne in the year 774 by Pope Hadrian I. The list of canonical books in the decree of Gelasius does not distinctly appear till about the 10th century. Both lists simply repeat the Canon of Carthage (Westcott, *Bible in Church*, 194 ff.). It is a remarkable instance of the rapid victory of usage over scholarship, that in the Codex Amiatinus (written about 541) of Jerome's Vulgate, the books of the Apocrypha are mixed with those of the Hebrew canon, against the express judgment of Jerome himself. But indications are not wanting, that the question of the value and authority of certain works was regarded in the Latin Church as distinct from that of ecclesiastical use.

The determination of the canon in Spain was a matter of unusual importance. The Priscillianists during the 5th century introduced a multitude of apocryphal writings, which it was one of the chief cares of the orthodox bishops to destroy. The Arian Goths probably rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, as well as the Apocrypha of the Old Testament. On their conversion, they bound themselves to accept the Roman canon, as well as other decrees of the see of Rome. Isidore of Seville (†636) follows Augustine expressly in dealing with the Old Testament Apocrypha, and reckons among "Canonical Scriptures" books which the Hebrews do not receive (see *Origines*, vi. 2.) In the list which he gives (Kirchhofer's *Quellensammlung*, p. 505), the books of the Old Testament are enumerated exactly as in the English canon, except that Job and Esther are placed after Solomon's Song. After Malachi, he adds, without any mark of distinction, "Judith et Tobias et Machabaeorum Libri quibus auctoribus scripti sunt minime constat." Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and the apocryphal books of Esdras, do not seem to be mentioned at all. In the New Testament, after the Gospels and Acts, he proceeds, "Pauli Epistol. xiv, novem ecclesiis, reliquae discipulis scriptae. Ad Hebraeos a plerisque Latinis ejus esse dubitatur, propter dissonantiam sermonis; eandem alii Barnabae, alii Clementi adscribunt. Jacobi, Petri ii., Cath. Judae et Johannis. Johannis Apocalypsis. Caetera Apocrypha." He seems therefore to have acknowledged only one epistle of St. John.

<sup>b</sup> Canon Westcott has however pointed out (*art. CANON*, p. 265) that his language is inconsistent on this point.

The code which Charlemagne gave at Aix for the government of the Church was founded upon that which he received from Pope Hadrian as mentioned above. In this it was enjoined that "the Canonical Books only be read in the Church;" but it does not appear that any definite list was given, though in the printed editions the list of *Laodicea* was appended. Alcuin, the well-known English scholar (†804), Charlemagne's chief literary adviser, was commissioned towards the close of his life to undertake a revision of the Latin Bible for public use. He restored in a great measure Jerome's text in those books which Jerome had translated, but did not separate the Apocrypha. Several MSS. remain which claim to be derived from Alcuin's revision. One of the finest of these, known as "Charlemagne's Bible," is in the British Museum. A peculiarity of this copy is, that it contains the apocryphal Letter to the Laodiceans as a fifteenth Epistle of St. Paul. [C.]

#### CANONICAL HOURS. [HOURS OF PRAYER.]

**CANONICI.** The canonical clergy have occupied an intermediate position between the monks and the secular clergy. As living together under a rule of their own they were often regarded popularly as a species of monks; while, inasmuch as their rule was less strict, and their seclusion from the world less complete, they were sometimes, from a monastic point of view, classed even with the laity, as distinguished from those who were "religious." Thus the colleges of the "canonici" were sometimes called "monasteria" (Hospin. *De Monach.* iii. vi. p. 72 b.); while Dudo (*De Act. Norman.* iii. v.) broadly dividing Christians into "regular" or "contemplative," and "secular" or practical places "canonici" among the "secular" (Du Cange, *Gloss. Latinit.* s. voce). The canonici did not fully assume this quasi-monastic character till the 8th century. The theory which would trace them back as a monastic order to St. Augustine, and which ascribes to him the Augustinian Rule scarcely needs refutation (Hospin. *De Monach.* iii. vi. p. 71 b.; Bingh. *Origin. Eccles.* vii. ii. § 9).

The "canonici" were at first the clergy and other officials attached to the church, and were so called either as bound by canons (v. Du Cange, s. c.), or more probably as enrolled on the list of ecclesiastical officers, *κανόν*, *matricula*, *albus*, *tabula* (Socr. *H. E.* i. 17; Theod. *Lect. H. E.* i. p. 553; *Conc. Chalced.* 451 A.D. c. 2; Vales. *ad Socr. H. E.* v. 19; Bingh. i. v. § 10). Du Cange explains the word by the "canon" *σπορυαή*; a certain proportion (one-fourth) of the aims of the faithful set apart for the maintenance of the clergy and other officers of the church (*Conc. Apath.* 506 A.D. c. 36; *Aurel.* iii. 548 A.D. c. 11; *Narbon.* 589 A.D. cc. 10, 12). Another, but most improbable derivation is from *κωνωνικολ* (Du Cange, s. v.). A passage is cited by Du Cange from the life of Antony attributed to Augustine—*ἐτίμα τὸν κανόνα*—to show that the word was equivalent to "clerus." But "canonici" was at first a more comprehensive word than "clerus," embracing all who held ecclesiastical offices, as readers, singers, porters, &c. (Thomass. *Vet. et Nov. Discipl.* i. ii. 34; Bingh. i. v. § 10).

Some bishops even before the 5th century, for instance Eusebius of Vercellae, Ambrose of Milan, the great Augustine, and Martin of Tours, set an example of monastic austerity to the clergy domiciled with them, which became widely popular (*Conc. Tolet.* ii. A.D. 531, c. 1; *Turon.* ii. A.D. 567, c. 12). Gelasius I. at the close of the 5th century founded an establishment of "canonici regulares" at Rome in the Lateran (Hospin. III. vi. p. 72 b.; Bingh. VII. ii. § 9). In 531 A.D. the 2nd Council of Toledo speaks of schools conducted by the "canonici" wherein the scholars lived "in domo ecclesiae sub Episcopi praesentiâ" (cc. 1, 2); and, before the end of the same century, the 3rd Council of Toledo orders the Scriptures to be read aloud in the refectory of the priests, "sacerdotali convivio" (c. 7). A similar phrase, "mensa canonica," is quoted by Du Cange from Gregory of Tours (*Hist. x. ad fin.*) in reference to the "canonici" established by Baudinus, archbishop of Tours, in the 6th century, and from a charter granted by Chilpéric in 580 A.D. (*Miraei Diplom. Belg.* II. 1310, ap. Du Cange, s. v.). In the 3rd Council of Orleans, A.D. 538, the "canonici" are forbidden secular business (*Conc. Aurel.* III. c. 11). The college in which the canons resided, or rather the church to which the college was attached, is styled "canonica" in a charter 724 A.D. (*Chart. Langob.* Brunett. p. 470, ap. Du Cange, s. v.).

Bishops, especially for missions, were frequently chosen out of the monasteries; and these naturally surrounded themselves with monks. In the words of Montalembert many a bishopric was "cradled" in a monastery. Thus in Armoria "the principal communities formed by the monastic missionaries (from Britain in the 5th century) were soon transformed into bishoprics." (*Monks of the West*, II. 273.) In countries which owed their Christianity to monks, the monastery and the cathedral rose side by side, or under one roof. But cathedral-monasteries are, strictly speaking, almost peculiar to England (Stubbs, *Introd. to Epp. Cantuar.* xxi.); for, while elsewhere, for the most part, either the cathedral or the monastery ousted the other, in England many of the cathedrals retained their monastic, more exactly their quasi-monastic character till the Reformation. Usually it was the mother-church, as Canterbury or Lindisfarne, which thus adhered to its original institution, while the new cathedrals for the sub-divided diocese passed into the hands of the non-monastic clergy (Stubbs, v. *sup.* xxii.). In either case, as at Worcester, the cathedral clergy were the parochial clergy of the city (Stubbs. *The Cathedr. of Worcester in the 8th Century*, Communic. to the Historic. Sect. of the Instit. July, 1862). The result of this combination on the clergy generally, and on the monks, was twofold. On the one hand the clergy became, in the first instance, more monastic; on the other, a somewhat more secular tone was given for a time to the monasteries. But, as these cathedral-monasteries came to lose their missionary character, other monasteries arose, by a reaction of sentiment, of a less secular and of a more ascetic kind; e.g. in England, Crowland, and Evesham, in contrast to Peterborough and Worcester (Stubbs, v. *sup.*). By the Council of Clovesho, A.D. 747, all monasteries proper in England were placed under the Benedictine rule;



and thus the severance was defined of the chapters and the monasteries. (*Conc. Clovesh.* c. 24; cf. *Reg. S. Bened.* c. 58; cf. Mabill. *AA. O. S. B.* I. Praef. lvi.).

But Chrodegang, or Chrodogang, cousin of Pepin and archbishop of Metz, in the latter part of the 8th century, was virtually the founder of "canonici" as a semi-monastic order. By enforcing strict obedience to the Rule and the Superior he tightened the authority of the bishop over the clergy of his cathedral (*Reg. Chrodeg.* ap. Labb. *Conc.* vii. 1445). But, while retaining the monastic obligations of "obedience" and of "chastity," he relaxed that of poverty. His "canonici" were, like monks, to have a common dormitory and a common refectory (*Reg. Chrod.* c. 3; *Conc. Mogunt.* 813 A.D. c. 9). Like monks they were to reside within the cloister; and egress, except by the porter's gateway, was strictly forbidden (*Conc. Aquisgr.* 816 A.D. cc. 117, 144). But they were allowed a life interest in private property;<sup>a</sup> though after death it was to revert to the church to which they belonged; and, which is especially curious, they were not to forfeit their property, even for crimes and misdemeanours entailing otherwise severe penance. (*Reg. Chrod.* cc. 31, 32; cf. Stubbs, *Epp. Cantuar.* Introd. xxiv.) Thus the discipline of the cloister was rendered more palatable to the clergy; while a broad line of demarcation was drawn between them and monks (*Conc. Mogunt.* cc. 9, 10; *Conc. Turon.* III. c. 25). They were not to wear the monk's cowl (*Reg. Chrod.* c. 53, interpolated from *Conc. Aquisgr.* c. 125). The essential difference between a cathedral with its "canonici" and an abbey-church with its monks, has been well expressed thus: the "canonici" existed for the services of the cathedral, but the abbey-church for the spiritual wants of the recluses happening to settle there (Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, ii. 443).

Chrodegang's institution was eagerly adopted by the far-seeing Karl, in his reformation of ecclesiastical abuses; indeed he wished to force it on the clergy generally (Robertson's *Ch. Hist.* II. 200). He ordered the "canonici" to live "canonice," and to obey their bishop as abbat; a similar enactment was made at the Councils of Aachen, 788 A.D. and of Mentz, 813 A.D. (*Conc. Aquisgr.* cc. 27, 29; *Conc. Mogunt.* c. 9; cf. Du Cange, s. v.; Hospin. xxii. 154; Robertson's *Ch. Hist.* II. 198). It was evidently the great legislator's intention to make these colleges of canons instrumental for education (*Conc. Cabill.* 813 A.D. c. 3; Alteser. *Asceticon.* II. 1). Thus one of the principal canons was the "Scholasticus" (schoolmaster, or more properly, chancellor, Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, II. 443), and the buildings were arranged mainly to be used as schools (Hospin. p. 153-6).

The rule of Chrodegang in its integrity was shortlived. By the middle of the 9th century it was in force in most cathedrals of France, Germany, Italy, and, more partially, in England (Robertson's *Ch. Hist.* II. 200). But, though milder even than that mildest of monastic rules—the Benedictine—it was too severe to be generally accepted by the clergy, especially in England. In the 9th century (Robertson, II. 209), or, rather, by the end of the 8th (Stubbs, *Epp.*

<sup>a</sup> Also, the diet was more generous. (*Reg. Chrod.* c. 22; *Conc. Aquisgr.* 816 A.D. c. 122.)

*Cantuar.* Intr. xvii.), bodies of secular clerks, with the character if not the name of "canonici," had supplanted monks in many parts of England; but they soon lost the ground which they had gained. Partly, perhaps, from the popularity of monks with the laity in England, as the harbingers of Christianity, and as intimately connected with the history of the nation, partly from the repugnance of the clergy to asceticism, the "Lotharingian" rule never took root here<sup>b</sup> (Freeman, *v. sup.*, II. 85). According to William of Malmesbury (Stubbs, *De Invent. Cruc.* Intr. ix.), it never was accepted here. "An attempt was made to introduce it in the Legatine Council of 786, which probably went no farther in effect than to change the name of secular clerks into canons, and to turn secular abbots into deans" (Stubbs, *v. sup.* x.; *Conc. Calcyth.* c. 4.) By 1050 A.D. it was nearly obsolete in England (Stubbs, *v. sup.* ix.). Celibacy seems to have formed no integral part of the plan in the foundation of Waltham. (Freeman, *v. sup.* II. 443; Stubbs, *De Inv. Cruc.* xii.)

Even where it had been at first in vogue the Rule of Chrodegang was soon relaxed; nor were the efforts of Adalbero, Willigis, and others, effectual to restore it (Robertson's *Ch. Hist.* II. 477). The "canonici" became, first, a community dwelling together under the headship of the bishop, but not of necessity under the same roof with him; next, an "acephalous" community,—a laxity which had been specially condemned by the Council of Aachen, already mentioned (c. 101)—and, gradually, instead of representing the clergy of the diocese they developed into a distinct, and, sometimes, antagonistic body (Robertson, II. 476). As their wealth and influence increased they claimed a share in the government of the diocese (Robertson, II. 401). Trithemius speaks of the "Canonici Trevirenses" in the close of the 10th century, as both in name and in reality "seculares non regulares": and Hospinian protests against the very expression "canonici seculares,"<sup>c</sup> as a contradiction in terms, like "regulares irregulares." (Hospinian, *v. sup.* p. 73.)

The "Canons Regular of St. Augustine," founded by Ives of Chartres and others, in the 11th century, may be regarded as resulting from the failure of the attempts to force the canonical rule on the clergy of the cathedral and collegiate churches (Robertson's *Ch. Hist.* II. 708). These "canonici" differed but slightly from the monks; and, unlike the "canonici" of older date, resembled the monks in the renunciation of private property. This order was introduced into England very early in the 12th century by Adelwald, confessor of Henry 1st, but some assign an earlier date. At the Reformation there were, according to Hospinian (p. 73), more than 8000 "cecerobia canonicorum" in Europe; the number declined greatly afterwards. The various mediaeval subdivisions of "canonici," enumerated by Du Cange (s. v.) do not fall within our present scope. (See also Thomassini, *Vetus et Nova Disciplina*, I. iii.

<sup>b</sup> Till the 14th century these semi-regular, semi-secular foundations seem to have been uncongenial to the English. Harold, the founder of Waltham, is an exception. (Freeman, *Norm. Conq.* II. 445.)

<sup>c</sup> The expression "secular canons" sometimes occurs prematurely (e.g. in Freeman's *Norman Conquest*) where "secular clerks" would be more exact.

cc. 7-12; III. ii. c. 27; *Bibliothèque Sacrée*, par Richard et Girardin, s. v. Par. 1822; Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Chrétiennes*, Par. 1865).

*Canonicae* in the primitive church were devout women, taking charge of funerals and other works of charity (Socr. *H. E.* i. 17; Soz. *H. E.* viii. 23, cf. Justin. *Novell.* cc. 43, 59, ap. Menardi *Comm. in S. Bened. Anian. Conc. Reg.* c. 68). Though not originally bound by a vow, nor compelled to live in a community (Bingh. *Orig. Eccl.* VII. iv. § 1; but cf. Pelliccia *Eccl. Christ. Polit.* I. iii. 3, § 1), they lived apart from men, and had a special part of the church reserved for them in the public services (Du Cange, s. v.). In the 8th century the "*canonicae*," "*canonissae*," or "*canonichissae*," lived together after the example of the "*canonici*," being like them attached to particular churches (Pellic. I. iii. 4, § 1). They are distinguished from nuns (*Conc. Francof.* 794 A.D. cc. 46, 47); but, like nuns were strictly debarred from the society of men (*Conc. Aquisgr.* 816 A.D. c. 20; cf. *Conc. Cubill.* 813 A.D. c. 53). They were to occupy themselves specially, like the "*canonici*" in education (*Conc. Francof.* c. 40; *Conc. Aquisgr.* c. 22). See further *Magdeb. Centur.* viii. 6. The "*domicellae*" or secular canonesses are of later date (Du Cange, s. v.). (See also Thomass. *Vet. et Nov. Discipl.* I. iii. cc. 43, 51, 63; Alteserrae *Asceticon.* III. 3.) [I. G. S.]

#### CANONISTAE. [CANON LAW.]

CANONIZATION is defined by Ferraris (sub voc. *Veneratio Sanctorum*) to be a "public judgment and express definition of the Apostolic See respecting the sanctity and glory of one, who is thereupon solemnly added to the roll of the saints, and set forth for the public veneration of the whole Church militant, and the honours due to saints decreed to him." And it is distinguished by him from *Beatification*, which means, according to the same authority, a like "lawful grant by the pope to a particular kingdom, province, religious body, or place, to venerate and invoke, in the mass and by exposition of relics," &c., some particular person, deceased. Both, in this sense, date subsequently to the period of which the present work treats, the first formal canonization by a pope being said to be either that of St. Suibert by Pope Leo III. A.D. 804, at the request of Charlemagne (Ferraris, as above), or (which however depends on a letter said to be a forgery) that of Udalric, bishop of Augsburg, by diploma of Pope John XV. A.D. 993 (Mabill. *Act. SS. Ben. Saec. V. Pref.* § 101; Gibbings, *Praefect. on the Diptychs*, p. 33, Dubl. 1864). But canonization in some sense (= inserting in the Canon of the Mass) is the outgrowth of a practice of very early date (being alluded to by Tertullian, *1<sup>a</sup> Cor.* iii., and, earlier still, in the *Martyr. Polycarp.* xviii., ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 15), viz. that of reciting at a certain part of the Eucharistic service the names (among others) of deceased saints and martyrs [DIPTYCHS]; not for invocation ("non invocantur," St. Aug. *De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 10), but "in memory of those who have finished their course, and for the exercising and preparation of those who have yet to walk in their steps" (*Mart. S. Polyc.*). The authority by which a name was inserted in this list—the saint being then said to be "*vindicatus*" (Optat. *De Schism.*

*Donat.* i. 16)—was, until at least the 10th century, that of the bishop, with (no doubt) the consent of his clergy and people, and, as time went on, of the synod and metropolitan, and according to Mabillon (*Praef. in Act. SS. Bened.* p. 412), of the emperor or king. But the consent of the last named could only have been asked or given in cases of political importance, real or supposed. The last case of canonization by a metropolitan is said to have been that of St. Gaultier, or Gaucher, abbat of Pontoise, by the Archbishop of Rouen, A.D. 1153 (Gibbings, as above). And a decree of Pope Alexander III. A.D. 1170, gave the prerogative to the pope thenceforth, so far as the Western Church was concerned [CALENDAR; MARTYROLOGY; MENOLOGY]; who proceeded (acc. to Ferraris) in two ways, either by formally sanctioning local or other saints, who had long before been canonized in effect by common consent, or by initiating the process himself in new cases. "Canonizare" is also used to signify simply to "approve," or to "appoint to a canonry," or to enrol in the "canon" of the clergy, or to make a canon in a Council. (Salig. *De Diptychis*; Du Cange; Suicer; Ferraris, *Prompta Biblioth.*) [A. W. H.]

CANOPY. The fixed solid canopy, or *ciborium*, over the altar, has already been described under ALTAR, p. 65. It has been supposed, however, that the altar was sometimes anciently covered with a canopy of a lighter kind, as of silk. In the will of Abbot Aredius (in the *Works* of Gregory of Tours, p. 1313, ed. Ruinart), who died A.D. 591, we find, among other things declared necessary for a church, "*coopertorios holosericos tres; calices argenteos quatuor . . . item cooperturium lineum . . .*" These silken coverings Binterim (*Denkwürd.* vii. 3, 353) believes to be not altar-cloths, but canopies, while the "*cooperturium lineum*" is an altar-cloth, distinct from the corporal. Gregory of Tours also, a contemporary of Aredius, describing a dream or vision, says, "*cum jam altarium cum oblationibus pullio serico coopertum esset*," Guntchramn entered (*Hist. Franc.* vii. 22, p. 347, ed. Ruinart). Here again Binterim (*u. s.*) supposes that a canopy is intended, insisting on the words of Optatus (*De Schism. Donat.* vi. 1, p. 92), that it was a matter of notoriety that the boards of the altar were covered with linen. The words of Optatus, however, written of the African church in the 4th century, have but little application to Gallican customs at the end of the 6th, nor are they in fact contradictory to the words of Gregory; for the altar may have been first covered with linen, and the oblations upon it afterwards covered with a silken veil. This was probably the case; for a word derived from '*coopere*' would naturally refer to covering up closely, rather than to shading as a canopy does. Compare ALTAR-CLOTHS, p. 69. There can be little doubt that Mabillon and Ruinart are right in explaining the word *cooperturium* of an altar-covering or VEIL. The "*cooperturium Sarmaticum*," which Gregory rejected (*De Vitis Patrum*, p. 8, 1195), seems to have been intended for a similar use.

The custom of carrying a canopy over the pope in certain processions does not seem to be mentioned earlier than the 12th century (see *Ordo Romanus XI.* 17, 126; 40, 136); and the



These canticles are said with an antiphon, in the same manner as the psalms.

Other Western breviaries use a greater variety of canticles: thus the Benedictine and other monastic breviaries of the same type, have three canticles instead of psalms, in the third nocturn on Sundays and festivals.

In the Office of the Greek Church, the following nine canticles, called *odes* (ὕμναι), are appointed at Lauds:—

- (1) The Song of Moses in Exodus (Ex. xv. 1-19).
- (2) The Song of Moses in Deut. (Deut. xxxii. 1-43).
- (3) The Prayer of Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 1-10).
- (4) The Prayer of Hezekiah (Isa. li. 3-19).
- (5) The Prayer of Isaiah (Is. xvi. 5-20).
- (6) The Prayer of Jonah (Jon. ii. 3-9).
- (7) The Prayer of the Three Holy Children (Dan. iii. 3-34). [In Apocry.]
- (8) The Song of the Three Holy Children. [Sextonary.]
- (9) Magnificat and Benedictus.

These are assigned:—(1) to Sunday and Monday; (2) to Tuesday; (3) to Wednesday; (4) to Thursday; (5) to Friday; (6) and (7) to Saturday; (8) and (9) are said at a different time.

*Benedictus* and *Benedictus* were in early times sung in some masses: the former before the prophecy in some early Gallican masses; the latter is prescribed in the 4th Council of Toledo to be sung before the epistle on Sundays and festivals of martyrs.

"Te Deum" is the only composition not taken from Holy Scripture, which is usually considered a canticle. Some ritualists, however, think it should be reckoned among hymns.

For a fuller collection of canticles see the Mozarabic breviary, and Thomasius, vol. ii.

[H. J. H.]

**CANTICUM EVANGELICUM.** "Benedictus" was sometimes so called, probably to distinguish it from the other canticle said at Lauds, which is taken from the Old Testament. The expression occurs in a MS. Pontifical of the Church of Poitiers of about 800 A.D., and elsewhere.

[H. J. H.]

**CANTICUM GRADUUM.** The Gradual Psalms were sometimes so-called. They were recited in the following order: the first five with *Requiem aeternam*, &c., and followed by a few versicles, were said "pro defunctis." The next ten each with "Gloria;" five "pro congregatione," and five "pro familiaribus;" each group being followed by a few versicles and a collect.

[H. J. H.]

**CANTOR.** (*Psalmista*, ψάλτης, ψαλτηστής, ψάδης)

Among the clerici of the ancient Church are to be reckoned, as a distinct order, the Cantores or Psalmists, whose institution dates, it would seem, from the 4th century. They are mentioned in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, so called (ii. 25, § 12; iii. 11; viii. 10, § 2, etc.) and in the *Apostolical Canons* (cc. 26, 43, 89). In the fifteenth canon of the council of Laodicea, A.D. 365, they are called *κατασκευαστοὶ ψάλλοντες*, i.e. singers enrolled in the canon or catalogue of clergy, to whom the office of singing in the church was then restricted. The reason of their appointment seems to have been to regulate and encourage the ancient psalmody of the Church. There can be no question

† So distinguished in the titles.

but that from the apostolical age, singing formed a part of the public worship, the whole congregation joining, as in the prayers; but when it was found by experience that the negligence and unskillfulness of the general body of the people rendered them unfit to perform this service without instruction and guidance, it was resolved to set apart a peculiar order of men for the singers' office, not with a view to abolish the ancient psalmody, but to retrieve and improve it. That the restriction imposed by the council of Laodicea must be regarded as a temporary provision, designed only to revive and develop the ancient psalmody, then falling into decay, appears from the facts collected by S. Augustine, Chrysostom, Basil, and others, that in their own age the custom of congregational singing was again generally observed in the churches.

As to the form of ordination by which the cantores were set apart for their office, this was done, as in the case of the other inferior orders, without imposition of hands; but in one thing it differed from the others, that whereas the latter were usually conferred by the bishop or a chorepiscopus, this order might be conferred by a presbyter, using the form of words following, as given in the 4th council of Carthage, c. 10: "See that thou believe in thy heart what thou singest with thy mouth, and approve in thy works what thou believest in thy heart." [Compare CONFESSOR, § 4.] Bingham, iii. 7; Martene de Ant. Eccl. Ritibus l. c. viii. art. 8, § 4. [D. B.]

**CANTUARIENSE CONCILIUM.** [CANTUARY.]

CAPA or CAPPA. [COPE.]

**CAPITOLINI.** A name of reproach applied by the Novatians to the Catholics, because the latter charitably resolved, in their synods, to receive into communion again, upon their sincere repentance, such as had offered sacrifice in the Capitol (Bingham, b. i. c. 8). [D. B.]

**CAPITULA.** The name of a prayer in the Mozarabic breviary immediately preceding the Lord's Prayer, which in this rite occurs near the end of the office. It changes with the day and office, and also varies much in length, but has no special characteristics to distinguish it from other Mozarabic prayers. The corresponding prayer in the Mass, not however called by this name, is directed to be said "ad orationem dominicam." Baronius, referring to an epistle of Pope Vigilius, observes that formerly the word *Capitulum* was used of "preces quaedam prolixiores in honorem Sanctorum vel Solennitatum." [H. J. H.]

**CAPITULARE.** [ANTIPHONARIUM, p. 100.]

**CAPITULARY.** The term "Capitulary" means a set or collection of capitula or little chapters. It is applied to the laws and ordinances of the early Frankish sovereigns, because the laws enacted at one time and place were usually collected and published in a continuous series. The collective series was called a "Capitulary;" the several laws which were the members of the series were called "Capitula." The term has not in itself any ecclesiastical meaning, being also applicable to temporal laws. But, as a fact, the majority (though by no means the whole) of the Frankish Capitula were of an ecclesiastical character.



The edition of Baluze<sup>a</sup> begins with Childert's *Constitution for the Abolition of Idolatry*, 554 A.D. This is followed by various other capitula of the first race of kings, viz. of Lothaire I. and II., Dagobert, and Sigebert. Crime, slavery, marriage, contracts, pledges, judicial and ecclesiastical regulations, all find place among these laws, which furnish some interesting evidence of the religious, political, and social condition of France. They show strong traces of clerical influence, in the care which they take of ecclesiastical interests. The Merovingian princes were rude and unlearned, and were glad to make use of the abilities and learning of the priesthood: they were also dissolute, and perhaps glad to compound for their excesses by gratifying the priesthood; and both these causes conspired to throw wealth and power into episcopal hands. Nor was this state of things wholly without its advantages. The influence of the clergy mitigated the ferocity of the nobles, and it has been suggested that the humane tone of portions of the Merovingian laws is probably due to the part which they took in the formation of them.

It may be briefly mentioned that the following subjects appear repeatedly and with prominence:

The right of sanctuary in churches. The crime of doing violence to churches or monastic houses. The crime of violence to the persons or property of the clergy or monks.<sup>b</sup> The right freely conferred on all men, without restraint, of making gifts of land or other property to the Church. The duty of a strict observance of the Lord's day.<sup>c</sup>

It is impossible, however, here to discuss these laws in detail. Indeed, in the judgment of Guizot, they hardly deserve it. Civilisation during the Merovingian dynasty persistently declined, and in the Church the bishops came by degrees to constitute an irresponsible and ill-organized aristocracy,—the power of the Metropolitans and of the State having gradually declined.

We come next to a few Capitularies in the nominal reign of Childéric III., but in reality the work of Carloman and Pepin, and then to the Capitularies of Pepin le Bref as sovereign of the Franks in the year 752.

Of these latter Baluze gives five or six, but Hallam notices that only one is expressly said to be made "in generali populi conventu." The

<sup>a</sup> Guizot speaks of this as, when he wrote, the best edition, but still only to be regarded as the materials for a really correct and satisfactory edition of the Capitularies. Since that time the voluminous and elaborate work of Pertz has appeared, in which the Capitularies have been re-edited from MS. authority, and several unpublished by Baluze added to the number. This is therefore probably now the standard edition; but the references in this article have been kept to the work of Baluze, because it is more portable, and probably more accessible, and because Guizot's references are always made to it.

<sup>b</sup> "In all temporal affairs the Theodosian Code was the universal law of the clergy. But the barbaric jurisprudence had liberally provided for their personal safety: a subdeacon was equivalent to two Franks; the antrustion and priest were held in similar estimation; and the life of a bishop was appreciated far above the common standard, at the price of 900 pieces of gold" (Gibbon, vol. vi. chap. xxxviii.).

<sup>c</sup> This subject recurs continually in the Capitularies.

rest appear to be due to synods; but it would, perhaps, be rash to conclude positively that they may not, in some cases, have had some kind of subsequent assent from the lay Counts.<sup>d</sup>

It is, perhaps, hardly quite correct to say that the Capitularies of Pepin "relate without exception to ecclesiastical affairs" (Hallam, *Med. Ages*, vol. i. chap. ii. part 2). Not only are they concerned with questions of marriage and kindred matters, which perhaps are quasi-ecclesiastical, but one or two deal with tolls, with the regulation of money, with parricide, and with the administration of justice as well secular as spiritual. The general complexion, however, is ecclesiastical. Amongst other things, two synods are to be held annually, and detailed regulations are made as to the rights of bishops, abbots, monks, and clergy.

The continuance in the laws of Pepin, and, as we shall see, in those of Charlemagne, of the same strong ecclesiastical type which is found in those of the Merovingians, is perhaps due, amongst other causes, to the desire to attract the Church to the side of the new dynasty. "In order to encounter and subvert the reverence which was still yielded to a merely titular monarch, the supposed descendant of the gods, it was necessary to enlist on their own side religious feelings of a far deeper nature, and of a much more solemn significance." (Sir J. Stephen, *Lect. on Hist. of France*, vol. i. p. 84.)

From the time of Pepin, however, the Sovereign Power set itself not only to advance the interests of the Church, but to correct its disorders. The strengthening of the Metropolitan authority and that of the Crown were among the means used for reorganizing the system.

We turn next to the important and copious legislation of Charlemagne.

The public Capitularies of Charlemagne are reckoned by Guizot at sixty in number. Five other documents of a more private character may also claim, in the opinion of that writer, a right to the name.<sup>e</sup> Nearly all these Capitularies contain a large number of Capitula, or distinct articles in each of them. These amount in all to 1150, and are upon very various subjects, even when included in the same Capitulary. Guizot classifies—

80	under Moral Legislation,
273	" Political "
130	" Penal "
110	" Civil "
85	" Religious "
309	" Canonical "
73	" Domestic "
12	" Occasional "

Under the first head he places such articles as: "Turpe lucrum exercent qui per varias cir-

<sup>d</sup> Comp. the 2nd Capit. of Carloman, A.D. 743, which begins:—"Modo autem in hoc synodali conventu, qui congregatus est ad Kalendas Martias in loco qui dicitur Liptenas, omnes venerabiles sacerdotes Dei et comites et praecepti prioris synodi decreta consentienter firmaverunt, seque ea implere velle et observare promiserunt" (Baluze, l. 149).

<sup>e</sup> Baluze's collection contains many errors, but this is due to the loose use of the word "capitulary." Pertz of course gives more still; and some of these last might probably be fairly considered as of a public character, and added to the computation of Guizot.

conventiones lucrandi causa inhoneste res quaslibet congregare decertant" (Baluze i. 454). This is the 16th capitulum of a Capitulary made A.D. 806. It is rather a maxim of ethics than an edict or law.

Religious legislation in the above classification is such as relates not to ecclesiastics alone, but to all the faithful. In some points this resembles the moral in its tone. Thus we find:

"Ut nullus credat quòd nonnisi in tribus linguis (probably Latin, Greek, and German) Deus orandus sit: quia in omni lingua Deus adoratur, et homo exauditur, si juste petierit" (Baluze i. 270). This is No. 50 of a set put forth A.D. 794.

Canonical legislation is the term for what concerns the relations of the clergy among themselves. The tendency of this class of Capitula is to uphold the power of the bishops. Even the monastic bodies are to be in subordination to them.<sup>f</sup> In fact, Charlemagne appears to have considered that by reducing all the clergy under the episcopate, and then exercising a personal influence over the bishops himself, he was providing the best remedy for the condition of the Church, which was one of much disorganisation. He aimed at a stronger and more pervading discipline, not by reducing the episcopal powers, but by taking care that their vast powers were well exercised.

With the other heads of the classification we have not here to do, except in so far as under the title of "Political Legislation" some regulations are found as to the relation of the secular and ecclesiastical powers. These tend to show that Charlemagne, while giving great power to the bishops, consulting with them on church matters, and using their learning and intelligence for the general purposes of his government, was careful not to become their tool, nor to subject his own authority to theirs. "The laws which fix the obligations, the revenues, even the duties of the clergy, are issued in the name of the emperor; they are monarchical and imperial, not papal or synodical canons" (Milman. *Lat. Christ.* book v. chap. 1). In return for his having confirmed the system of tithes by a law of the empire, Charlemagne "assumed the power of legislating for the clergy with as full despotism as for the laity," though "in both cases there was the constitutional control of the concurrence of the nobles and of the higher ecclesiastics, strong against a feeble monarch, feeble against a sovereign of Charlemagne's overruling character. His institutes are in the language of command to both branches of that great ecclesiastical militia, which he treated as his vassals, the secular and the monastic clergy." — *Ibid.*

In any inquiry, however, on the subject of Capitularies, it is necessary to bear in mind the extremely loose use of the word which prevails in Baluze and other editors. Guizot has pointed out that they apply this title equally to no less than twelve distinct kinds of documents. "We find in their collections of so-called Capitularies" — he says —

"1. Ancient laws revived. (*Bal.* i. 281.)

<sup>f</sup> See 4th Capitulare, A.D. 806, cap. ii. (*Bal.* i. 450), and 1st Capitulare, A.D. 802, cap. xv. (*Bal.* i. 366). Pepin had laid down the same principle (*Bal.* i. 160).

- "2. Extracts from ancient laws put together for some special purpose. (*Ibid.* i. 395.)
- "3. Additions to ancient laws (amounting probably to new laws. (*Ibid.* i. 387.)
- "4. Extracts from previous Canons. (*Ibid.* i. 209.)
- "5. New laws properly so called.
- "6. Instructions given by Charlemagne to his *Missi*, to guide them in their duties. (*Ibid.* i. 243.)
- "7. Answers given by Charlemagne to questions from counts, bishops, &c., as to practical difficulties in their administration. (*Ibid.* i. 401.)
- "8. Questions drawn up in order to be proposed for discussion to the bishops or counts at the next assembly, *e. g.*, 'To ascertain on what occasions and in what places the ecclesiastics and the laity seek, in the manner stated, to impede each other in the exercise of their respective functions. To inquire and discuss up to what point a bishop or an abbot is justified in interfering in secular affairs, and a count or other layman with ecclesiastical affairs. To interrogate them closely on the meaning of those words of the Apostle: "No man that warreth for the law entangleth himself with the affairs of this life." Inquire to whom these words apply.' (*Ibid.* i. 477.)
- "9. Sometimes the so-called Capitula seem to be little more than memoranda. (*Ibid.* i. 395.) (Perhaps, however, this class is identical in reality with Class 6.)
- "10. Judicial decrees. (*Ibid.* i. 398.)
- "11. Regulations for the management of the royal lands and possessions. (*Ibid.* i. 331.)
- "12. Matters of an executive and administrative rather than legislative nature. (*Ibid.* i. 26, in Art. 1, 6, 7, 8, 53, 54.)"

It is obvious that a very different kind of sanction might be required for some of them from that which would be needed for others. No general rule can therefore be laid down applicable to all. Nor even in respect to those which are in the strictest sense legislative is it easy to discern an uniform constitutional procedure.

As regards ecclesiastical matters, it may probably be considered that the prelates were always consulted, though in most cases the initiative, and in all cases the final, authorization came from the Sovereign. Thus a Capitulary A.D. 813 of Canonical Rules is entitled—

"Capitula de confirmatione constitutionum quas episcopi in synodis auctoritate regia nuper habitis constituerant."

If it could be safely assumed that all legislative Capitularia, on whatever subject, had the collective assent of one of the General Assemblies held in every year, it would follow that ecclesiastical laws had the assent of the laity.<sup>g</sup> For

<sup>g</sup> See Baluze, Preface, §§ 7-9. He suggests that some of the apparent exceptions consist of capitula which are mere extracts from ancient Church Councils, and which therefore the royal authority may have been deemed competent to promulgate. In some other instances, he thinks

in these assemblies, counts and great men, as well as prelates, were present. Hincmar, in an important document at the close of the ninth century (Guizot, *Lect.* 20), gives some account of these assemblies, and says that it was in the option of the lay and ecclesiastical lords to sit together or separately, according to the affairs of which they had to treat—ecclesiastical, secular, or both. From this it might at first appear that canonical matters were considered by the clergy alone, but perhaps this may be rather understood of the previous discussion and preparation of the law. If so, it is consistent with its being finally submitted for the consent and approbation of the whole assembly.

The further question, as to which much controversy has taken place, whether the lesser freeholders had a share in legislation, and if so, whether their voice was given in the assembly, or when the Capitularies passed by the assembly were subsequently proclaimed locally in the different districts, is a matter rather of political inquiry, and hardly belongs to the subject of the present work. It is discussed by Hallam (*Middle Ages*, chap. ii. part II.), where references will be found to other authorities.

Upon the whole, it must always be borne in mind that in that early state of society—a state in which the master-mind of Charlemagne was reducing to something like order very chaotic elements—we must not expect to find any pedantic exactness of constitutional law. The will of the Sovereign was the motive power of the whole system, but before exercising it he availed himself of the advice of the counsellors who were most likely to be of service: so far all is clear. The extent to which he submitted every legislative regulation to the whole body of the assembly, held, with certain modifications, twice in the year, is a matter on which it is more difficult to speak positively. Perhaps the practice even as to legislative regulations was not uniform, while certainly the boundary between legislative and executive regulations was very ill-defined.

On the reception accorded to the Capitularies by the Church, and the quasi-canonical authority at-

tributed to them, much information will be found in the Preface of Baluze, § 18 et seq. See also the letter of Leo IV. in Gratian, *Dist.* 10, c. 9.

Capitularies subsequent to the reign of Charlemagne do not fall within our limits. The latest are those of Carloman in 882, after which there is a long blank in French legislation.

It does not seem that a formal collection of the Capitularies was made till they were edited in four books by Angese, Abbot of Fontenella, who died in 833. These four books contain the laws of Charlemagne, and a portion of those of Louis le Debonnaire. Charles the Bald cites this work as a code of authority. Subsequently Benedict, a deacon of Mayence, about the year 842, added three more books. These, however, contain fragments of Roman and canon law, besides the Capitularies of the Carolingian kings. Four supplements again have been added by anonymous compilers.

*Authorities.*—*Capitularia Regum Francorum. Additas sunt Marculfi monachi et aliorum formulas veteres et notae doctissimorum virorum. Stephanus Baluzius Tutelensis in unum collegit, ad vetustissimos codices manuscriptos emendavit, magnam partem nunc primum edidit, notis illustravit.* Parisiis, 1677 (2 vols.). Guizot's *Lectures on the History of Civilization in France*, translated by Hazlitt. Bogue, 1846. Hallam's *Middle Ages*. Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, Art. "Capitularen." Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, tom. i. Legum. Hanover, 1835. [B. S.]

**CAPITULUM, CAPITULARE**, = κεφάλαιον.—(1) Properly, a summary or heading, under which many particulars are arranged; "brevis multorum complexio" (*Papias ap. Du Cange*). Hence (2), in the plural, codes of law, ecclesiastical or civil, digested under chapters or *capitula* (so used in *Cod. Theodos.*). And inasmuch as these mostly applied to special emergent cases not adequately met by existing general laws, *Capitula* came to mean *Addimenta et Appendices legum*. So the *Capitula* or *Capitularia* of Charlemagne and his successors, mostly passed in mixed assemblies of clergy and laity. (3) The word came also to mean the (usually short) "chapter" itself, of which it was properly the heading. As, e.g. the *capitula* or short lessons (e.g. from the Psalms) for particular days, mentioned in the Council of Agde, A.D. 506, can. 21, and by Pope Vigilius, A.D. 538 × 555, *Epist.* 2; called also *Capitella* in the same Council of Agde, can. 30. And *Capitulare Evangeliorum in circulo Anni* was a list of the beginnings and endings of the Gospels for the Church year. So also, again (besides our modern use of the word "chapter"), the *Capitula* of a Monastic Rule. (4) And from this last-mentioned usage, coupled with the practice of reading a *capitulum* or chapter of the Rule, or (as was St. Augustine's practice) of the Scriptures, to the assembled canons or monks, the assembled canons or monks themselves came to be called, in a body, the *capitulum* or chapter [CHAPTER], and their meeting-place the chapter-house. And in process of time the term in this sense became limited to the cathedral chapter: "*Capitulum* dicitur respectu ecclesiae cathedralis; *conventus* respectu ecclesiae regularis; *collegium* respectu ecclesiae inferioris ubi est collectio viventium in communi" (Lyndwood). *Congregatio* was the earlier term. [A. W. H.]

capitularies may in the first instance have been put forth by the sole authority of the sovereign, but subsequently submitted to the general assemblies for their recognition and consent, where such a step seemed to be expedient. Butler says, "They (the Capitularies) were generally promulgated in public assemblies composed of the sovereign and the chief men of the nation, as well ecclesiastics as secular" (*Horae Juridicae*, p. 129, edit. 1807).

In one case, in the reign of Childéric III., in a capitulary due to Pepin, we read that synods are to be held annually, "ut haeresis amplius in populo non resurgat, sicut invenimus in Adalberto haeresim, quem publiciter una voce condemnauerunt xxiii. episcopi et alii multi sacerdotes cum consensu Principis et populi," &c. (Bal. l. 157). Here the laity seem to have had a consentient voice even in so purely spiritual a matter as heresy.

Hallam notices the more frequent mention of "general consent" in the capitularies of Charlemagne, as compared with those of his predecessors (*Middle Ages*, vol. i. p. 215, 216, ed. 1855). On the other hand, the author of the article "Capitulariae" in Herzog thinks that Hincmar's words point to a separation made by Charlemagne between the clergy and laity, so that the former obtained a right to make "leges ecclesiasticae," as distinguished from capitularies (for which latter general assent was still needful); but subject to a veto on the part of the sovereign.

**Chrodegang**, bishop of Metz († 766), in his *Rule* (c. 18) desires the canons of his order to assemble after prime, to hear a reading of a martyrology or some similar work; on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and on saints' days, treatises or homilies of an edifying kind were to precede this reading; on other days, the *Rule* itself, or a portion of it. Similar directions are frequent in later statutes. This assembly was called *capitulum*. (Martene, *De Antiq. Eccl. Ritibus*, lib. iv. c. vii. § 4.) See also the *Life* of Benedict of Aniane by Ardo, c. 52 (in *Acta SS. Bened. saec. iv. pt. 1*). In the *Life* of Germar, abbot of Flaviacum († 658?), the *third* hour is mentioned as the time for holding capitulum (c. 15, in *Acta SS. Ben. saec. ii.*); so in Adrevaldus, *De Mirac. S. Bened.* (c. 28, *ib.*). Dunstan (*Concordia*, cc. 1 and 5) desires capitulum to be held after prime in summer, after terce in winter. This seems to be in accordance with the intentions of St. Benedict: for one object of the capitulum was the distribution of the day's labour among the brethren; and according to his *Rule*, c. 48, labour was to begin after prime in summer, after terce in winter.

The place of holding the capitulum seems anciently (according to the *Ordo Conversat. Monast.* c. 3) to have been the cloister; but see CHAPTER-HOUSE. [C.]

(5) The "little Chapter," said at all the canonical hours excepting Matins, after the psalms. It consists of one or two verses of Scripture, usually taken from the Epistles, whence the corresponding passage in the Ambrosian breviary is called *Epistolella*. It is often taken from the Prophets, and occasionally from other parts of Scripture. It is recited by the officiating priest, standing, and is not preceded by a *Benediction*. At the end "Deo Gratias" is said. See (3) above.

(6) An anthem in the Ambrosian rite said at Lauds after the psalms and before the antiphon, and varying with the day. That for ordinary Sundays is "Cantate Domino canticum novum: laudatio ejus in ecclesia sanctorum." It is also said at the lesser hours, and at Compline following the *Responsio brevis*, after the *Epistolella*. [H. J. H.]

[Du Cange; Mayer, *Diss.* in his *Thes. Nov. Stat. &c.*, *Eccles. Cathedr. et Colleg. in Germaniâ*; Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*.]

**CAPRASIIUS**, martyr at Agen, is commemorated Oct. 20 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

**CAPSA**, also **CAPSULA**, **CAPSELLA**. A box or case. The name is applied to several kinds of caskets for ecclesiastical use.

1. The casket used to contain the unconsecrated elements. According to the direction of the *Ordo Romanus I.* c. 8, two acolytes bear in the procession before the pope, when about to celebrate, "capsas cum sanctis apertas." On this passage Binterim (*Denkwürdigkeiten*, vii. 1, 369) observes that by 'sancta' in the neuter plural we are to understand, not the consecrated Body of the Lord, but the yet unconsecrated Elements, which the acolytes bore before the mass, just as after it they carried off the remains of the oblations in 'sacculi.' This procession corresponds, in fact, to the 'Greater Entrance' of the Greeks, in which the elements are borne in

CHRIST. ANT.

solemn procession from the sacristy to the Holy Table.

2. Capsa sometimes designates the vessel in which the reserved Eucharist was borne from one place to another. The seventeenth canon of the council of Orange enjoins, "cum capsae et calix offerendus est, et admistione Eucharistiae consecrandus" [CONSECRATION]. The meaning of this, Mabillon (*Comm. Praev. in Ord. Rom.* p. cxxxix) considers to be that, together with the 'capsa' containing the sacred vessels and perhaps the Eucharist, the chalice was also to be brought to the altar. The word **TURRIS** is used in a similar sense. Compare **TABERNACLE**.

3. A repository or **SHRINE** (Fr. *châsse*) for preserving the relics of saints. The legates of the Apostolic See in their letter to Hormisdas (in *Hormisdas Epistolae*, p. 475, Migne) say that they suggested the making of shrines (capsellas) for the relics of each of the apostles severally in the church of the Apostles at Constantinople. In the description of the altar built by St. Benedict at Aniane, we read that an opening was made in the back of it for inserting the 'capsae' which contained relics of saints (*Acta SS. Feb. ii. 614*). Compare **ALTAR**, p. 64.

4. A casket to contain the book of the Gospels. Ado of Vienne speaks (*Chronicon*, A.D. 519) of twenty "capsae evangeliorum" of gold, richly jewelled [LITURGICAL BOOKS]. [C.]

**CAPSARIUM**. The room in which the capsae containing relics were placed. Perpetuus of Tours (circa A.D. 490), in his will (D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, v. 105) distinguishes a reliquary which he left to a friend from another gilded 'theca' which was in his capsarium, and which he left to the church (Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v.). [C.]

**CAPSUM**. The nave of a church. Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 14) describes a certain church as having thirty-two windows in the sanctuary, twenty in the nave (in capso). (Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v.) [C.]

**CAPTATOIRES**. The leaving by testament the institution of an heir to the secret will of another was by the Roman law termed a *captatoria institutio*, and forbidden (see Dig. bk. xxviii. t. v. ll. 70, 71, 81; Code, bk. vii. t. xxii. l. 11). In a less technical sense, however, the *captator* answered substantially to our legacy-hunter, and the scandal is one which seems to have been rife in the early church—as indeed the satirists shew it to have been in the heathen world of the day. Perhaps we may see a germ of it in what St. Paul says (ii. Tim. iii. 1, 2) of the "covetous" who shall be "in the last days," adding, "for of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women" (v. 6), though his description applies mainly to dishonest and selfish teachers. By the end of the 4th century, at any rate, Christian emperors had to legislate against it. A law of Valentinian, Valera, and Gratian (A.D. 370) in the Theodosian Code, enacted that clerics or professors of continence were not to frequent the houses of widows and female wards, but should be banished by public judgment, if the relatives of such females should deem fit to prosecute them; nor should any such persons receive aught from the woman with whom they might become connected



under pretext of religion, by any kind of liberality, or by her last will; but any bequest to them from such females should be void, nor could they take under any trust either by donation or testament. Should anything be so given or left to them after the date of the law, the public exchequer was to receive it. Another law in the same Code (l. 27), of Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius (A.D. 390), contains special provisions as to liberalities by deaconesses, who amongst other things were forbidden to nominate as their heirs any church, cleric, or poor man; this however was partly revoked a few months later (l. 28 *ib.*) by the same emperors, so far as allowing the enjoyment of certain articles of personal use by clerics or servants, under the name of a church (Bingham does not seem quite to have understood the bearing of this last enactment). These laws, although as will be seen, they did not hold their ground in the state, are remarkable from the reference to them in one of Jerome's best known letters (*Ep.* 2, ad Nepotianum): "Shameful to say, the priests of idols, actors, charioteers, harlots receive inheritances; only to clerics and monks is this forbidden by law, and forbidden, not by persecutors but by the princes. Nor do I complain of this law, but lament that we should have deserved it." And he proceeds to draw one of his scathing sketches of those who devote a shameful service to old men and childless old women, besieging their bedsides, performing for them the most menial and repulsive offices, in dread at the doctor's entrance, asking with trembling lips if the patient be better, in peril if he become a little stronger, feigning joy whilst their minds are tortured by their avarice, sweating for an empty inheritance.

There is a striking analogy between Jerome's picture and one traced in one of the novels of Leo and Majorian, annexed to the Theodosian Code (bk. viii. N. vi. § 11; A.D. 458). It professes to restrain the avidity of these *captatores*, who by attendance by the bedside of persons they scarcely know, corrupt by simulated affection minds wearied with bodily illness and having no longer any clear judgment, so that forgetting the ties of blood and affinity, they may name strangers their heirs. Medical men are suborned to persuade their patient to wrong, and neglecting the care of healing become ministers to the covetousness of others. And it proceeds to enact that persons who could not claim in case of intestacy in any degree from a testator, if they should receive anything by way of bequest or trust, should give one-third to the treasury, until by fear of this the injustice of testators and dishonesty of captators should come to an end. It will be observed that this law, instead of being confined to clerics and monks like the previous one, is of a general character. Perhaps, though it did not hold its place, it has not been without influence on the differential duties imposed by most modern states on legacies and successions, which are generally highest as against strangers to the family of the testator or predecessor.

As respects the clergy, indeed, we find by a law almost contemporary with the last, inserted in Justinian's code, that of Valentinian and Marcian, A.D. 455 (bk. i. t. ii. l. 13), that widows, deaconesses, virgins dedicated to God, nuns, and women bearing any other name of religious

honour or dignity, received full liberty to leave by will or otherwise all or any part of their fortune. In short, the strongest laws against clerical captation which Jerome applauded seem to have been tacitly abrogated, utterly inconsistent as they were with the growth of Romish or Oriental priestcraft.

The term *hereditetas* seems only to differ from that of *captatores*, so far as it implies only the captation of inheritances, not of gifts from the living. [J. M. L.]

**CAPTIVES, REDEMPTION OF.** The disasters which fell upon the Roman empire in the 4th and 5th centuries gave a special prominence to this as one of the forms of Christian love, and it connects itself accordingly with some of the noblest acts and words of the teachers of the Church. Ambrose was charged by his Arian opponents with sacrilege for having melted down the eucharistic vessels of the church at Milan for this purpose, and defends himself against the charge on the grounds that this was the highest and best use to which he could have applied them (*De Offic.* ii. 28). Augustine did the same at Hippo (Possidius, *Vita*, c. 24). Acacius, Bishop of Amidas, ransomed as many as 7000, who had been taken prisoners by the Persians (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 21); Deogratias, Bishop of Carthage, the Roman soldiers who had been carried off by Genseric after the capture of Rome (Victor *Utic. de persecut. Vandal.* i., *Bibl. Patr.* vii. p. 591). It is worth noting that this was not only admired in individual actions, but that the truth that mercy is above sacrifice was formally embodied in ecclesiastical legislation. The Code of Justinian (i. tit. 2, *de Sacros. Eccles.* 21), while forbidding the alienation of church vessels or vestments for any other purpose, distinctly permits them to be pledged or even sold for this or other like works of mercy or necessity. [E. H. P.]

**CAPUA, COUNCIL OF**, A.D. 389, provincial, respecting the schism at Antioch between Flavianus and Evagrius; also respecting the denial by Bonosus of the perpetual virginity of the B. V. Mary; passed also a canon against rebaptizing, re-ordination, and translation of bishops, embodied in the African code (*S. Ambros. Epist.* 78, 79; *Cod. Can. Afric.* 48; Labb. ii. 1039, 1072). [A. W. H.]

**CAPUT JEJUNII.** [LENT.]

**CAPUTIUM**, a covering for the head, worn by monks, sometimes sewn on to the tunic, as a hood (*lieg. Comm. S. Bened.* c. 55). [I. G. S.]

**CAR, CART, CHARIOT, &c.** Herzog (*Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie u. Kirche*, 8vo. Gotha, 1861, s. v. "Sinnbilder,") mentions a sculpture in St. Callixtus, which contains a chariot without driver, with pole turned backwards, and whips left resting on it. This, as he says, appears evidently intended as a symbol of the accomplished course of a life. In Bottari, tav. clx., two quadrigae are represented at the base of an arch (covered with paintings of ancient date) in the second cubiculum of the catacomb of St. Priscilla on the Salarian Way. The charioteers carry palms and crowns in their hands, and the horses are decorated with palm-branches, or perhaps plumes; which connects the image of the chariot with St. Paul's imagination of the

Christian race (1 Cor. ix. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 7). (See Martigny, s. v. "Cheval," and article HORSE in this book.)

Guenebault refers to a sculpture from an ancient Gothic or Frank tomb at Langres (*Univ. Pittoresque (France)*, pl. xlv.), and to a cart or waggon on one of the capitals in the crypts in St. Denis (pl. lv. vol. ii. in A. Hugo, *France Pittoresque et Monumentale*). In Strutt (*View of the Inhabitants of England*, Lond. 1774, 4to. vol. i. p. 5, fig. 6) there is a chariot of the 9th century, so presumed. See also D'Agincourt, *Peinture*, pl. clxiv. No. 14, and pl. clvii. In the catacomb of St. Praetextatus (see Perret, *Catacombes*, vol. i. pl. lxxii.) there is a somewhat powerful and striking representation of the Chariot of Death, who is taking a departed woman into his car. [R. St. J. T.]

**CARACALLA** (in late Greek writers *καπαρδαίον*). Originally a garment peculiar to Gaul; it was introduced into Roman use by the emperor M. Aurelius Antoninus, commonly known in consequence as Caracallus or Caracalla. See Ferrarius, *de Re Vest.* pars ii. lib. i. c. 28. Ecclesiastical writers speak of it as worn by clerics (Ven. Beda, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. i. c. 7, referring to the year 305 A.D. and to the martyrdom of St. Alban), and as corresponding in shape to the Jewish ephod. So says St. Eucherius of Lyons, writing about the middle of the 5th century, and referring evidently to the genuine Gallic caracalla, which was a kind of short tunic with sleeves and furnished with a hood. With him agrees Dio Cassius (quoted by Rubenius, *de Re Vest.* lib. i. c. 6), who describes the caracalla as a sleeved tunic made somewhat in the fashion of a corselet, *χειριδωτὸς χιτὼν ἐς θώρακος τρόπον τινα πεποιημένον*. But the caracalla introduced into use by M. Aurelius was lengthened so as to reach nearly to the feet. So we must infer from the statement of Aurelius Victor: "Cum e Gallia vestem plurimam de-  
verisset, talarisque caracallas fecisset, coegissetque plebem ad se salutandum talibus introire, de nomine hujus vestis Caracalla nominatus est." Spartianus speaks still more distinctly to the same effect: "Ipse Caracalla nomen a vestimento quod populo dederat, *demisso usque ad talos, quod antea non fuerat*, unde hodieque dicuntur Antoninianae Caracallae ejusmodi, in usu maxime Romanae plebis frequentatae." From the reference to this vestment made by St. Jerome (*Epistle to Fabiola*), we may infer that, like other garments suited for out-door use, the caracalla was furnished with a hood. "Ephod . . . palliolum mirae pulchritudinis praestringens fulgore oculos in modum caracallarum *sed absque cucullis*." The statement to the same effect made by St. Eucherius of Lyons, is evidently a mere reproduction of St. Jerome. (*Instit.* lib. ii. cap. 10. "Ephod, vestis sacerdotalis . . . Est autem velut in caracallae modum, *sed sine cucullo*." [W. B. M.]

**CARAUNUS.** [CHARAUNUS.]

**CARILEFUS**, presbyter, of Aninsula in Gaul, is commemorated July 1 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

**CARILIPPUS**, martyr, is commemorated April 28 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

**CARISIUS**, with CALLISTUS, martyr at Co-

rinth, is commemorated April 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

**CARITAS.** [CHARITAS.]

**CARPOPHORUS.** (1) One of the *CORONATI QUATUOR*, commemorated Nov. 8 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*).

(2) Presbyter, martyr at Spoleto, commemorated Dec. 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

**CARPUS.** (1) Bishop, martyr at Pergamus, commemorated April 13 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*).

(2) The disciple of Paul, martyr at Troas, commemorated Oct. 13 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*); as "Apostle" and one of the Seventy, May 27 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(3) Bishop of Thyatina, martyr, Oct. 13 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**CARDINAL.** As the Benedictine Editors of St. Gregory the Great (*Ad Ep.* i. 15) truly remark: "Nomen vetus, nova est dignitas, purpura recentior." Our chronological limits extend at most to the early dawn of the dignity, which is a long way out of sight of the purple. Cardinal winds, cardinal numbers, cardinal virtues, the cardinal altar, and cardinal mass, are expressions all illustrative of the gradual adaptation of the term to that which was *chief* in the hierarchy. As the name of "pope," or "papa," was originally common to all bishops, so the chief presbyters and deacons of any church to which a cure of souls was attached were apt to have the term "cardinal" applied to them by way of distinction long before it was applied to the presbyters and deacons of the Church of Rome in particular. Parish churches had come to be called "titles," as conferring a title upon those who served them; and a title, from the notion of fixity that was implied in it, "cardo," the *hinge* on which, when *fixed* to a door, the door turns. Then, as there were chapels and oratories that were not parish churches—in other words gave no distinctive title—so there were priests and deacons attached to parish churches temporarily, that were not fixtures; or who went by their titles, yet were not therefore called cardinals. In the writings of St. Gregory the Great this distinction comes out strongly, being applied by him even to bishops, as is shewn by Thomassin (*De Ben.* ii. part ii. 115). Thus, on one occasion, he bids the Bishop of Grosseto visit the church of Porto Bar-rato, then vacant, and ordain "one cardinal presbyter and two deacons there" (*Ep.* i. 15). On another occasion we find him naming Martin, a Corsican bishop, whose see had been destroyed, "cardinal priest," or "pontiff," of another church in the island that had long been deprived of its bishop (i. 79). Elsewhere, he forbids Januarius, archbishop of Cagliari, making Liberatus "a cardinal-deacon," unless furnished with letters dismissory from his own diocesan (i. 83). "Cardinales violenter in parochiis ordinatos forensibus in pristinum cardinem revocabat Gregorius," as is said of him by his own biographer, John the Deacon (iii. 11), a writer of the 9th century; instances of which abound in his epistles: "cardinare" and "incardinatio" are words used by him in describing this process. The bishop, priest, or deacon, made "cardinal" of a church in this sense, was attached to it permanently, in contradistinction to bishops administering the

affairs of a diocese during a vacancy, and priests or deacons holding subordinate or temporary posts in a parish church. Of titles, or parish churches in Rome, the number seems to have varied in different ages. According to Anastasius, or whoever wrote the lives of these popes (on which see Cave, s. v.), St. Euaristus, A.D. 100-9, divided the city amongst his presbyters, and appointed seven deacons. St. Fabian, A.D. 236-50, divided its "regions" amongst these deacons. Cornelius, the next pope, tells us himself of as many as 44 presbyters there then, while the number of deacons remained the same (Euseb. vi. 43). From St. Dionysius, A.D. 259-69, being also credited by his biographer with having divided the churches in Rome amongst his presbyters, and instituted cemeteries and parishes or dioceses, we must infer that the old arrangements had been thrown into confusion, and the number of churches diminished considerably, by the persecutions under Decius and Valerian. And this would explain what we are told once more by Anastasius, that St. Marcellus, A.D. 308-10, appointed 25 titles, as parishes (*quasi dioceses*) in the city, for administering baptism and penance to the multitudes converted from paganism, and for burial of the martyrs. Long after this, the number of titles in the city stood at 28. Accordingly, when we read of a presbyter or deacon of the Roman church without any further distinction, a member of the Roman clergy is meant who was attached to some chapel or oratory within the city. When we read of a presbyter or deacon of some particular title there, a member of the Roman clergy is meant, who was either temporarily or permanently attached to one of the 25 or 28 parish churches, or seven regions of the city; and to those permanently attached to either the name of "cardinal" was given, after it had got into use elsewhere. Anastasius himself, or a namesake and contemporary of his, had it applied to him (Cave, s. v.). The fact that the popes in those days were elected, like most other bishops, by the clergy and people of their diocese, is amply sufficient to account for the prodigious importance that attached gradually to the cardinal presbyters and deacons of the Church of Rome, throwing those of all other churches into the shade. Cardinal bishops were not known there for some time afterwards, as Thomassin shews (*ib.* c. 116). On the contrary, the rule laid down under anathema by the synod under Stephen IV. A.D. 769, was, in the words of Anastasius, that "nobody, whether a layman, or of any other rank soever, should be capable of being advanced to the pontifical dignity, who had not risen regularly step by step, and been made cardinal presbyter or deacon." But when Anastasius, a little further on, speaks of the same pope appointing the seven bishops, whom he calls "hebdomadal cardinals," to functionate at the altar of St. Peter in turn, he is probably not using the phrase in the exact sense which it has since borne: as in the Council of Constantinople that restored Photius, A.D. 879, and was contemporary with Anastasius, Paul, bishop of Ancona, and Eugenius, bishop of Ostia, were present as legates of John VIII., and were styled and subscribed as such; while Peter, the third legate, subscribed as "presbyter and cardinal," and was so styled throughout (Bever. *Synod.* ii. 299). Similarly, in the list of sub-

scriptions to the Roman synod that preceded it, all the bishops write themselves bishops only, while the presbyters and deacons are written "cardinals" in addition. The seven bishops of Ostia, Porto, St. Rufina, Albano, Sabina, Tusculum, and Praeneste, began, in point of fact, to be called "cardinals" in the 11th century, or the age of St. Peter Damian, himself one of them, when formed into a college with the cardinal presbyters and deacons by the decree of Nicholas II. A.D. 1059, for electing all future popes. And it was a much later development by which bishops of distant sees came to be made cardinal deacons or presbyters of some church in Rome as well. For a description of the Roman church in the 11th century, by which time the seven cardinal bishops had been appointed to the church of St. John Lateran to officiate there in turn for the pope: and the 28 cardinal presbyters distributed between the four churches of St. Mary Major, St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Laurence, seven at each, see the old ritual in Baron. A.D. 1057, n. 19; Comp. the *Liber Diurnus Pontif. Rom.* iii. 11, in Migne's *Patrol.* cv. p. 77; and more in Du Cange, Hoffman, Moreri, Morone, s. v.; and Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.* v. 155-8. [E. S. F.]

**CARENA** (= *Quadragesima*). A forty-days' fast, imposed by a bishop upon clergy or laity, or by an abbot upon monks [PENITENCE]. A MS. Penitential, quoted by Ducange (s. v.), speaks of fasting on bread and water, "quod in communi sermone *carina* vocatur." [C.]

**CARNIPRIVIVUM**, or **CARNISPRIVIVUM**. This name is said by Macer (*Hierolexicon*, s. v.) to be applied to Quinquagesima Sunday, as being the last day on which it was permitted to eat flesh, the Lent fast anciently commencing on the following day, as, he says, is still customary with the Orientals and with some religious orders in Europe. In the calendar of the Greek Church, however, the *Κυριακή Ἀποκριῶν* [APOCREOS] is *Sexagesima* Sunday. Beletth says (*Rationale*, c. 65), "Secunda Dominica Septuagesimae dicitur vulgo *carnisprivium*," where by the "second Sunday of Septuagesima" we must no doubt understand Quinquagesima; and this Sunday is called in the Mozarabic Missal *Dominica ante carnes tollendas* (Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v.). [C.]

**CARNIVAL**. This word, variously derived from "caro vale," or "ubi caro valet," is applied, in the narrowest sense, to the three days preceding Ash-Wednesday; in a wider sense to the whole period from St. Blaise's Day (Feb. 3) to Ash-Wednesday. The period immediately preceding Lent has long been a season devoted to somewhat more than usual gaiety, in anticipation of the austerities of Lent. (Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexicon*.) [C.]

**CARPENTORACTENSE CONCILIUM**. [CARPENTRAS.]

**CARPENTRAS, COUNCIL OF** [near Narbonne, CARPENTORACTENSE], A.D. 527, Nov. 6, respecting the fair distribution of revenue between the bishop and the parish-priest (Labbe. *Conc.* iv. 1663). [A. W. H.]

**CARTHAGE, COUNCILS OF**. [AFRICAN COUNCILS.]

**CASK**, as symbol. [DOLIUM.]

**CASSIANUS.** (1) Martyr at Saragossa, is commemorated April 18 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Bishop and confessor of Autun, is commemorated Aug. 5 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr at Rome (Bede), or at Imola (*Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi), is commemorated Aug. 13 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Usuardi).

(4) Martyr at Taugiers, is commemorated Dec. 3 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(5) Of Rome, A.D. 431, is commemorated Feb. 29 (*Cal. Byzant.*). Perhaps identical with (3).

[C.]

**CASSIUS.** (1) Martyr at Damascus, is commemorated July 20 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr, is commemorated Oct. 10 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

[C.]

**CASSOCK.** (*Ital.* Casaca, Casachino; *Fr.* Casaque; *Flam.* Casacke.) It is not easy to determine with what older words, or with what older garment, the present 'casock,' as a garment and as a word, is to be identified. Some have thought that the Italian 'casaca' and the French 'casaque' are to be traced to 'caracalla' (see the article above), 'casaca' representing an older 'caraca.' Others trace the word through *κακός* or *κακός* (*Xenophon, Cyrop.* viii. 3, 6-8; *Jul. Pollux*, vii. 88, describing it as *ἰσχυρὸς χιτὼν*) to *cas*, skin or hide. In connection with this it may be noticed that Agatharctides (a Greek grammarian, at Alexandria, of the 2nd century A.C.), quoted by Lapsius (*Ep. ad Hieronymum*, 44), states that the Egyptians had certain garments made of felt which they called *casaca*. "Apud Aegyptios *κακὰς τῶν κακῶν*, verba sunt Agatharctides, *εὐκατασκευαστὴς κακῶν* . . . Acne in ultima habes 'casock,' difficult alios originationes." See this and other references in Menage, *Dict. Etym.* under 'Cassaque.' [W. B. M.]

**CASTOLUS, or CASTULUS,** martyr at Rome, is commemorated March 28 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

[C.]

**CASTOR,** martyr at Tarsus, is commemorated April 27 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Usuardi); also March 28 (*ib.*).

[C.]

**CASTORIUS.** (1) Martyr at Rome, is commemorated July 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr at Rome under Diocletian, Nov. 8 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Usuardi).

[C.]

**CASTUS.** (1) Martyr in Africa in the 3rd century, is commemorated May 23 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr, Sept. 4 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Usuardi).

(3) Martyr at Capua, Oct. 6 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Usuardi).

[C.]

**CASULA.** (See also AMPHIBALUM, PLANETA, PVPLA, PACHULA.)

§ 1. *The word and its derivation.*—The word *Casula* (whence *Fr.* and *Eng.* *Casuble*), a diminutive originally of *ovis*, "a cottage," comes before us in patristic literature in two senses. It is used, first, in its literal meaning of a cottage or hut; as by St. Gregory of Tours (*De Mirac. S. Juliani*, cap. xiv), and by St. Isidore of Seville (*De Off. Ecccl.* lib. ii. 'de monachis'). It is used also, and far more commonly, as a designation for an outer garment; the word having been in all

probability a provincial term, of popular use, for the garment which in the older Latin was known as a *paenula*. St. Isidore of Seville, circ. 600 A.D., is the first writer who gives any formal derivation of the word, or anything approaching to a description of the garment itself. "The casula," he says (*De Origin.* xix. cap. 21), "is a garment furnished with a hood (*vestis cucullata*); and is a diminutive of 'casa,' a cottage, seeing that, like a small cottage or hut, it covers the entire person." Philo Judaeus, some 600 years earlier, had used a similar comparison, when, describing a garment made of goat-skins (no doubt a rough *paenula*) commonly worn in his time, he says that it formed a "portable house" (*σκηνη αλκιν*) for travellers, soldiers, and others, who were obliged to be much in the open air. (*De Victimis*, Philonis Opp. Fol. Paris, 1840, p. 838, A.)

§ 2. *Form and material of the Casula.*—As a description of the form or appearance of the casula, which will add anything to that of St. Isidore already quoted, the earliest notice we have is in a MS. of uncertain date (probably 9th century, or thereabout), containing fragmentary notions of the old Gallican liturgy (Martene, *Thesaurus Anecd.* tom. v. col. 99): "Casula, quam amphibelum vocant quo sacerdos induitur, tota unita . . . Ideo sine manica, quia sacerdos potius benedictum quam ministrat. Ideo unita extrinsecus, non scissim, non aperta, quia multae sunt Scripturae sacrae secreta mysteria, quae quasi sub sigillo sacerdos doctus debet abscondere," etc. This "vestment," for Church use, for such it here is (see below, § 5), is here described as "made in one piece throughout," as "without sleeves," and "without slit or opening in front." This description is exactly what might be expected on the supposition that the casula was virtually a *paenula* under another name. And it exactly corresponds with the earliest representations of the chasuble preserved in ecclesiastical art. (See PLANETA.)

The materials of the casula varied according to the purposes it was designed to serve. In the earlier periods of its history, when it was regarded as a garb of very humble pretensions, it was made of wool (St. Augustine, *De Civit.*, quoted below, § 3), and probably also, like the *paenula*, of skins, dressed with the wool or fur upon them. But from the sixth century downwards, we hear of chasubles of brilliant colour (*superbi coloris*), and of costly materials, such as silk. Boniface III. (A.D. 606) sent a chasuble, formed partly of silk and partly of fine goat-hair, as a present to king Pepin. (Bonifacii, P. P. III. *Epist.* III. apud Oct. Ferrarium, *De Re Vet.* p. 685.)

§ 3. *Various uses of the Casula.*—The earliest notions of the casula shew that, like the *paenula*, it was originally a garment of very humble character, such as would be worn by peasants and artisans as their ordinary out-door dress, for protection against cold and wet. Being furnished with a hood, it was both hat and cloak in one. St. Augustine, writing about the close of the 4th century, but speaking of a story dating from before his own time, tells a tale of one Florentinus, a working tailor at Hippo, who lost his casula, and had no money to buy a new one (*De Civit.* Dec. lib. xii. cap. 8, § 9). Fifty "folles," as we learn from the course of the story, would have been thought about a reasonable sum for him to pay. But he himself for greater economy meant



to lay some wool, which his wife might make up for him as best she could. In another passage (*De sermo cap. v. opp. tom. v. p. 550*) St. Augustine speaks of the casula as a garment which any one of his congregation might be expected to possess, and one which every one would take care to have good of its kind. A notice of the casula, preserved to us in Procopius (*De Bello Vandalo*, lib. II. cap. 26), shews that even to his time (circ. 550) the tradition had survived of the very humble character attaching to this dress. He has occasion to speak of the object submission by which Arabinus, when defeated by Gontharis, sought to disarm the anger of the victor. And he speaks of him as putting upon him an outer garment unsuited for a general, or for any warlike usage, but befitting a slave or a man of humble station; this being, he adds, what the Romans, in the speech of Latium, call *casula*.

§ 4. Worn by monks, and, as an out-door dress, by the clergy.—The same reasons which made the casula a suitable dress for peasants, recommended it also as a habit for monks. Ferrandus, first the deacon and afterwards the biographer of Focasius, bishop of Naxos, in Africa, tells us that the bishop retained his monastic dress and ascetic habits after being advanced to episcopal dignity (circ. 507 A.D.). He continued to wear a monk's leathern girdle (*pelleum circumferens*); and neither used himself, nor permitted his monks to use, a casula of costly quality or of brilliant colour ("Casulam pretiosam vel superbi coloris nec ipse habuit, nec suos monachos habere permisit"). At a period a little after this St. Caesarius, archbishop of Arles in Gaul († 540), is described as wearing a casula in his ordinary walks about the streets (St. Caesarii Vita, apud *Acta Sanctorum*, Augusti d. xvii. tom. vi.). And he had also one special casula, of finer material doubtless, and either white or of some rich colour, for processional use. ("Casulam, qua in processione utabatur, et aliam paschalem, proferet, datque egredi, jubetque ut vendat uni ex clero.") The same bishop, in his will, when disposing of his wardrobe, distinguishes between the *indumenta paschalia*, or vestments for church use on Sundays and high festivals, which had been presented to him, and his *casula villosa*, or long-sleeved cloak, which would be suitable for out-door wear only:—"Sancto et domino meo archiepiscopo, qui mihi indigno digne successerit... indumenta paschalia, quae mihi data sunt, omnia illi serviant, simul cum casula villosa et tunica vel paludamento quod melius dixerim. Reliqua vero vestimenta mea, excepto birro amiculari, mecum clericis quam laici... dividant."

At or just after the close of the sixth century, a further notice of the casula, preserved to us by John the Deacon (*Vita Gregorii Papi*, lib. IV. cap. 63), serves to indicate that the casula, worn at Rome as an out-door habit by ecclesiastics, must have differed in some respects from the customary dress then worn in the East by persons of the same class. One about John, a Persian, came to Rome in St. Gregory's days, "ad adorandum loculos mactarum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli." "One day," so he himself tells the story, "I was standing in the middle of the city, when who should come across towards me but Pope Gregory. Just as I was thinking of making my obeisance to him ("mittere me ante eum"), the pope came close up, and seeing my intention,

stood before me, *Deo dico, fratres*, he bowed himself to the ground before me, and would not rise till I had done so first. Then embracing me with much humility, he slipped three pieces of money into my hand, and desired that a casula should be given me, and everything else that I required."

This use of the casula as the characteristic out-door garb of the clergy, and in many places also of monks, was maintained in the West from the 5th to the 8th century. In the Council of Ratisbon, held in April, A.D. 742, under the presidency of St. Boniface, one of the canons determined on was directed against those of the clergy who (in out-door life, as we may infer) adopted the dress of laymen, the *angon*, or short open cloak then commonly worn. "We have decreed that presbyters and deacons shall wear, not 'angon,' as do laymen, but 'casula,' as becometh servants of God." ("Decrevimus quoque ut presbyteri vel diaconi non angie laicorum more, sed casulis utantur, ritu servorum Dei.")

§ 5. Use of the Casula as a Vestment of Holy Ministry.—From the 5th to the 8th century the term *PLANETA* (q. v.) appears to have been the term ordinarily employed in Italy and Spain, if not elsewhere, for the supervestment worn in office of holy ministry. The earliest undoubted evidence of the word *casula* being used in this precise meaning dates from the 9th century, or possibly the 8th, if the Sacramentary of St. Gregory belongs in its present form to that time. But the usage of words in formal documents such as this last, confirmed as this is by the nearly contemporary writings (circ. 820) of Rabanus Maurus, Amalarius, and Walafid Strabo, indicates, generally, a considerably earlier popular usage. However this may be, we know that from the date of these last writers to the present time, the word *casula* has been used as the exact equivalent of *planeta* by western ritualists, and has in general usage quite superseded all other terms, such as *amphibolus*, *infusa*, *planeta*, by which at various times it has been designated.

It does not fall within the compass of this work to trace the various modifications of the 'chasuble,' in respect of form, material, and ornament, from the 9th century downwards, or to treat of the various symbolical meanings attributed to it. Full information, however, upon these points will be found in the following treatises. Beck, *Geschichte der liturgischen Gewänder des Mittelalters*, 2 vols. 8vo., Bonn, 1864; Pugin, *Manual of Ecclesiastical Ornament*, fol., London, 1844; Rock, *The Church of our Fathers*, London, 1849; and in the *Vestiarium Christianum* (London, 1868) of the writer of this article. [W. B. M.]

**CATABASIA** (*Katabasia*). An anthem or short hymn in the Greek office, so called because the two sides of the choir come down (*anabai-vous*) into the body of the church and unite in singing it. It often occurs between the "odes" of a "canon;" and its construction is that of any other "troparion." Sometimes two "catabasiai" occur together between each ode, as on the Sunday after Christmas-day, where each pair consists of the first troparion of the corresponding odes of the two canons for Christmas-day, mentioned in a preceding article. [H. J. N.]

**CATACOMBER**. Few words are more familiar, or more universally intelligible than "Catacombs."

as signifying a subterranean excavation constructed for the interment of the dead. Yet in its original meaning the word had no connection whatsoever with sepulture, or even with excavations, but was simply used as the name of a particular district in the vicinity of Rome.\*

The word *Catacumbæ*, the earliest form in which we meet with it, is unquestionably derived from the Greek *κατὰ* and *κύμβη*, "a hollow," and so "a cup," "a boat," &c., a widely spread root which we trace in the Greek *κύμβαλον*, the Latin *Cymba*, the Celtic *Cum*, the A.-S. *Combe*, and the Piedmontese *Comba*, "a valley," or "hollow." It is allied to the Sanskrit *Kumbhas*, "a pit." In Ducange *Gloss. Med. et Inf. Græcitatibus* we find "*Κύμβη, Cymbi—πλοῖα περιφερῇ Ῥωμαίοις, Suidas.*" "*κυμβεῖον, εἶδος ποτηρίου παραπλήσιον τῷ σχήματι πλοῖω δ καλεῖται κύμβη*" *Auctor. Etymol.* The district near the tomb of Cecilia Metella and the Circus of Romulus on the Appian Way appears, probably from its natural configuration, to have borne this designation. In the *Imperium Caesarum*, a document of the 7th century, printed by Eccard in his *Corpus Hist. Med. Aev.* vol. i. p. 31, the erection of the Circus of Maxentius, or Romulus, A. D. 311, in that locality is spoken of in these words, "Maxentius Termas in Palatio fecit et Circum in *Catecumpus*." The site of the adjacent Basilica of St. Sebastian is indicated by the same name in a letter of Gregory the Great to Constantia (the daughter of the Emperor Tiberius Constantinus, married by him to his successor Maurice) towards the end of the 6th century, excusing himself for not sending her the head of the Apostle Paul, which she had requested as a gift to the Church she had erected in his honour (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* iv. Ind. xii. Ep. 30). Speaking of the bodies of the Apostles Peter and Paul he writes "quæ ducta usque ad secundum urbis milliariū in loco qui dicitur [ad] *catucumbas* collocata sunt." A various reading, *catatumbas*, found in some MSS., and adopted by Baronius, *Martyrol. ad xiii. Kal. Feb.* has led some writers to adopt a different etymology, *ad* (*κατὰ*) *tumbas*, and to consider the word an early synonym for "coemeterium." But the best MSS. read *cumbas* not *tumbas*, and there is no ground for believing that Christian burial places generally were known by any such name till a considerably later period. The view of Padre Marchi (*Monum. Primitiv.* p. 209), that the word *catucumb* is a mongrel, half Greek and half Latin, and that the second element is to be found in the verb *cumbo*, is based on false philological principles, and may safely be rejected. The distance of the Basilica of St. Sebastian from the Tiber is a sufficient reason for discarding the etymology of the anonymous author of the *History of the Translation of St. Sebastian*, c. vi. "Milliario tertio ab Urbe, loco qui ob stationem navium *Catacumbas* dicebatur."

All through the middle ages the phrase "ad catacumbas" was used to distinguish the subterranean cemetery (*catucumb* in the modern sense) adjacent to the Basilica of St. Sebastian ("in loco qui appellatur *Catacumbas* ubi corpus beati Sebastiani martyris cum aliis quiescit."

Anast. *Hadr.* i. § 343; "coemeterio Sancti Christi martyris Sebastiani in *catucumbis*." *Ib.* Nicolaus i. § 601) while the term itself in its restricted sense designated a subterranean chapel communicating with that Basilica in which, according to tradition, the bodies of the two great Apostles had been deposited after the ineffectual attempt of the Greeks, referred to by S. Gregory u. s. to steal them away (Bosio, *Rom. Sotteran.* cap. xiii.). In documents from the 6th to the 13th century we continually meet with the expressions "festum ad catacumbas," "locus qui dicitur in catacumbas" and the like. The earliest authority is a list of the Roman cemeteries of the 6th century, where we find "*cimeterium catecumbas ad St. Sebastianum Vis Appia*." In the *De Mirabilibus Romae* of the 13th century we read "*Coemeteria Culisti juxta Catacumbas*." The first recorded use of the word in its modern sense out of Rome is at Naples in the 9th century (De Rossi, *R. S.* i. 87.)<sup>b</sup>

Bede, at the beginning of the 8th century, writes, *de Sex aetatibus mundi* ad ann. 4327. "Damasus Romae episcopus fecit basilicam juxta theatrum S. Laurentio et aliam in *catucumbis* ubi jacuerunt corpora sancta Apostolorum Petri et Pauli." The celebrity acquired by this cemetery as the temporary resting-place of the chief of the Apostles led to a general familiarity with its name, and a gradual identification of the term "*catucumbæ*" with the cemetery itself. When in process of time the other underground places of interment of the Christians fell into neglect and oblivion, and the very entrances to them were concealed, and their existence almost forgotten, this one beneath the Church of St. Sebastian remained always open as the object of pilgrimage, and by degrees transferred its name to all similar subterranean cemeteries. "A visit to the cemeteries became synonymous with a visit *ad catucumbas*, and the term *catucumb* gradually came to be regarded as the specific name for all subterranean excavations for purposes of burial, not only in the neighbourhood of Rome, but also in Naples, Malta, Paris, Sicily, and wherever else similar excavations have been discovered" (Northcote, *R. S.* 109).

*Origin.*—Until a comparatively recent period a very erroneous opinion as to the origin of the subterranean cemeteries of Rome was universally entertained. No one thought of calling in question the assertion that they were exhausted sandpits, and had been originally excavated for the purpose of obtaining the volcanic stratum known as *arena* by the ancients, and as *pozzolana* by the moderns, so extensively used by them in the composition of their mortar; and that the Christians, finding in the labyrinthine recesses of these deserted *arenarie* suitable places for the concealment of the bodies of their martyred brethren, had taken possession of them and employed them as cemeteries. There was great plausibility about this view. It seemed to derive support from the 'Martyrologies' and other ancient documents in which the expressions *in arenario*, or *juxta arenarium*, or *in cryptis arenariis* are of not unfrequent

\* For other examples of a local name becoming generic cf. "Capitol," "Palace," "Academy," "Newgate," "Bodiam," &c.

<sup>b</sup> In the same way as this cemetery of St. Sebastian was known by the designation "ad catacumbas," others were specified as "ad Nymphæas," "ad Ursum pileatum," "inter duas lauros," "ad Sextum Philippi," and the like.

occurrence. It also removed the seeming difficulty, which a fuller understanding of the laws regulating sepulture among the Romans has dissipated, as to the possibility of a small and persecuted body excavating galleries of such enormous extent, and disposing of the material extracted from them without attracting the notice and provoking the interference of the supporters of the dominant religion. Once started and given to the world under the authority of the names of men of acknowledged learning it found general acceptance, and became an historical tradition indolently accepted by one generation of investigators after another. Bosio, the pioneer of all subsequent examinations of the catacombs, maintained a discreet silence upon the origin of the subterranean cemeteries; but their Pagan origin is accepted by his translator and editor, Aringhi, as well as by Baronius, Severano, Bottari, Boldetti, and other writers on the subject. Marchi, with a touch of quiet sarcasm, affirms that it causes him no surprise that this hypothesis should have been maintained by Bottari, who, it is abundantly evident, "studied the subterranean Rome quite at his ease not under but above ground." (Marchi, *u. s.* p. 15.) But he confesses to astonishment that "the excellent Boldetti," with all the opportunities afforded by personal examination for perceiving the wide difference between the *arenariæ* and the cemeteries which lie below them, should have never seen the untenableness of the traditional view. In more modern times the same origin of the catacombs was asserted by D'Agincourt, Raoul-Rochette, and indeed by every one who wrote on the subject. Padre Marchi has the merit of being the first to promulgate the true doctrine that the catacombs were the work of Christians alone, and from the first designed for places of sepulture. The Padre ingenuously informs us (p. 7) that he commenced his investigations with the most unquestioning faith in the universally received theory, and that it was only by degrees that his studies and experience, not among books and papers, but in quarries, cemeteries, and sand-pits, led him to an opposite conclusion, and put him in a position to declare to the world as an unquestionable fact, that in the Christian cemeteries no Pagan ever gave a single blow with pickaxe or chisel. The brothers De Rossi, the pupils of Padre Marchi in the work of investigation, have continued his labours in the same path of patient examination of facts, and that with such success that it may now be regarded as established beyond controversy that the origin of the catacombs was Christian and not Pagan, and that they were constructed expressly for the purpose of interment, and had no connection with the *arenariæ* beyond that of juxtaposition. In certain cases, as at St. Callistus and St. Agnes, the catacombs lie at the side of or beneath those excavations, so that they are entered from them, the *arenariæ* effectually masking the doors of access to the Christian galleries, while they afforded them an easy mode of removing the excavated earth.

Padre Marchi's confidence in the old theory of the Pagan origin of the catacombs was first disturbed by a careful examination of the geological characteristics of the strata in which they were, as a rule, excavated. The surface of the Campagna surrounding Rome, especially on the left

bank of the Tiber, where the catacombs are chiefly situated, is almost entirely formed of materials of volcanic origin. These igneous strata are of different composition and antiquity. We will only specify the three with which we are concerned, viz., the so-called *tufa litoide*, *tufa granolare*, and *pozzolana pura*. The *pozzolana pura* is a friable sand rock, entirely destitute of any cementing substance to bind the molecules together and give them the nature of stone. The *tufa granolare* is in appearance almost the same rock as the *pozzolana pura*. The distinguishing mark is the presence of a slight cement, which gives the mass some degree of solidity, and unites the sandy particles into a stone which is cut with the greatest ease. The third stratum, the *tufa litoide*, is a red conglomerate cemented into a substance of sufficient hardness to form an exceedingly useful building stone. Of these three strata, it was the first and the last alone which were worked by the ancient Romans for architectural purposes, while it is exclusively in the second, the *tufa granolare*, that the catacombs were excavated. The *tufa litoide* was employed from the earliest ages, as it still is, in the buildings of Rome. The interior of the *Cloaca Maxima*, the *Tabularium* of the Capitol, and others of the most ancient architectural works, attest its durability, as well as the early date of its use, and it is still extensively quarried as building stone at the foot of Monte Verde, outside the Porta Portese (Murray's *Handbook for Rome*, p. 324). While this formation furnished the stone for building, the third named—the *pozzolana pura*, found in insulated deposits, rarely of any considerable extent—supplied the sand required for the composition of the mortar, and as such is commended by Vitruvius (*Arch.* iii. 7) as preferable to every other kind. The vicinity of Rome, and indeed some parts of the city itself, abounded in *pozzolana* pits, or *arenariæ*, forming an intricate network of excavations, not running in straight lines, as the galleries of the catacombs do almost universally, but pursuing tortuous paths, following the direction of the sinuous veins of the earth the builders were in search of. References to these sand-pits, whose dark recesses afforded secure concealment as well to the perpetrators of deeds of blood as to their intended victims, appear in some of the chief classical writers. Cicero mentions that the young patrician Asinius had been inveigled into the gardens of the Esquiline, where he was murdered and precipitated into one of the sand-quarries: "Asinius autem . . . quasi in hortulos iret, in arenarias quasdam extra Portam Esquilinam perductus occiditur" (*Orat. pro Cluentio*, c. 13). Suetonius also relates that when the trembling Nero, fearing instant assassination, took refuge in the villa of his freedman Phaon, between the Nomentan and Salarian roads, he was advised to conceal himself in an adjacent sand-pit, "*in specum egestæ arenæ*," but he vowed that he would not go underground alive, "*negavit se vivum sub terram iturum*" (Sueton. *in Neron.* 48).

Exhausted sand-pits of this kind also afforded burial places for the lowest dregs of the populace, for slaves, and others who on ceremonial grounds were denied the honour of the funeral pile. The best known are those left by the sand-diggers on the Esquiline, which, we learn

Hornae, were used as common receptacles for the vilest corpses, and defiled the air with pestilential exhalations, until Maecenas saved the district from its degradation and turned it into a garden (Horat. *Serm.* i. 8, v.).


ac prius angustis cuncta cadavera cellis,  
caeruas vili portanda locabat in arce,  
ac mœerne plebi stabat commune sepulchrum."

In his commentary on Acron the Scholiast on *Horat.* says: "Huc aliquando cadavera portabant plebeiorum sive servorum: nam sepulchra non erant antea." These loathsome burial places were known by the names of *puteoli* or *foes*; a diminutive of *puteus*, "a well," according to the etymology given by Festus. They also designated *culinae*, from their shape. *olat. sub. voc. culina*; Padre Lupi, *Dissertation.* § cxxxix. p. 63).

We need not pause to refute the monstrous and so carelessly propounded by Basnage, Burnet, &c., which identified the first beginning of the Christian catacombs with these le charnel-houses, which were the opposite of Paganism, and asserted, in Burnet's words, that "these burying-places that are graced by the pompous title of catacombs are no other than the *puteoli* mentioned by Festus Pompeius, the meanest sort of the Roman slaves were not so without any further care about them as to rot." The most superficial acquaintance with the catacombs will convince us of the falsity of such an hypothesis, and prove the rectitude of the assertion that "the *puteoli* to which the carion of the Roman slaves were flung had not the slightest analogy to the decorous, careful, and expensive provisions made by the early Christians for the conservation of their dead" (*Edin. Rev.* No. 221, 859).

It is otherwise probable, this presumed connection between the *arcuariae* and the cemeteries of the Christians would be at once destroyed by the remarkable fact first noticed by Clui, and confirmed by the investigations of the brothers De Rossi, to which we have alluded above, that the strata which furnished the *putres* were carefully avoided by the workers of the catacombs, who ran their vast series of galleries almost exclusively in the *arenariae*. While, on the one hand, they avoided the solid strata of the *tufa tonda*, could not be quarried without at least double the time and labour required in the soft tufa, and the excavated material from the *tufa tonda* could not be disposed of without great inconvenience, with equal care these subterranean workers avoided the layers of friable *pozzolana* which would have rendered their work insecure, which no permanent gallery or rock tomb had been constructed, and selected that of a medium hardness which was best fitted for their peculiar purpose. The suitability of the *tufa arenaria* for the object in view is better stated than in the words of Dr. Northcote. "It is easily worked, of sufficient consistency to admit of being hollowed out into galleries without at once falling in, and its nature causes the water quickly to drain from it, thus leaving the galleries dry and secure, an important consideration when we

think of the vast number of dead bodies which once lined the walls of the subterranean cemeteries" (*Roma Sotterr.* p. 321). To these advantages may be added the facility with which the rock was triturated so as to be carried out of the excavations in the form of earth instead of heavy blocks of stone, as would have been the case in the quarries of compact tufa.



Plan of Arenaria

The exclusively Christian origin of the catacombs, and their destination from the first for purposes of interment is also evident, from the contrast furnished by their plan, form, and mode of construction, to the *arenariae*, or sand-pits, and *lapidicinae*, or stone quarries, of ancient times. This contrast is made evident to the eye by Padre Marchi, from whom the annexed woodcuts are borrowed (*Trat.* i. iii. ix.-xii.), and by



Plan of St. Agnes

Dr. Northcote and Mr. Brownlow in the plan and atlas appended to their *Roma Sotterranea*. The ground plans given by Marchi lay before us in successive plates the ichnography of the stone quarry which lies above the catacomb of St. Pontianus, and of the *arenaria* which lies above that of St. Agnes, and the portions of the cemetery immediately beneath them. Nothing could more forcibly show the difference between the vast cavernous chambers of the quarry,



where the object was to remove as much of the stone as was consistent with safety, and the long narrow galleries of the catacomb in which the object was to displace as little of the stratum as would be consistent with the excavator's purpose. The plates also enable us to contrast the tortuous passages of the *arenariae*, running usually in curved lines, with a careful avoidance of sharp angles, and wide enough to admit a horse and cart for the removal of the material, and the straight lines, right angles, and restricted dimensions of the *ambulae* of the catacombs. Another marked difference between the *arenariae* and the subterranean cemeteries of the Christians is, that the walls of the latter always rise vertically from the floor of the gallery, while, on account of the frailness of the material in which they were excavated, the walls of the sand quarries are set at a re-entering angle, giving the gallery almost the form of a tunnel. This mode of construction renders it impossible to form sepulchral recesses with exactly closed apertures, as we find them in all the galleries of the catacombs. The friability of the material also forbids the adaptation of a plate or marble or tiles to the aperture of the recess, which was essential to confine the noxious effluvia of the decaying corpses.

The wide distinction between the mode of construction adopted in the quarries and that rendered necessary by the requirements of the cemeteries, and the practical difficulties which stood in the way of transforming one into the other are rendered more evident by the few instances in which this transformation has been actually effected. The examples we would bring in proof of our statement are those given by Mich. Stef. De Rossi from the cemeteries of St. Hermes and St. Priscilla (*Analisi. Geol. ed. Arch.* vol. i. pp. 31, 32, sq.; Northcote, *R. S.* pp. 323, 329). In the first plane of the catacomb of St. Hermes we have a specimen of a sepulchral gallery with three rows of lateral *loculi*, constructed in brick and masonry, within an ancient *arenaria*. At first sight the difference between the form and proportions of the galleries and *loculi*, and those of the usual type, is scarcely noticeable. Closer inspection, however, shows that the side walls are built up from the ground, in advance of the tuff walls of the gallery, which is two or three times the ordinary width, leaving space enough for the depth of the *loculi*. These are closed in the ordinary manner, with the exception of those of the uppermost tier, where the closing slabs are laid at an angle, sloping up to the barrel vault of the gallery, and forming a triangular instead of a rectangular recess. When the galleries cross one another the space becomes wider and the walls more curved, and the vault is sustained in the centre by a thick wall containing tombs, which divides the *ambulae* into two parallel galleries. This example indicates the nature of the alterations required to convert an *arenaria* into a cemetery. These as a rule were so costly and laborious that the Christians preferred to undertake an entirely fresh excavation.

The second example is that from the cemetery of St. Priscilla, on the Via Salaria Nova. The annexed plan given from De Rossi enables us, by a variation in the shading, to distinguish between the original excavation and the form

into which it was subsequently converted when it became a Christian burial-place, and helps us to appreciate the immense labour that was expended in the erection of "numerous pillars of various sizes, long walls of solid masonry, sometimes straight, sometimes broken into angles, partly concealing and partly sustaining the tufa and the sepulchres of the galleries, frequent niches of various size often interrupted by pillars built up within them," and the other modifications necessary to convert the original excavation into its present form. We may mention a third example of the same kind: the *arenaria* adjacent to St. Saturninus, on the same road. A portion of this cemetery has been excavated in good *porzolana* earth, and has the characteristics of a true *arenaria*. The galleries are wide, and are curved in plan. The walls and vault are arched, and it has not been thought



Plan of part of the Catacombs of St. Priscilla from De Rossi, showing the adaptation of an *Arenaria* to a Christian cemetery. The dark shading represents the tufa rock; the lighter the added masonry.

consistent with security to construct more than two ranges of *loculi* near the pavement, and even these occur at wider intervals than is usual where the rock is harder. In all respects the contrast this division of the cemetery presents to the ordinary type is most marked. "Here we have another instance of the Christians having made the attempt to utilise the *arenaria*, but it appears that they found it more convenient to abandon the attempt, and to construct entirely new galleries, even at the cost of descending to a greater depth into the bowels of the earth" (Northcote, *R. S.* p. 330).

These examples when candidly examined lead to a conclusion directly opposite to that affirmed so confidently by Raoul-Rochette and others. So far from its being the case that the Christians commenced their subterranean cemeteries by adopting exhausted *arenariae*, which they ex-

ended and enlarged to suit their increasing requirements, so that "an *arenaria* was the ordinary matrix of a catacomb," the rarity of such instances that can be adduced, and the marked contrast between the *arenaria* and the *catacomb* both in plan and mode of construction, confirm our assertion that the subterranean cemeteries of the Christians had a distinct origin, and from the first were intended for places of interment alone, and that what, previous to recent investigations, was regarded as the normal condition of things, was really extremely exceptional, and is to be explained in each case on exceptional grounds.

The traditional hypothesis to which we have referred, by which the conclusions of all investigators before the memorable epoch of Padre Marchi were fettered, had its foundation in certain passages in ancient documents of very questionable value, which describe the burial-places of certain martyrs and others as being in *arenario*, *juxta arenarium*, *ad arenas*, or in *cryptis arenariis*. These passages are almost exclusively derived from the documents known as "*Acta Martyrum*," which, from the extent to which their text has been tampered with at different dates, are generally almost worthless as historical authorities. None of those in question are contained in Ruinart's *Acta Martyrum Sincera*, and they are probably of little real weight. And further, even if the statements contained in them deserved to be received with more confidence De Rossi has very acutely demonstrated that they cannot fairly be considered to prove the fact for which they are adduced. They show little more than that the terms *arenarium*, &c., were used more loosely at the time these "Acts" were compiled than strict accuracy warranted, and were applied to the whole "hypogaeum" of which the sand-pit at most only formed part. According to Mich. Stef. De Rossi (*Analisi. Geol. ed. Arch.* vol. i. pp. 13-34), if we confine ourselves to a range of five or six miles out of Rome, there are no more than nine passages of these "Acts" in which martyrs are recorded to have been interred in *arenario* or in *cryptis arenariis*; while of this limited number of authorities, four refer to cemeteries in which an *arenaria* is actually found more or less closely connected with the cemetery, and in which therefore the fact may be at once acknowledged to be in agreement with the record, without in the least impugning our conclusion as to the generally distinct nature of the two.

It deserves notice also, as showing the worthlessness of these records as statements of fact, that two of the passages which speak of interments in *cryptis arenariis*, that of SS. Nereus and Alexander in the cemetery of Domitilla, and that of S. Laurentius in that of Cyriaca, refer to localities where *pozzolana* is not to be found, but where the stratum in which the cemetery is constructed is that known as *capellaccio*, which is quite worthless for building purposes. No *arenarium*, or *crypta arenaria*, properly so called, could have existed there.

With regard to the passage which refers to the place of sepulture of SS. Marcus and Marcellinus. Padre Marchi justly observes that it is not said that these martyrs were buried in *cryptis arenarum*, but "*in loco qui dicitur ad arenam*," and therefore merely in the neighbour-

hood of the pits from which the walls of the city were built.

But although the exclusively Christian origin of the catacombs has to be distinctly asserted, and the idea that they had their origin in sand quarries, already existing in the first ages of the Church, must be met with a decided contradiction, we must be careful not to press the distinction so far as to deny the connection which really exists, in very many instances, between the cemetery and an *arenaria*. We must also allow that there are examples in which *loculi* for Christian interment have been found in the walls of the tortuous roads of a sand quarry. Mr. J. H. Parker, who by his accurate investigations is conferring on the architecture and topography of Rome the same benefits he has bestowed on the architecture of his native country and of France, has discovered *loculi* in the sides of a sand-pit road, near the church of S. Urbano alla Caffarella. This road evidently communicated with the cemetery of Praetextatus, to which the main entrance was from the church, originally an ancient tomb. A modern brick wall, built across the road, prevents any further examination of the locality. Such communications between the cemeteries and the adjacent *arenariae* were frequently opened in the days of persecution, when, as Tertullian informs us, the Christians were "daily besieged, and betrayed, and caught unawares in their very assemblies and congregations; their enemies having informed themselves as to the days and places of their meetings" (Tert. *Apol.* vii.; *ad Nat.* i. 7), and when, therefore, it became necessary as far as possible to conceal the entrances to their burial places from the public gaze. In those times of trial the original entrances to the catacombs were blocked up, the staircases destroyed, and new and difficult ways of access opened through the recesses of a deserted sand-pit. These afforded the Christians the means of ingress and egress without attracting public notice, and by means of them they had facilities for escape, even when they had been tracked to the catacomb itself. The catacomb of S. Callistus affords examples of these connections with *arenario*. (Cf. the plans given by De Rossi, Northcote, and Marchi.)

*History.*—The practice of interring the entire corpse unconsumed by fire in a subterranean excavation has been so completely identified with the introduction of the Christian religion into Rome that we are in danger of losing sight of the fact that this mode of burial did not in any sense originate with the Christians. However great the contrast between the sepulture after cremation in the urns of *columbaria*, or the indiscriminate flinging of the dead into the loathsome *puticoli*, and the reverent and orderly interment of the bodies of the departed in the cells of a catacomb, the Christians, in adopting this mode, were only reverting to what one of the early apologists terms "the older and better custom of inhumation" (Minuc. Fel. *Octav.* c. 34). It is well known that the custom of burying the dead was the original custom both with the Greeks and Romans, and was only superseded by burning in later times, chiefly on sanitary grounds. The Etruscan tombs are familiar examples belonging to a very early period. In Rome, cremation did not become general till the later days

of the republic. The authority of Cicero is definite on this point. He states that Marius was buried, and that the Gens Cornelia adopted cremation for their dead in living memory, Sulla being the first member of that Gens whose body was burnt (*Cic. de Leg. ii. 22*). Under the Empire cremation became the almost universal custom, though not so as absolutely to exclude the other, which gradually regained its lost hold on the public mind, and was re-established by the fourth century. Macrobius asserts positively that the custom of burning the dead had entirely ceased in his day. "Urendi corpora defunctorum usus nostro saeculo nullus" (*Macrobi. Saturn. lib. vii. c. 7*). Of the practice of inhumation of the unburnt body we have not unfrequent examples in Rome itself. The tomb of the Scipios, on the Appian Way (now within the Aurelian walls), is a familiar instance. The correspondence between the arrangements of this tomb and those of the earlier Christian catacombs, e.g. that of Domitilla, is very marked. In both we have passages excavated in the tufa, giving access to sepulchral chambers arranged in stories; burial places cut in the native rock and covered with a slab of stone; sarcophagi standing in recesses, partially hollowed out to receive them. Visconti was of opinion that this tomb was a used-out stone quarry. In this he is followed by Raoul-Rochette, *Tableau des Catac.* p. 23. It is favoured by the irregularity of the plan. Another like example is the tomb of the Nasos, on the Flaminian Way, described by Bartoli, in which Raoul-Rochette has traced a marked resemblance to the plan and general disposition to the catacomb of St. Hermes, which, as we have seen already, presents many marked variations from the ordinary plan of the Christian catacombs. Other examples are given by De Rossi, *R. S. i. 88*, who remarks that this mode of interment was much more general in Rome and its vicinity than is usually credited. He quotes from Fabretti, *Insc. Dom.* p. 55, a description of a tomb found by him at the fourth mile on the Flaminian Way. "Necdum crematione instituta a tophe indigena excavatum sepulchrum . . . . malia in nostris Christianorum coemeteriis videntur," and mentions a numerous series of cells of a similar character cut in the living rock examined by him in different localities in the vicinity of the city.

But although Pagan subterranean burial places possess a family likeness to the cemeteries of the Christians, they are unmistakably distinguished from them by certain unfailing marks. They are of much more contracted dimensions, being intended for the members and dependants of a single family, instead of being open to the community of the faithful generally. As being destined to be the abodes of the dead only, their entrances were firmly closed, while the burial niches were frequently left open; while on the other hand, in the Christian cemeteries, constantly visited for the purposes of devotion and for the memorial of the departed, the *loculi* were hermetically sealed, to prevent the escape of noxious gases, while the entrance stood always open, and the faithful could approach each separate grave with their prayers and their offerings. These distinctions are broadly maintained as a rule. As regards dimensions, however, there are exceptions each

way. We meet with some isolated Christian burial chambers designed to receive the individuals of a single family; and on the other hand, some heathen tombs exceed the usual limits of a single chamber. De Rossi mentions the existence of many *hypogaea*, opening from the tombs and columbaria on the Appian and Latin Ways, which contain a few small *cubicula* and three or four very short *ambulacra*. Such *hypogaea* were assigned by Marchi, without sufficient evidence, to the adherents of idolatrous Oriental sects (*De Rossi, R. S. i. pp. 88-92*).

But it is not in these heathen examples that we are to find the germ of the Christian catacombs. We are to look for them in the burial places of another people, with whom the Christians of Rome were from the first closely connected, and indeed in the popular mind identified—the Jews. The first converts to the faith in Rome were Jews; and, as Dean Milman has remarked (*Lat. Christianity, i. 31*), no Church seems to have clung more obstinately to Judaizing tenets and Jewish customs than the Roman. In their manner of sepulture, therefore, we should anticipate that the Roman Christians would follow the customs of the land which was the cradle of their religion, and to which so many of them traced their parentage—customs which were faithfully adhered to in the land of their dispersion. They had an additional reason for regarding this mode of interment with affectionate reverence, as one hallowed to them by the example of their crucified Master, and in Him associated with the hopes of the resurrection. The practice of burial in sepulchres hewn out of the living rock was always familiar to the Jews, and was adopted by them in every part of the world wherever they made settlements and the nature of the soil permitted it. The existence of Jewish catacombs in Rome, of a date anterior to Christianity, is no matter of conjecture. One was discovered by Bosio at the opening of the 17th century, and described by him (*R. S. c. xxii. p. 141 seq.*), bearing unmistakable evidence of a very early date. This cemetery, placed by him on Monte Verde, outside the Porta Portese, has escaped all subsequent researches (Marchi, p. 21 seq.). From the meanness of its construction, the absence of any adornment in painting, stucco, or marble, and the smallness and paucity of its *cubicula* (only two were found), it was evidently a burial place of the poorer classes. There was an utter absence of all Christian symbols. Almost every *loculus* bore—either painted in red or scratched on the mortar—the seven-branched candlestick. In one inscription was read the word *CTNAΓΩΓ. συναγωγή*.

Another Jewish catacomb is still accessible on the Via Appia, opposite the Basilica of St. Sebastian. According to Mr. Parker (who has included photographs of this catacomb in his invaluable series, Nos. 1160, 1161), part of it is of the time of Augustus, part as late as Constantine. It contains two *cubicula*, with large *arcusolia*, ornamented with arabesque paintings of flowers and birds, devoid of distinctive symbols. Some of the *loculi* present their ends instead of their sides to the galleries—an arrangement very rarely found in Christian cemeteries. The inscriptions are mostly in Greek characters, though the language of some is Latin. Some bear Hebrew words. Nearly all have the candlestick. In

1866 another extremely poverty-stricken Jewish catacomb, dug in a clay soil, was excavated in the Vigna Cimarra, on the Appian Way.

The idea so long and so widely prevalent, that works of such immense extent, demanding so large an amount of severe manual labour, could have been executed in secret, and in defiance of existing laws, is justly designated by Mommsen as ridiculous, and reflecting a discredit, as unfounded as it is unjust, on the imperial police of the capital. It is simply impossible that such excavations should have escaped official notice. Nor was there any reason why the Christians should have desired that their burial places should have been concealed from the state authorities. No evidence can be alleged which affords even a hint that in the first two centuries at least there was any official interference with Christian sepulture, or any difficulties attending it to render secrecy or concealment desirable. The ordinary laws relating to the burial of the dead afforded their protection to the Christians no less than to their fellow citizens. A special enactment, of which we find no trace, would have been needed, to exempt the Christians from the operation of these laws. So long as they did not violate any of the laws by which the sepulture of the dead was regulated the Roman Christians were left free to follow their taste and wishes in this matter. Nor, as we have seen, was there anything altogether strange or repulsive in the mode of burial adopted by the Christians. They were but following an old fashion which had not entirely died out in Rome, and which the Jews were suffered to follow unmolested. One law they were absolutely bound to observe, viz., that which prohibited interment within the walls of the city. And a survey of the Christian cemeteries in the vicinity of Rome will show that this was strictly obeyed. All of them are contained in the zone at once prescribed by law and dictated by convenience, within a radius of about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  miles from the Aurelian walls. "Between the third and fifth mile from the walls no Christian sepulchre has been found; at the sixth, only one, that of St. Alexander; while beyond the seventh mile tombs are again met with, but these belong rather to the towns and villages of the Campagna than to Rome itself" (Northcote, *R. S.* p. 334; Mich. Stef. de Rossi, *Analisi. Geol. ed Arch.* i. 45).

Legal enactments and considerations of practical convenience having roughly determined the situation of the Christian cemeteries, a further cause operated to fix their precise locality. Having regard to the double purpose these excavations were to serve—the sepulture of the dead, and the gathering of the living for devotion—it was essential that a position should be chosen where the soil was dry, and which was not liable to be flooded by the neighbouring streams, nor subject to the infiltration of water. If these rules were not observed, not only would the putrefaction of the corpses have taken place with dangerous rapidity, and the air become poisoned, but the galleries themselves would have been choked with mud and been rendered inaccessible. We find, therefore, that the planners of the cemeteries, as a rule, avoided the valleys and low lands, and restricted their operations to the higher grounds surrounding the city, particularly where the geological conditions of the soil pro-

mised them strata of the *tufa granolare*, in which they by preference worked, and where springs of water were absent. As an example of the disastrous consequences of not attending to these precautions we may name the cemetery of Castulus, on the Via Labicana, re-discovered by De Rossi in 1864 (*Buletino de Arch. Crist.*, Feb. 1865). From its low position, the galleries are filled with clay and water, which have reduced them to ruin and rendered the cemetery quite inaccessible.

As a rule, each catacomb occupies a separate rising ground of the Campagna, and one divided from any other by intervening valleys. The general humidity of these low grounds, and the streams which flow along them, effectually prohibit the construction of galleries of communication between the various cemeteries. The idea broached by Raoul-Rochette, and contended for by Marchi, that a subterranean communication at a low level exists between the whole of the Christian cemeteries of Rome, as well as with the chief churches within the city, is, in Mommsen's words, "a mere fable"—in fact, a complete impossibility. Such galleries of connection, if formed, would have been constantly inundated, if they had not at once become mere conduits of running water.

Each of the larger cemeteries, then, may be regarded as an insulated group, embracing several smaller cemeteries, corresponding to the original funeral *areas* assigned to the interment of the early Christians, but never crossing the intermediate depressions or ravines, and seldom, if ever, having any communication with each other (M. Stef. de Rossi, *R. S. Analis. Geol. ed Arch.* i. 41, seq.).

The notions which have been entertained as to the horizontal extent of the catacombs are very greatly exaggerated. It has been even gravely asserted that they reach as far as Tivoli in one direction and Ostia in the other. It is probably quite impossible to form a correct estimate of the area actually occupied by them, from our ignorance of their real extent. Not a few which were known to the older investigators cannot now be discovered, and it can hardly be questioned that others exist which have never been entered since the period when they were finally given over to neglect and decay. M. Stef. de Rossi, in his valuable *Analisi Geologica ed Architettionica*, so often referred to, p. 60, declares his belief that nearly the whole of the available space within the above-named cemeterial zone, where the soil was suitable for the purpose, was occupied by burial vaults. But he discreetly abstains from any attempt to define either their superficial area or their linear extension. The calculations that have been hazarded by Marchi and others are founded on too vague data to be very trustworthy. Marchi calculated that the united length of the galleries of the catacombs would amount to 800 or 900 miles, and the number of graves to between six and seven millions. The estimate quoted by Martigny (*Diction. des Ant. Chret.* p. 128) does not go beyond 587 miles. That given by Northcote (*R. S.* p. 26) is more modest still,—“on the whole there are certainly not less than 350 miles of them.” But all such estimates are at present simply conjectural.

The beginnings of these vast cemeteries were



small and comparatively insignificant. There is little question that almost without exception they had their origin in sepulchral areas of limited extent, the property of private families or individuals, devoted by them to this sacred purpose. The investigations of De Rossi, an explorer as sagacious as he is conscientious, have satisfactorily proved that the immense cemetery of Callistus, with its innumerable *cubicula* and stories of intricate ramifications, originally consisted of several small and independent burial grounds, executed with great regularity within carefully prescribed limits. The manner in which a subterranean cemetery was constructed was as follows. First of all a plot of ground suitable for the purpose was obtained by gift or by purchase, extending so many feet, *in fronte*, in length, along the high road, so many, *in agro*, in depth, at right angles to the road. That which used to be known as the cemetery of Lucina, the most ancient part of the cemetery of Callistus, measured 100 Roman feet in length by 180 feet in depth. A second area of the same cemetery including the Papal crypt and that of St. Caecilia measured 250 along the road, and reached back 100 feet *in agro*. Such a plot was secured by its Christian proprietor as a burial-place with the usual legal formalities. The fact of the individual being a Christian threw no impediment in the way of the purchase, or of the construction of the cemetery. All were in this respect equally under the protection of the laws. The first step in the construction of the cemetery was the excavation of a passage all the way round the area, communicating with the surface by one or more staircases at the corners. *Loculi* were cut in the walls of these galleries to receive the dead. When the original galleries were fully occupied, cross galleries were run on the same level, gradually forming a network of passages, all filled with tombs. If a family vault was required, or a martyr or other Christian of distinction had to be interred, a small rectangular chamber, *cubiculum*, was excavated, communicating with the gallery. In the earlier part of the cemetery of Callistus a considerable number of these small burial chambers are found, succeeding one another as we proceed along the *ambulacrum* with as much regularity as bedrooms opening out of a passage in a modern house. When the galleries in the original *piano* had reached their furthest extension consistent with stability, the excavators commenced a new system of galleries at a lower level, reached by a new staircase. These were carried out on the same principle as those in the story above, and were used for sepulture as long as they afforded space for graves. When more room was wanted the *fossore*s formed a third story of galleries, which was succeeded by a fourth, and even by a fifth. Instances indeed are met with, as in some parts of the cemetery of Callistus, where, including what may be called a *mezzanine* story, the number of *piani* reaches seven. Sometimes, however, according to Cav. Mich. S. de Rossi (*Analisi. Geol. ed. Archit. del Cimitero di Callisto*, vol. ii. p. 30), the upper *piani* are of later date than the lower, experience having given the excavators greater confidence in the security of the strata, and the complete cessation of persecution removing the temporary necessity for concealment. Some of these later galleries are not more than from three to four

inches below the surface. The extreme narrowness of the galleries is one of the most marked characteristics of the Christian catacombs. The object of the excavators being to economize space and make the most of a limited area, the gallery was not formed of a greater width than would be sufficient for the purpose of affording two tiers of sepulchral recesses, with room enough between for the passage, usually, of a single person. The narrowest galleries, which are by no means rare, are from 2 ft. to 2½ ft. wide. The normal width is from 2½ ft. to 3 ft. A few are 3½ ft. wide. A still smaller number, and those usually very short, are from 4 ft. to 5 ft. in width. These rules, says M. S. de Rossi, are unalterable, whatever be the piano, or the quality of the rock. The only variation is that where the rock is more friable the galleries are less numerous, and more of the intervening stratum is left untouched; while they become more numerous and intricate the greater the solidity of the formation. The ceiling is usually flat, sometimes slightly arched. The height of the galleries depends on the nature of the soil in which they are dug. The earliest were originally the least elevated; the *fossore*s being apprehensive of making them too high for security. As they gained confidence in the strength of the rock, space required for more graves was obtained by lowering the floor of the galleries, so that not unfrequently the most ancient are now the most lofty. Sometimes the construction of galleries at a lower level was stopped by the cessation of the *strata* of *tufa granolare*: and at others, as in the Vatican cemetery, by the occurrence of springs, which threatened the inundation of the galleries and the destruction of the graves. When further progress downwards was prevented, another funeral area was opened by the side of the original one, and the same process was repeated. It often happened that in the course of time independent cemeteries which had been formed in adjacent plots of ground were combined together, so as to form one large necropolis. Examples of this are found in almost all the great cemeteries of Rome, and the combination of names which has thus arisen has given rise to no little confusion. Portions of what has since become one cemetery bear different appellations in the ancient documents, and it is not easy to unravel the tangled skein: e. g. the cemetery "ad Ursum pileatum" on the "Via Portuensis" bears the titles of St. Pontianus, SS. Abdon and Sennen, and St. Pigenius. That on the "Via Appia," usually known as the cemetery of St. Praetextatus, is also called after St. Urbanus, SS. Tiburtius and Valerianus, St. Balbina and St. Marcus.

Tradition and documentary evidence have assigned several of the Roman catacombs to the first age of the Church's history. For some, an apostolical origin is claimed. It may be difficult to prove beyond question that any of the existing catacombs belong to the age of St. Peter and St. Paul, but the matter has been very carefully and dispassionately examined by De Rossi, *R. S. i.* p. 184 seq., and the evidence he collects from the existing remains in support of the traditional view is of a nature to convince us that some of them were constructed at least in a very early period. This evidence is presented by

paintings in a pure classical style, with a very rare admixture of distinctly Christian symbols; decorations in fine stucco, displaying a chaste architectural spirit; crypts of considerable size, not hewn out of the living *tufa*, but carefully, and even elegantly, built with pilasters and cornices of brick and terra-cotta; wide corridors with painted walls, and recesses for sarcophagi, instead of the narrow *ambulacra* with their walls thickly pierced with shelf-like funeral recesses; whole families of inscriptions to persons bearing classical names, and without any distinctively Christian expressions; and lastly, though rarely, consular dates of the second, and one or more even of the first century. The catacombs that present these distinctive marks of very early date are those of Priscilla on the Via Salaria Nova, that of Domitilla on the Via Ardentina, of Praetextatus on the Via Appia, and a portion of that of St. Agnes, identified with the cemetery of Ostrianus or Fons Petri.

The evidence of early date furnished by inscriptions is but scanty. It must, however, be borne in mind that only a very small proportion have the date of the year, as given by the consuls, upon them. The chief object was to fix the anniversary of the death, and for this the day of the month was sufficient. The most ancient dated Christian inscription is of the third year of Vespasian, A.D. 72, but its original locality is unknown (Northcote, *R. S.* p. 65). Röstel (*Roms Beschreibung*, i. 371), quotes from Boldetti, p. 83, one of the consulate of Anicius and Virius Gallus, A.D. 98, from the catacomb of Hippolytus; but it begins with the letters D. M., and contains no distinctly Christian expressions. One of the consulate of Sura and Senecio, A.D. 107, and another of that of Piso and Bolanus, A.D. 110, were seen by Boldetti in the catacomb beneath the basilica of St. Paul (Boldetti, pp. 78, 79). The same explorer found here also an inscription, which the name of Gallicanus fixes either to A.D. 127 or A.D. 150.

The beginning of the third century finds the Christians of Rome in possession of a cemetery common to them as a body, and doubtless secured to them by legal tenure, and under the protection of the authorities of the city. We learn this instructive fact from the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus (ix. 11), where we read that Pope Zephyrinus "set Callistus over the cemetery," κατέστησεν ἐπὶ τὸ κοιμητήριον. As we have seen reason to believe that at this period several Christian cemeteries were already in existence, there must have been something distinctive about this one to induce the bishop of Rome to intrust its care to one of his chief clergy, who in a few years succeeded him in his Episcopate. We can have little hesitation in accepting De Rossi's conclusion (for the grounds of which the reader must be referred to his great work *Roma Sotterranea*, or to Dr. Northcote's excellent abridgement of it under the same title) that this was the cemetery which we read in Anastasius, § 17, Callistus "made on the Appian Way, where the bodies of many priests and martyrs repose, and which is called even to the present day coemeterium Callisti." In a crypt of this cemetery Zephyrinus himself was buried, in violation of the rule which had prevailed almost without exception up to that period, that the bishops of Rome should be laid where St. Peter was

believed to repose, in the crypt of the Vatican. Of the fifteen bishops who are reported to have preceded Zephyrinus, all but Clemens, who is recorded to have been buried in Greece, and Alexander, whose sepulchre was made near the scene of his martyrdom, on the *Via Nomentana*, according to the oldest and most trustworthy recensions of the *Liber Pontificalis*, were supposed to sleep in the Vatican cemetery. Of the eighteen who intervened between him and Sylvester, no fewer than thirteen repose in the cemetery of Callistus. Slabs bearing the names of Anteros, A.D. 236, Fabianus, A.D. 251, (the first bishop of whose martyrdom there is no question), Lucius, A.D. 253, and Eutychianus, A.D. 275, in Greek characters, the official language of the Church, with the words *Episcopus*, and, in the case of Fabianus, *martyr*, added, have been discovered by Cav. de Rossi in this crypt. An adjoining vault has revealed the epitaph of Eusebius, A.D. 311, set up by Damasus, and engraved by his artist Furius Dionysius Philocalus, whose name it bears. In another crypt in the same cemetery De Rossi's labours have been rewarded by the fragments of an epitaph which is reasonably identified with that of Cornelius, A.D. 252, whose portrait, together with that of his contemporary and correspondent Cyprian, is painted on its wall. Callistus himself does not lie in the catacomb that bears his name. He met his end by being hurled from a window into a well in the Trastevere, and his corpse was hastily removed to the nearest cemetery, that of Calepodius, on the Via Aurelia. It cannot be reasonably questioned that a cemetery which was the recognised burial-place of the bishops of the city had a public, official character distinct from the private cemeteries with which the walls of Rome were surrounded.

To the period of peaceful occupation and undisturbed use of the cemeteries by the Christian population of Rome succeeded that of persecution. We cannot place this earlier than the middle of the third century. There might be occasional outbreaks of popular violence directed against the Christians, and isolated acts of cruelty and severity towards the professors of an unpopular religion. We know from the famous correspondence between Pliny and Trajan, that even under the merciful survey of so wise and benevolent a ruler, the position of a Christian was far from one of security. Of this we have a proof, if it be really authentic, in the touching record of a martyrdom within the precincts of the catacombs, given by the celebrated epitaph of Alexander from the cemetery of Callistus (Bosio lib. iii. c. 23, p. 216).

"Alexander mortuus non est sed vivit super astra et corpus in hoc tumultu quiescit. Vitam explevit cum Antonino Imp. qui ubi multum beneficii antevenire previderet pro gratia odium reddidit. Genua enim flectens vero Deo sacrificaturus ad supplicia ducitur. O tempora infasta quibus inter sacra et vota ne in cavernis quidem salvari possimus. Quid miserius vita, sed quid miserius in morte cum ab amicis et parentibus sepeliri nequeant. Tandem in caelo coruscat. Parum vixit qui vixit iv. x. Tem."

Another of almost equal interest, from the same cemetery, is also found in Bosio, p. 217, referring to a martyrdom in the days of Hadrian.

"Tempore Adriani Imperatoris Marius ado-

lescens Dux militum qui satis vixit dum vitam pro CHO consumsit. In pace tandem quievit. Benemerentes cum lacrimis et metu posuerunt."

There was no general persecution of the Christians in Rome from the reign of Nero, A.D. 65, to that of Decius, A.D. 249-251. "During that period," writes Dean Milman (*History of Christianity*, bk. iv. c. ii. p. 329, note 2), "the Christians were in general as free and secure as the other inhabitants of Rome. Their assemblies were no more disturbed than the synagogues of the Jews, or the rites of other foreign religions. From this first terrible but brief onslaught under Decius, to the general and more merciless persecution under Diocletian and Galerius, A.D. 303, there is no trustworthy record of any Roman persecution." These epochs of persecution left their marks on the construction of the catacombs. The martyrdom of Xystus II. in the cemetery of Praetextatus, A.D. 257 ("Xystum in cimiterio animadversum sciatis . . . et cum eo diaconos quatuor," Cyprian, *Ep.* 80), and the walling up alive of a considerable number of the faithful, men, women, and children, near the tombs of the martyrs Chrysanthus and Daria, in a catacomb on the Via Salaria, recorded by St. Gregory of Tours, *De Gloria Martyr.* i. c. 28; and other traditions of the same period, even though we are compelled to hesitate as to some of them, testify to the danger that attended the meetings of the faithful in the cemeteries, and the necessity which had arisen for secrecy and concealment if they would preserve the inviolability of their graves, and continue their visits undisturbed. To these fierce times of trial we may safely assign the alterations which we find made in the entrances of and staircases leading down to the catacombs, and the construction of concealed ways of ingress and egress through the *arenariae* which lay adjacent to them. We may instance the blocking up and partial destruction of two chief staircases in the cemetery of Callistus, and the formation of secret passages into the *arenaria*. One of these is approached by a staircase that stops suddenly short some distance from the floor of the gallery, and was thus rendered utterly useless to any who could not command a ladder, or some other means of connecting the lowest step with the *arenaria* (Northcote, *R. S.* pp. 331, 347; De Rossi, *R. S.* ii. 47-49). It happens not unfrequently that galleries are found completely filled up with earth from the floor to the vault. It has been considered by many that this was the work of the Christians themselves, with the view of preserving their sepulchres inviolate by rendering the galleries inaccessible to friend or foe. This view, first propounded by Buonarruoti, *Osserv.* p. xii., is strongly maintained by De Rossi, *R. S.* ii. 52-58, who assigns this earthing-up of the tombs to the persecution of Diocletian, A.D. 302. But the opinion maintained by other equally competent authorities is more probable, that this proceeding was simply dictated by convenience, as a means for disposing more easily of the earth excavated from newly-formed galleries. It must always have been a tedious and laborious operation to convey the freshly-dug earth from the catacomb to the surface, through the long tortuous passages, and by the air-tunnels. The galleries already piled with tombs, and therefore useless for future

interments, offered a ready reception for the material, and in these it was deposited. This is the view of Marchi, p. 94, and Raoul-Rochetta, *Tableau des Catac.* p. 35, and even of Boldetti, pp. 607; although the last-named author is unable altogether to reject Buonarruoti's idea that the galleries were thus filled up to save the hallowed remains they contained from the sacrilegious hands of the heathen.

The middle of the fourth century, which saw the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Roman states, was the commencement of a new era in the history of the catacombs. Subterranean interment gradually fell into disuse, and had almost entirely ceased by the close of that century. The undeniable evidence of the inscriptions with consular dates as given by De Rossi, *Inscr. Christ.* i. p. 117, &c., shews that between A.D. 338 and A.D. 360 two out of three burials took place in the subterranean portions of the cemeteries. Between A.D. 364 and A.D. 369 the proportions are nearly equal, and a new era in the history of the cemeteries began—the era of religious interest. The zeal displayed by Pope Damasus A.D. 366-384 in repairing and decorating the catacombs; erecting new staircases for the convenience of pilgrims, searching for the places of the martyrs' interment, and adorning them with exquisitely engraved epitaphs in large faultless characters, the work of an artist named Furius Dionysius Philocalus, caused a short sudden outburst of desire to be buried near the hallowed remains, resulting in wholesale destruction of many hundreds of early paintings with which the walls of the *cubicula* and *arcosolia* were covered. But the flame soon died out. Between A.D. 373 and A.D. 400 the subterranean interments were only one in three, and after A.D. 410, the fatal year of the taking of Rome by Alaric, scarcely a single certain example is found. But although the fashion of interment came to an end, the reputed sanctity of those whose remains were enshrined in them caused them to be the object of wide-spread interest. Pilgrims flocked to visit the places hallowed by the memories of so many confessors and martyrs, for whose guidance catalogues of the chief cemeteries and of the saints buried in them were from time to time drawn up, which have proved of considerable service in their identification. Even hermits came from a distance and fixed their cells in their immediate neighbourhood.

It appears evident from Jerome's well-known description of his visits to the catacombs when a schoolboy, circa A.D. 354, Hieron. in *Ezech.* c. xl. that even in the latter half of the fourth century interment was rare in them. He speaks of visiting "the tombs of the apostles and martyrs," and describes the walls of the crypts "lined with the bodies of the dead;" but his language is that of one describing a cemetery long since disused, not one in daily activity. So also, *Praef. ad Lib.* ii. in *Galat.*, "Ubi alibi tanto studio et frequentia ad martyrum sepulchra curritur?" The words of the poet Prudentius, written about the same time, describing the tomb of Hippolytus, lead to the same conclusion. His lengthened and minutely detailed description does not contain a word that indicates that the cemetery which contained this sacred shrine was used for actual interment.

Amidst all the devastation committed by the barbarian conquerors both in the first and second sack of Rome, A.D. 410, 457, we have no record of damage inflicted on the cemeteries. It may be simply lack of evidence. We cannot deem it likely that any feeling of reverence would have led the Goths to refrain from the rich plunder the piety of devotees had stored up in the burial chapels. Prudentius informs us that the *aedicula* which enshrined the relics of St. Hippolytus was bright with solid silver, and other catacombs were certainly as sumptuously decorated. But whether the catacombs were devastated by Alaric's hordes or no, it is certain that after A.D. 410 "the use of the subterranean cemeteries as places of burial was never resumed, and that inscriptions and notices that seem to refer to them will be found on closer examination to relate to basilicas and cemeteries above ground. The *fossors*' occupation was gone, and after A.D. 426 their name ceases to be mentioned. The liturgical books of the fifth century refer constantly, in the prayers for the dead and the benediction of graves, to burials in and around the basilicas, never to the subterranean cemeteries," (Northcote *R. S.* p. 104). But though disused as places of sepulture the catacombs continued to be visited by pilgrims, and were regarded with special devotion by the popes, who from time to time repaired and beautified them (*e. g.* Symmachus, A.D. 498-514; Anast. § 81). The fatal zeal displayed by successive pontiffs in the restoration and decoration of these consecrated shrines is the cause of much perplexity to the investigator who desires to discover their original form and arrangements. Nothing but long experience and an intimate acquaintance with the character of the construction and ornamentation of different periods can enable us to distinguish with any accuracy between the genuine structure of the catacombs and the paintings with which they were originally adorned, and the work of later times. Many of the conclusions drawn by Roman Catholic writers from the paintings and ritual arrangements of the catacombs as we now find them, and the evidence supposed to be furnished by them as to the primitive character of their dogmas and traditions, prove little worth when a more searching investigation shows their comparatively recent date. An analogous exaggeration has widely prevailed with regard to the custom of resorting to these gloomy vaults as places of concealment in times of persecution. We cannot fairly doubt that they occasionally served as places of refuge, though it is not always easy to determine whether the language used refers to the subterranean part of the cemetery, or to the *cellae*, the basilicas, and other buildings which had gradually risen in the *area* that lay above them; but that which was at most exceptional has been spoken of almost as if it were the rule.

We have direct evidence that the ravages of the Goths under Vitiges, when they sacked Rome, A.D. 537, extended to the catacombs, "*Ecclesiae et corpora sanctorum martyrum exterminatae sunt a Gothis*" (Anast. § 99). On their retirement the havoc they had committed was repaired by Pope Vigilius, who replaced the broken and mutilated epitaphs of Pope Damasus by copies, not always very correct. These good deeds stand recorded in an inscription of this pope now in the Gallery of the Vatican:—

CHRIST. ANT.

"Dum peritura Getae posuissent castra sub urbem  
Moverunt Sanctis bella nefanda prius,  
Totaque sacrilego verterunt curde sepulchra  
Martyribus quondam rite sacrata pia.  
Quos monstrante Deo Damasus sibi Papa probatos  
Affixo monuit carmine jure coli;  
Sed perit titulus confracto marmore sanctus  
Nec tamen his iterum posse latere fuit.  
Diruta Vigilinus nam posthaec Papa gemiscens  
Hostibus expulsis omne novavit opus."

The reverence for the catacombs was now gradually dying out. One pope after another attempted to revive it by their decrees, but without any permanent effect. John III., circa A.D. 568, restored the cemeteries of the holy martyrs, "and ordered that oblations" (the Eucharistic elements), "cruets, and lights [*oblationes, ampullae*' (var. lect. '*amulae*'), vel '*luminaria*'], should be supplied from the Lateran every Sunday" (Anast. § 110). It is also recorded in commendation of Sergius I., A.D. 687-701, that when he was a presbyter it was his wont to "celebrate mass diligently through the different cemeteries" (Anast. § 158). In the next century, circa 735, Gregory III., a zealous builder and repairer of churches, arranged a body of priests to celebrate mass, and provided that lights and oblations should be furnished from the palace for all the cemeteries round Rome (Anast. § 204). In neither of these cases, however, can we affirm that the reference is chiefly to *underground* cemeteries or catacombs.

We have now reached the period of the religious spoliation of the catacombs, from which they have suffered more irreparably than from any violence offered by sacrilegious hands. The injuries commenced by the Goths had been repeated by the Lombards under Astolphus, A.D. 956. But these invaders did little more than complete the devastation which was being already caused by the carelessness of those by whom these cemeteries should have been religiously tended. The slothfulness and neglect manifested towards these hallowed places are feelingly deplored by Paul I. in a Constitution dated June 2, A.D. 761. Not only were sheep and oxen allowed to have access to them, but folds had been set up in them and they had been defiled with all manner of corruption. The holy father therefore resolved to translate the bodies of the saints and enshrine them in a church he had built on the site of his paternal mansion (Anast. § 259, 260). Paul's immediate successors reversed his policy, and used all their endeavours to restore the lost glories of the catacombs. But it was too late, the spirit of the age had changed. As the only means of securing the sacred relics from desecration, Paschal, A.D. 817-827, was forced to follow the example set by Paul, July 20, A.D. 817. He translated to the church of St. Prassede, as recorded in an inscription still to be read there, no less than 2300 bodies. The work was continued by succeeding popes, and many cartloads of relics are recorded to have been transferred at this period from the catacombs to the Pantheon. The sacred treasures which had given the catacombs their value in the eyes of the devout having been removed, all interest in them ceased. Henceforward all inducement to visit them was lost, and with some insignificant exceptions the catacombs lapsed into complete


X



oblivion, in which they remained wrapped for more than six centuries. It was not till May 31, 1578, that their fortuitous discovery revealed to the astonished inhabitants of Rome the hidden treasures that lay beneath their feet, and awoke an interest which, though sometimes flagging and not always intelligently exercised, has never since expired, and which the combined genius, learning, and industry of Marchi, and his pupils, the brothers De Rossi, together with the remarkable discoveries which have rewarded their researches, and the skill with which they have known how to interpret and employ the results of their investigations, have of late raised to a pitch that has never before been equalled.

It is not within the scope of this article to record the names and trace the labours of the investigators who have employed themselves in this field of research. This will be found in the chronological sketch prefixed to Raoul-Rochette's excellent and unprejudiced little work, "*Tableaux des Catacombes de Rome*," Paris, 1853, as well as in the opening pages of the *Roma Sotterranea* of De Rossi, and the English abridgement by Dr. Northcote and the Rev. W. E. Brownlow, London, 1869.


**Description.**—The catacombs of Rome, to which as the most interesting and most thoroughly investigated of the subterranean cemeteries our present remarks will be confined, consist of a vast labyrinth of narrow subterranean passages or galleries excavated in the strata of volcanic earth that underlie the city and its neighbourhood, for the purpose of the interment of the dead. These galleries are excavated at different levels, forming various stories or *piani*, one beneath the other, communicating by narrow flights of steep stairs cut in the native rock, as well as by shafts and wells sunk for the purpose of affording light and air. These stories of galleries lie one below the other sometimes to the number of five, or even, as in the cemetery of St. Callistus of seven. The galleries as a rule preserve the level



Section of the Crypt of St. Landra in the Catacomb of St. Callistus, from De Rossi.

of the *piani* to which they belong, so that it is very rare to meet with galleries, gradually descending by an inclined plane to a lower story. The only communication, as a rule, between the stories is by flights of steps. The lowest are usually


the latest; the additional labour of removing the earth from the greater depth not being undertaken until the want of burial space in the story above forced it upon its possessors. Instances occur where a stratum of considerable thickness having been left by the original constructors between two stories of *ambulacra*, an intermediate story (a *mezzanine* or *entresol*), has been excavated in later times. These corridors, or *ambulacra*, follow no definite system. They more usually than not run in straight lines, forming an intricate network continually crossing and recrossing one another at different angles, and as no law of parallelism is adopted in laying out the plan, it is not easy to reduce them to any system. These galleries are not merely passages of access to the cemetery, but themselves con-



Gallery with "Loculi," from Northcote's "Roma Sotterranea."

stitute the cemetery. They do not conduct to the places of interment, but the dead are interred in them. The walls are vertical, and (as represented in the annexed woodcut) are pierced on each side with long low horizontal recesses, commencing a few inches above the level of the floor, and rising tier above tier, like the berths in a ship's cabin, to the number of five, six, and sometimes even twelve ranges. They are divided from one another by an intervening shelf of tufa as this was compatible with security. The length of these niches is almost invariably in the direction of the gallery. This form was much easier to excavate, and enabled the corpse to be laid in its tomb with greater facility and reverence than when the recess entered deep into the rock, at right angles to the axis of the corridor. Examples of this latter form do exist in the Roman catacombs, but very rarely. Padre Marchi, *Monumenti delle Arti Crist. Prim.* pp. 110, 225, tav. xiv., xlii., xlii., gives a description and engravings of 20 specimens discovered by him in the cemetery of St. Cyriaca (see ground plan). The same mode of construction appears in the heathen catacombs in Egypt, and those of the Saracens at Taormina, engraved by D'Agincourt, pl. ix. The name given in modern times to these sepulchral cavities is *loculus*. The original term, appearing thousands and thousands of times in the inscrip-


tions of the catacombs, was *locus*. The word *loculus*, properly signified a *box* or a *coffin*, "*cujus* (Agapeti) *corpus in loculo plumbeo translatus est* (Constantinopoli) *usque in basilicam B. Petri apostoli*" (Anastas. lix. § 95; cf. *Ibid.*



Loculi in the Catacombs of St. Cyriac, from Marchi.

lxiii. 110), and is incorrectly applied to the grave. Its use in this sense was introduced by Lupi in the early part of the 18th century. He writes "*loculum appello excavatum in coemeterii parietibus fenestram parvam ad unum alterumve cadaver excipendum*" (Lupi, *Dissert. ad Sev. Martyr. Epitaph.* 1734, p. 2, note 3). Each recess usually contained a single body. But instances are by no means rare where by increasing its depth it was made capable of receiving two, three, or four corpses. Such recesses were designated *bisomi*, *trisomi*, *quadrisomi*, etc., according to the number of bodies for which they were destined. Examples of the use of all these terms appear in the epitaphs. *Bisomi*: from that of St. Callistus, "*Donata se viv. emit sibi et Marcellinae locum bisomum.*" (Boldetti, p. 286.) "*Sergius et Junius Fossore R. N. M. in pace bisom.*" (Boldetti, p. 85.) "*Hoc tunc coivgi seofite bisom. maritus fecit*" (Bosio, p. 507). *Trisomi*: "*Seberus, Leontius Bictorius. Trisomum*" (Bosio, p. 216). "*Se buba (viva) emit Domnina locum a Successum trisomu ubi positi.*" (*Ib.*). *Quadrisomi*: "*Consulatu Nicomaci Flabiani locum Marmorari quadrisomum*" (Maitland, p. 39; see Marchi, pp. 115-117.) The *loculi* were in later times purchased of the sextons, *fossore*, and as some of the inscriptions already given show, not unfrequently in a person's lifetime. Another example is the following ungrammatical epitaph from Bosio, lib. iii. c. 41, "*Locus Beneati et Gaudiosae comparat se vivi comparaverunt et ab Anastasio et Antiocho FS. (fossoribus).*" An inscription from the Museum of the Capitol given by Burgon, *Letters from Rome*, p. 181, no. 25, acquaints us with the price paid, 1000 folles (the follis is said at that time to have been equivalent to an obolus), and that the bargain was struck in the presence of Severus and Laurence his brother sexton. "*Emit locum ab Argtaemianum visomum et hoc est et praetium et datum Fossor Philagro yd est Fol. N. et S. Praesentia Severi Foss. et Laurent.*" Sometimes *loculi* were excavated by the heirs of the *fossor* with whom the bargain was made, "*fossoris descendentibus*" (De Rossi, *R. S. I.* 215). The *loculi* are found of all sizes, from those suitable for an infant of a few days old which occur by thousands to those adapted to the body of a

full grown man. In the more ancient galleries apertures of various dimension occur confusedly, having been formed as occasion required. The early *loculi* are also of much larger dimensions than was needful for the reception of the body, and neither in the form of the niches themselves nor in their arrangement does the idea of economy of space shew itself. But experience taught the excavators how to make the most of the space at command, and Marchi, pp. 112, 113, tav. xv., produces an example from the cemetery of St. Cyriaca, where the *loculi* are arranged in groups according to their dimensions, every square inch of rock being utilised as far as was consistent with stability. In some cases the back wall of the *loculus* instead of being parallel to the lines of the opening is set at an angle, forming a trapezoidal recess in which bodies of different stature might lie side by side (see annexed ground plan and section) (Marchi, tav. xv. xviii.). In later times space was also economised by making the recess wide at the head and narrow at the feet. Examples are not wanting of graves being dug like those of our own day in the floor of the corridors. Marchi gives instances from the catacombs of Calepodius and Callistus, tav. xxi. xxvi. etc. But they are very unfrequent. The *loculi*, after the introduction of the body were closed with great care, either with slabs of marble (*tabulae*) or with large tiles.



Plan of above loculi (bisomi) from the Catacomb of St. Cyriac, from Marchi.

usually three, very exactly cemented together, and luted round with lime to prevent the escape of the gases of the putrefying bodies. The tiles closing the early *loculi* in the cemetery of Domitilla are of vast size. (De Rossi, *Bullett. de Ant. Christ. Magg.*, 1865.) On the slabs of the earlier *loculi*, e.g. in the cemeteries of Priscilla and Domitilla, the name is only painted in red and black pigment, not cut or scratched (Fabretti *Insc. Dom.* viii. p. 579; Aringhi, *R. S. I.* 37, p. 126; Boldetti, *Ab. ii. c. 1*). The striking fact that, in the words of Dean Milman (*Lat. Chr. i. p. 27*), "for a considerable part of the first three centuries the church of Rome was a Greek religious colony;" that its language, organisation, writers, scriptures, liturgy, were Greek, is evidenced by the inscriptions on these primitive burial places. They are almost exclusively in Greek. When engraved the letters are often coloured with vermillion. But an immense number of *loculi* are entirely destitute of any

inscription (Bosio, lib. iii. c. 41; Boldetti, lib. ii. c. 1; Lupi, p. 38). On these slabs were engraved the funeral inscription or epitaph, often accompanied with some of the more usual Christian emblems, the dove, the anchor, or the monogram of Christ. The word *tabula* appears in some of the epitaphs, *e. g.*, of a master to a pupil, "Posvit tabula magister discenti Pempino benemerenti" (Marchi, p. 119). "Bicentivs karo filio karissimo benemerenti posvit tabula qvi bixit annos iiii et dies xxii" (*Ib.* p. 120). Both from the catacomb of St. Cyriaca.

A small glass vessel containing indications of the presence of a red fluid, is often found embedded in the mortar at one extremity of the *loculus*. This was formerly considered to be a certain mark of a martyr's tomb, the "Congregation of Relics" having so decided (Apr. 10, 1868), the red sediment being supposed to be blood. But this opinion has long ceased to be entertained by the best and most unprejudiced Christian archaeologists who almost unanimously agree that the vessel contained Eucharistic wine, and was used at the funeral *agape*. [GLASS, CHRISTIAN.] Incised on the slab, or scratched on the mortar, the *palm branch* is one of the symbols that most constantly presents itself in connection with the *loculus*. This also has been authoritatively declared to be an indisputable evidence of a martyr's tomb, "palnam et vas sanguine tinctum pro signis certissimis martyrii haberi," (*Decree of the Cong. of Relics, u. s.*), and has been as completely set aside by later and less enthusiastic investigators. Not to dwell on the fact that the epitaphs found in connection with the palm branch, have as a rule, no reference to a martyr's death, this symbol is found on tombs prepared by individuals in their lifetime (*e. g.*, "Leopardus se biv. fecit" between two palm branches, Boldetti, p. 264), and decorates those of young children (*Ib.* p. 268); dignifies that of Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari, who died in schism, (*Ib.* p. 262); and even appears on pagan tombstones (*Ib.* p. 281, sq.). Not a few of the marble slabs (*tabulae*), closing the *loculi*, prove on examination, like some of our mediaeval sepulchral brasses, to have been used before, their back bearing a second inscription. These are known as *opisthographs*. They are usually heathen slabs, but not always. One described by Marchi, p. 53, bears on one side "Hilara in Pace," and on the other "Irene in Pace"—both Christian. Boldetti, lib. ii. c. 10, supplies a large number of examples of these twice used slabs. Mabillon (*Iter. Ital.* p. 136), writes of this custom, "Christianis mos erat ut e sepulchris gentilium lapides revellerent in suos usus, et relicta ex ea parte quae interiora Christiani tumuli spectabat profana inscriptione aliam in exteriori apponerent ritu Christiano" (Cf. Idem. *Euseb. Roman.* p. 34; Marchi, pp. 53, 123).

Besides the *opisthographs* where a heathen slab has been applied to a Christian use no inconsiderable number of distinctly pagan epitaphs has been discovered, in which no such transformation has taken place. Boldetti, lib. ii. c. 9, gives no less than 57 heathen inscriptions without any Christian admixture from the various catacombs, and the list might be very largely increased. One such is mentioned by Mabillon in his *Iter. Italicum. Mus. It.* vol. i. p. 47, which though it was destitute of Christian tokens was sent to Tou-

louse as the slab of a supposed martyr, Julia Enodia, when it was really that of Casta her mother, and was pagan. In Boldetti, p. 447, we have a curious heathen slab from St. Agnes, with the inscription "Domine frater ilaris semper ludere tabula" and symbols of gaming. De Rossi found pagan sarcophagi and pagan inscriptions in the catacomb of Callistus in excavations made under his own eye (*Rom. Sott.* ii. pp. 169, 281-290). It has been usually held that these were slabs which had been removed from the heathen tombs in the vicinity of the catacombs after the Christian religion had become dominant, and brought down to be re-engraved and fitted for their new purpose. "Primos Christianos Paganorum memorias titulosque suffratos esse et suis loculis coemiterialibus claudendis propriis nominibus insculptis et profanorum absconditis aut abrasis . . . ostendere possumus" (Fabretti *Inscr. Ant.* p. 307). But another and widely different view has lately been propounded by Mr. Parker and others, that the rigid separation usually supposed to exist between Christians and heathen in the places of sepulture was not always maintained, and that when in the fourth century the burning of the dead ceased the catacombs became the common burial places of Rome for heathen and Christians alike. This is one of the many questions in connection with the catacombs in which fuller light may show that the traditional view requires some modification, but which must wait the result of further investigations for complete resolution. A class of mixed inscriptions remains to be noticed in which the heathen formula D. M., or even the full *Dis Manibus* appears in connection with Christian phraseology and Christian emblems. "Debita sacratis manibus officia" is quoted from Gruter by Fabretti *Inscr. Dom.* 112 A., as a Christian inscription. From the same collection (Gruter, MLXI.) he also gives one in which occurs the line "Sanctique Manes nobis petentibus adsint," in connection with the clause "quievit in pace," and the term "depositio." Other inscriptions from Fabretti's collection evidence the same lingering retention of heathen formula and phraseology in the expressions "Lachesis," "Taenariae fauces," "fatis ereptus iniquis," and the like. The strangely unchristian phrase "Tartarea custodia" occurs in the epitaph of a presbyter (Fabr. p. 329, no. 484). "Domus aeterna" is by no means infrequent: *e. g.* "Florentia quae vixit annis xxvi Crescens fecit Venemerenti et sibi et suis domu aeterna in pace" (*ib.* p. 114, no. 289). The untenable fallacy contended for by Boldetti, lib. ii. c. 11, Fabretti, and the earlier school of antiquaries, that the letters D. M. stood for *Deo Maximo* has been deservedly exploded. De Rossi allows that they can only stand for *Dis Manibus*, and we may safely regard the occurrence of these letters on Christian tombstones as an instructive example of the slowness with which an entire people changes its ancestral faith, and of the obstinacy with which certain usages are clung to long after their real force and meaning has passed away.\*

\* On this subject and its kindred topics the dispassionate verdict of Dean Merivale may be read with advantage. "The first Christians at Rome did not separate themselves from the heathens, nor renounce their ordinary callings; they intermarried with unbelievers,

Examples are not wanting where the work of excavation has not been completed, and the form of the *loculus* is still seen as it was sketched by the *fossore* on the wall of the *ambulacrum*.

The bodies of the faithful were not buried naked, but with the same feeling of reverence that pervaded the whole rite, were, like that of their Master, wrapt in linen cloths "as the manner of the Jews is to bury." Sometimes the body was enveloped in a sheet; sometimes swathed in many lengths of bands, in the same fashion as Lazarus is represented in the early Christian pictures and bas-reliefs. Bosio assures us that in his investigations he found instances of both modes. He mentions that, in excavating the foundations for St. Peter's, bodies were exhumed bound with linen bands, and that he himself had seen very many wrapt in linen sheets of exceeding fineness, which fell to dust at a touch (Bosio, *R. S.* cap. 19; Marchi, p. 19). The story of the double discovery of the body of St. Caecilia first by Pope Paschal, c. 820, and then by Cardinal Sfondrati, A.D. 1599, in the robes of golden tissue she had worn in life is familiar. (It may be read in Northcote, *R. S.* pp. 154-157.) That the bodies placed in the *loculi* were embalmed is probable from the known custom of the early Christians. Boldetti, lib. I. c. 59, affirms that on repeated occasions when he was present at the opening of a grave in the catacombs the assembled company were conscious of a spicy odour diffusing itself from the tomb. Of this custom Prudentius writes:

"*Aspernans myrrin Sabao,  
Corpus medicamine servat.*"  
(In *Seep. Vat. Hymn* 10).

Another and ruder mode of averting the evils which might arise from the putrefaction of the bodies in galleries which were the frequent resort of the living was to bury the corpse in quick lime. Padre Marchi remarked frequent examples of this custom, especially in the cemetery of St. Agnes. The lime appeared to have been placed between two winding sheets, one coarser and the other finer, of the tissue of which it retained the impress (Marchi, p. 19).

Interment in the *loculus* though infinitely the most common, was not the only, and perhaps not the earliest mode adopted by the Christians. Cav. de Rossi has been led by his investigations to the conclusion that the earliest form of Christian burial was in sarcophagi placed in detached chambers, and that burial in the *loculus* was of later date. The truth may however be that the bodies of the wealthier were laid in sarcophagi, which must have always been costly, while the friends of the poorer contented themselves with a simple *loculus* in the wall. The Cemetery of St. Domitilla at Tor Marancia, which is considered by De Rossi to be the monument of a Christian family of distinction, and is shown by the classical character of its architecture and decoration to have belonged to the first age of the church, affords examples of interment in sarcophagi, as

as even in their unions with one another did they neglect the ordinary forms of law. It would seem that they burnt their dead after the Roman fashion" (can this be shown to be true?), "gathered their ashes into the vessels of their patrons, and inscribed over them the customary dedication to the Divine Spirits."—*History of the Roman Church*, ch. liv.


well as of the transition from the sarcophagus to the *loculus*, in some graves which "though really mere shelves in the wall are so disguised by stucco and painting on the outside as to present to passers by the complete outward appearance of a sarcophagus" (De Rossi, *R. S.* i. 187, 195, 267; Northcote, *R. S.* p. 72, 73). Another example is the so-called *Capella Græca* of the catacomb of St. Priscilla. This crypt is of a very peculiar character, formed in the galleries of an ancient *arenaria*, not hollowed out of the tufa, but constructed of brick. The burial-places here are not *loculi*, but large arched recesses destined to contain sarcophagi of which in Bosio's time numerous fragments remained, and some still exist (Bosio, *R. S.* 513, 533; De Rossi, *R. S.* i. 188 sq.). The cemetery of Domitilla contains also numerous examples of sarcophagi of *terru cotta* buried in the floor of the *ambulacra*.

Another form of interment analogous to the sarcophagus was that in the *Table Tomb* or *Sepolcro a mensa*, an oblong chest either hollowed



Table Tomb.

out in the living rock, or built up of masonry slabs of stone or large tiles, and closed by a heavy slab of marble lying horizontally on the top, forming a table. The rock was excavated above the tomb, to form a rectangular recess. When the niche assumed a circular form, which is the more frequent though not the earlier shape, it is known by the name of *arcosolium* [ARCO SOLIUM.] Both



Arcosolium.

forms of tomb are met with in the galleries among the *loculi*, but their more usual position is in the sepulchral chambers, or *cubicula*, which opened out of the galleries. The *table tomb* sometimes stands in front of the wall, projecting from it, like the altar tombs of our own churches. Examples of this arrangement appear in the tombs of the presbyters Eusebius and Gregorius in the papal crypt in the cemetery of St. Callistus (De Rossi, vol. ii. p. 108, tav. I. A.). More frequently it is let into the wall, and stands in a recess, as we see in the tomb assigned by De Rossi to St. Zephyrinus, which formed the original altar in the same crypt (*ib.* pp. 20, 21, 51), and that of St. Cornelius in the same catacomb (*ib.* vol. i. p. 284, tab. v.). The arched form or *arcosolium* proper is not found in the more ancient cemeteries, or in the earliest constructed *cubicula*. This is an indication of date of great importance in determining the relative antiquity of the catacombs. De Rossi remarks (vol. ii. p. 245) that "the *arcosolium* is the dominant form in



every part of the second and third area of the cemetery of St. Callistus, and appears frequently in some of the crypts added to the original rectangular area to unite it to the second area, but is entirely wanting (with one exception which serves only to prove the rule) in all the *cubicula* of the primitive area, even in the most noble and illustrious of its sepulchres" (Cf. De Rossi, vol. i. pp. 284, 285; vol. ii. p. 21).


In addition to the ordinary places of interment in the *ambulacra*, the catacombs contain an immense number of sepulchral chambers or *cubicula*, each enshrining a larger or smaller number of dead, as well in *sabbi tombs* and *arcosolia* as in *loculi* pierced in the walls. These were origi-




In the Catacomb of St. Agnes, with stairs down out of the rock.

nally family burial places, excavated and embellished at the expense of the friends of the departed, and from the date of their first construction served for the celebration of the eucharistic feast and *agape*, on the occasion of the funeral, and its successive anniversaries. In times of persecution they may have supplied places of religious assembly where the faithful might gather in security for the celebration of the holy mysteries at the graves of the departed martyrs and others whose faith they might be soon called to follow and seal their testimony with their blood. The name *cubiculum* is of exclusively Christian use as applied to places of interment. We find it repeatedly used in that sense in the *Liber Pontificalis* of Anastasius. In the life of Sixtus III. A.D. 432-440, it is distinctly used for a family vault "Cujus" (Bassi) "corpus sepelivit ad Beatum Petrum apostolum in cubiculo parentum ejus" (Anast. xli. § 63). Padre Marchi, p. 101, gives several inscriptions from the catacombs themselves, in which the term occurs in this reference: e.g. CYBICVLVM DOMITIANI; CUBICVLVS FAL. GAUDENTI ARGENTARI, from the catacomb of St. Callistus. An inscription of the year 336 given by De Rossi, No. 45, indicates the family vault of Aurelia Martina CUBICVLVM AURELIE MARTINAE. "These inscriptions indicate," writes Marchi, p. 101, "that in the fourth century the persons named caused that their own *cubicula* should be excavated at their own expense. Each *cubiculum* was of sufficient dimensions to serve for several generations of their respective families. If it proved insufficient *loculi* were added at a greater or less distance from the *cubiculum*." Sometimes

we find the arch of an *arcosolium* of the first century cut through and used as a door or entrance to a second *cubiculum* excavated in its rear. the original sarcophagus being removed and carried to the back of the chapel that other bodies might be placed near it (*Bullettina di Arch. Crist.* 1887). The number of these sepulchral chambers is almost beyond computation. Marchi reckons more than sixty in the eighth part of the catacomb of St. Agnes. In that of St. Callistus they amount to some hundreds. They are equally frequent in the other cemeteries. Their form is very varied. In the catacomb of St. Callistus, with very few exceptions, they are rectangular, and that appears to have been the earlier shape. But the plates of Marchi, Boldetti, &c., afford examples of many other forms, triangular, pentagonal, hexagonal, octagonal, circular, and semi-circular. Among the examples given by Boldetti, pp. 14, 15, and Marchi, tav. xxiii., of which we give a plan and section, one



Plan of Cubiculum from Catacomb of St. Callistus.



Section of Cubiculum from Catacomb of St. Callistus.

from the cemetery of Callistus is circular, with a domed vault, and is surrounded by six arched niches. Another from that of St. Helena on the Via Labicana is square, with an insulated tomb in the centre, the roof being supported by four columns standing quite free of the walls, cut out of the native tufa. The roof is sometimes a barrel vault, sometimes a coved ceiling, nearly flat: in one instance, it expands into a lofty dome, lighted by a *luminare* (Bosio, p. 489, Marchi, tav. xxii.). Both the roof, the vaults, and the recesses of the *arcosolia* are generally coated with stucco, and richly decorated with religious paintings. In the later restorations the walls are often veneered

with plates of costly marble [PLATONIA]. In a very large number of examples the Good Shepherd occupies the centre of the ceiling, the surrounding lunettes containing Adam and Eve after the Fall, the history of Jonah, the Sacrifice of Abraham, Moses striking the Rock, the Three Children in the Furnace, the Visit of the wise men to Christ, the Raising of Lazarus, the Healing of the Blind man, the Paralytic carrying his Bed, the Miracle of the Loaves, and other scenes from the limited cycle of Scriptural subjects to which early Christian art confined itself, treated with a wearisome uniformity; embellished with palm branches, vines laden with grapes, the dove, the peacock, and other familiar Christian symbols. The walls of the chamber were also similarly decorated [FRESCOS]. The vault is in some cases supported by columns, either cut out of the tufa, or formed of brick coated with stucco (Marchi, tav. xix. xxii. xxx. xxxiii.). A very interesting cubiculum from the Via Latina given by Marchi, tav. xxii. p. 141, sq. from a plate of Bosio's, p. 302, has a domical vault and pillars covered with stucco, ornamented with vine branches and *amoris* in relief. The character of the decoration claims for this a very early date. It is doubtful whether any other of the kind has been discovered in the catacombs. Light and air were not unfrequently admitted by means of a shaft communicating with the surface of the ground, called *luminare*. A chamber so lighted was known as a *cubiculum clarum* (Cf. Anastas. Bibl. Vit. Marcellin. "Sepelivit (corpora) . . . in coemeterio Priscillae in *cubiculo claro*"). For examples see Marchi, tav. viii. xxix. xxxii. xlviii. Jerome's well known description of the catacombs in *Ezechiel*. c. xl. contains an allusion to these *luminaria*. His words are "raro desuper lumen admissum horrorem temperat . . . ut non tam fenestram quam foramen demissi luminis putes." And again, *præfat. in Daniel*. "Cum et quasi per cryptam ambulans rarum desuper lumen aspicerem." Prudentius also in his *Peristephanon*, xi.-v. 161-8 uses similar language:—

Occurrunt caedis immissa foramina tectis  
Quæ jaciunt claros antra super radios.

• • • • •

Attamen excisi subter cava viscera montis,  
Crebra terebrato fornice lux penetrat,  
Sic datur absentis per subterranea solis  
Cernere fulgorem luminibusque frui."

The Acts of SS. Marcellinus and Peter record that the martyr Candida was put to death by hurling her down an airshaft, and overwhelming her with stones, "per *luminare* cryptae jactantes lapidibus obruerunt," ap. Bolland. ii. Jun. n. 10. From an epitaph given by Marchi, p. 165, the *luminaria* appear to have been divided into "larger" and "smaller," "majora," "minora." It is as follows: "cumparavi Saturninus a||Susto (Sixto) locum visomum auri solid||os duo in *luminare* majore. Que po||sita est ibi que fuit cum marito an xl." Marchi gives an interesting example of a *luminare majus* serving for two *cubicula* from the cemetery of SS. Marcellinus and Peter (pl. xxix. pp. 165 sq.). A cylindrical shaft immediately above the *ambulacrum* expands into a cone as it descends, so as to supply light and air to chambers on opposite sides of the passage. Painted on the wall of the shaft is a dove with an olive branch. In the cemetery of Callistus the same *luminare* sometimes serves for three

chambers (Northcote, *R. S.* p. 128). Examples of the smaller *luminaria* from the cemetery of St. Helena may be found in Marchi, tav. vi. vii. viii. If the strata through which the shaft was driven were not sufficiently solid to stand without support, it was lined with a wall, carried up a little distance above the level of the ground, to avoid accidents. Many of the existing *luminaria* belong to the Damasine period, having been opened to admit light and air to the tombs of the more renowned martyrs when they became the object of pious visits. We may instance that of the crypt of St. Cecilia. If, as was most usual, there was no *luminare*, the chambers were illuminated by lamps, sometimes suspended by chains from the vault, sometimes standing in niches, or on small brackets of tile or marble often placed at the angle of a *loculus*. Bottari, vol. i. p. 17, asserts that when the catacombs were first opened some of these lamps were found still in their place, and we are informed by Marchi, p. 136, that the upper part of the niches, and the walls or ceilings above the lamps still retained the blackness caused by the smoke.

These *cubicula* were very frequently double, one on either side of the gallery, and, as we have just noticed, in some instances a *luminare* was sunk in the centre so as to give light to both (Boldetti, p. 16, b.). An inscription of the highest interest given by De Rossi, vol. i. p. 208, describes a double cubiculum of this kind constructed by the permission of Pope Marcellinus, A.D. 296-308, by the Deacon Severus for himself and his family, "*Cubiculum duplex cum arcisoliis et luminare || jussu P. P. sui Marcellini Diaconus iste || Severus fecit mansionem in pace quietam || sibi suis que.*" De Rossi describes a *luminare* of very large size and unusual character in the cemetery of St. Balbina discovered by him. It is nearly hexagonal, and opens on the subterranean excavations with no less than eight rays of light illumining as many distinct chambers and galleries (*R. S.* i. 265).

Each side of the cubiculum usually contains a table tomb or an *arcosolium*. That facing the entrance, behind which the rock is often excavated so as to form an apse, was the chief tomb of the chamber, and very frequently contained the remains of a martyr, and according to primitive usage, based on *Rev.* vi. 9-11, furnished an altar for the celebration of the Eucharist. The altar was sometimes detached from the wall. But this was not a primitive arrangement. In the papal crypt in the cemetery of Callistus we have traces of two altars. The original altar remains hewn out in the rock, the front of brickwork, and the stone slab covering it forming the holy table. In front of this, a raised marble step or *podium*, with four shallow holes or sockets is an evidence of a second later altar standing on four pillars. We have noticed above an example of an insulated altar from the cemetery of St. Helena. As more space was required for the interment of the bodies of members of the same family the walls above and around the original tombs were pierced with *loculi*, sometimes amounting to nearly a hundred. The desire of reposing in the same locality with the blessed dead, and in close proximity to a saint or martyr, which was awakened at so early a period and exercised so much power (cf. August. *de Curâ pro Mortuis gerendâ*; *Retract.* lib. v.

7. 64. Maximus Taurinensis. *Hom.* lxxxi. Ambros. *ad pop. de SS. Gervas. et Protas.* Paulinus Nol. in *Panegy. Celsi*) led to the excavation of *loculi* in the walls behind the earlier tomb, with complete disregard of the paintings decorating them, which were thus mutilated or destroyed. A very badly spelt and ungrammatical inscription given by Marchi, p. 102, from Boldetti, who copied it from the cemetery of St. Cyriaca, tells us of two ladies Valeria and Sabina, who in their lifetime had purchased from *fossore*s named Apro and Viator a double grave (*bisomum*) in the rear of that in which the bodies of recognised saints had been buried, "retro sanctos." It is as follows: IN CRYPTA NOBA RETRO SANCTUS EMERUM (-RUNT) SE VIVAS BALER | RA ET SABINA MERUM LOCU | BISONI AB APRONE ET A | BIATORE. The inscription set up by Damasus in the cemetery of Callistus in honour of the companions in martyrdom of Pope Xystus bears witness to his participation in this feeling, and his relinquishment of the fulfilment of his wishes lest he should disturb the ashes of the faithful.

"Hic fateor Damasus volui mea condere membra,  
Sed cineres timui sanctos vexare piorum."

An inscription given by Gruter, *Insc. Antiq. Christ.* p. 1167, No. 4, testifies the same sentiment.

"Sanctorum exuvils penitus confine sepulchrum,  
Promeruit sacro digna Marina solo."

St. Ambrose also states that he had resigned the place beneath the altar in which he had intended his own body should lie, "dignum est enim ut ibi requiescat sacerdos ubi offerre consuevit" to the relics of the recently discovered martyrs Gervasius and Protasius, and contrasts the position of Christ present on the altar with the saints beneath it, "ille super altari qui pro omnibus mortuus est, isti sub altari qui illius redempti sunt passione." (Ambros. *Ep.* xxii. 15.) See also Jerome, *adv. Vigilant.* p. 359. [ALTAR.] For examples of this ruthless destruction of earlier decorations (Cf. De Rossi, vol. ii. tav. 27, 28, 29; Northcote, *R. S.* Plate xvi.) When the *cubiculum* was absolutely too full to receive any more bodies *loculi* were dug in its vicinity, their connection with the family vault being indicated by an inscription to that effect, e.g. Marchi, p. 101, LOCA ADPERTINENTES AD CUBICULUM GERMULANI.

The altar was sometimes protected from any careless approach by lattice work of marble, *transenna*, the prototype of the *cancelli* of later Christian churches. Fragments of an enclosure of this kind were found by De Rossi in the papal crypt, and supply the authority for the restoration (*R. S.* vol. ii. pp. 20-27, tav. i. l. A.). Other examples are given by Boldetti from the cemeteries of Praetextatus and Helena, and Priscilla (pp. 34, 35, Marchi, p. 128). A very beautiful example of the *transenna* is seen in the cemetery church of St. Alexander, A.D. 498.

We know that it was the universal custom of the early church to celebrate the Eucharist at the time of a funeral, provided it took place in the morning (for authorities see Bingham bk. xxiii. ch. iii. § 12). By degrees a corrupt custom crept in, based on a superstitious view of the magical power of the consecrated elements, of administering the Holy Communion to the de-


parted (Bingham *Orig.* bk. xv. c. iv. § 20). The prohibition of this profane custom in the canons of some early councils (e.g. Auxerre, A.D. 578, can. 12; Carthage iii. A.D. 397, can. 6; Trullo, A.D. 691, can. 83) is evidence for its existence. The consecrated bread was laid as a charm on the breast of the corpse. The wine enclosed in small glass or earthenware bottles was placed in the grave, or imbedded in the mortar at the mouth of the *loculus*, and the red colour left by the exsiccated wine mistaken for blood in the early stages of catacomb investigation has created thousands of false martyrs. Another analogous custom was that of pouring libations of wine on the graves after the old heathen fashion, and supplying the dead with food for their last journey, *viaticum*. The 22nd canon of the Second Council of Tours A.D. 567 mentions those "qui in festivitate cathedrae domini Petri Apostoli cibos mortuis offerunt." Paulinus of Nola *Poem.* xxvii. vv. 566-7 thus alludes to the libations—

"Simplicitas pietate cadit, male credula sanctos  
Perfusa balante mero gaudere sepulchra."

Another purpose of the *cubicula* was for the celebration of the Funeral Feast on the anniversary of the day of death. This was a custom inherited from the heathen sepulchral rites, which too often degenerated into heathen license. St. Augustine deplors that "many drink most luxuriously over the dead, and when they make a feast for the departed, bury themselves over the buried, and place their gluttony and drunkenness to the score of religion" (*De Mor. Eccl. Cath.* c. xxxiv.), and condemns those who "make themselves drunk in the memorials of the martyrs" (*Cont. Faust.* lib. xx. c. 21). (Cf. Ambros. *de Elia.* c. xvii.; August. *Confess.* vi. c. 2.) In primitive times it may be charitably believed that such abuses were the exceptions, and that the anniversary was observed in a seemly manner, and with a cheerfulness tempered by religion. (On this custom see Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i. 454, Clark's edition; Bingham, *Origines*, bk. xx. ch. viii. §§ 1-10; bk. xxiii. ch. iii.; §§ 3-17; Bosio, lib. iv. c. 34.) The pictures on the walls of the *cubicula* in some of the catacombs furnish representations of these funeral feasts, of which they were the scene. The most curious is from an *arcosolium* in the catacomb of SS. Marcellinus and Peter (Bosio, p. 391). Three guests—a woman between two men—are seated at a crescent-shaped, or sigma table, at the two ends of which, in stately curule chairs, two matrons are seated. No dishes appear on the table: they are placed on a small three-legged stand in the centre, at which a lad is stationed preparing to execute the orders of the guests, which are written above their heads—"Irene da Calda," "Agape misce mi" (cf. Juven. *Sat.* v. 63; Martial, lib. i. Ep. 11; lib. viii., Ep. 63; lib. xiv., Ep. 95). Another painting from the same cemetery represents six persons, three of each sex, seated at an empty table. One is drinking from a *thyrtion*; another stretches out his hand to receive a cup from a person of whom no more than the arm is left (Bosio, p. 355).

The *cubicula* generally speaking are of small dimensions, and are incapable of containing more than a very limited number of worshippers. But there are also found halls and chambers of

much larger proportions, which have been considered by the chief Roman Catholic authorities on the subject to have been constructed for the purpose of religious assemblies. These are distinguished by Padre Marchi, by an arbitrary nomenclature which has failed to find acceptance, into *cryptas*, for the smaller, and *ecclesias*, for the larger excavations. Of the latter the most typical example is that discovered in the catacomb of St. Agnes in 1842, and described and figured by Marchi (pp. 182-191; Tav. xxxv.-xxxvii.) from whom we borrow the annexed plan and section. This comprises five quadrangular com-



Plan of supposed Church, from the Catacomb of St. Agnes, from Marchi.

partments, three on one side of the ambulatorium and two on the other, connected by a tolerably wide passage cutting the gallery at right angles. The two compartments to the right of the gallery are supposed to have been reserved for

but the whole rests on too conjectural a basis to be accepted as anything more than a possible hypothesis.

Some of the so-called *crypts* are destitute of *arcosolia*, or have the *arcosolia* placed at too great an elevation to serve as holy tables for the celebration of the sacred mysteries. These are assumed by Marchi to have been devoted to the instruction of *catechumens*. They usually consist of two chambers, one for each sex, and are provided with chairs for the (presumed) catechists, and benches cut in the tufa rock for the catechumens (cf. Marchi, pp. 180-183; tav. xvii.). But such an identification is exceedingly doubtful.

When the catacombs became places of refuge in times of persecution (as it is indisputable they did, though not to the extent popularly credited), it was essential that there should be the means of obtaining a supply of water without leaving the limits of the cemetery. This want was supplied by wells and springs, whether dug for this purpose or not, many of which remain to the present time, still holding water. We may mention one in the *Atrium* of the Catacomb of St. Callistus (F. in De Rossi's plan), which may still be used for its original purpose. The shaft of this well is furnished with foot holes, to enable a man to descend for the purpose of cleaning it out, as is the case, according to De Rossi, in all the ancient wells connected with the catacombs (M. S. de Rossi, *Analisi. Geol. ed. Arch.*



Section of supposed Church, from the Catacomb of St. Agnes, from Marchi.

women, and two of the three to the left of the gallery for men. The third compartment, divided from the others by an arch supported on stuccoed columns, formed the chancel or sanctuary. In the centre of the end wall stands the *cathedra*, or bishop's seat, flanked on each side by a stone bench running along the side walls, which formed seats for the clergy. Hollowed out so as to furnish *loculi* for children, an *arcosolium* fills the space behind the episcopal chair, and occupies both sides of each of the compartment. The walls above the *arcosolia* are pierced with tiers of *loculi*. There is no trace of an altar. The *cathedra* entirely prevents the *arcosolium* fronting the entrance being so used. Marchi therefore concludes that the altar must have been portable. The whole is entirely destitute of painting, or decorations of any kind, beyond a rich marble paneling, a small portion of which remains. The result of the learned father's researches was to satisfy him that the two sexes reached the church by distinct staircases (p. 42) and by separate corridors, and that the church itself must have been constructed before the commencement of the third century:

vol. ii. p. 97). Wells are also mentioned by Boldetti (p. 40) as existing in the cemeteries of Praetextatus and St. Helena, and natural springs in those of St. Pontianus, Ostrianus or Fons Petri and the Vatican.

In close connection with the wells of the catacombs stand the so-called *Baptisteries*. The most remarkable of these is that in the Catacomb of St. Pontianus, the purpose of which is put beyond doubt by its pictorial decoration (Arimgh, i. 381; Bottari, tav. xlv.; Boldetti, p. 40; Marchi, pp. 32, 220-224; tav. ii. xlii.). A descent of ten steps leads to a cistern filled by a natural stream flowing through a channel in the rock. The wall above the cistern retains a fresco of the Baptism of our Lord, and on that at the back of it is a magnificent jewelled cross, the stem immersed in the water, blossoming into flowers and leaves, and from its arms, which support lighted candles, the characters A. D. suspended by chains. Another of these so-called *baptisteries* is found in the lowest *piano* of galleries in the Catacomb of St. Agnes. It is a well-preserved chamber, with rude columns cut in the tufa rock in the corners. A spring of water



runs through it. The paintings have entirely perished from damp.

In connection with some cemeteries we find provision for washing the corpse. This is seen in the very remarkable early Cemetery of Domitilla at Tor Marancia. The entrance is above ground on the side of a hill cut down for the purpose. On each side of the doorway is a vestibule, or covered porch. To the left is a chamber where may be traced a well and cistern, with the place for the pulley of the bucket. This chamber was probably devoted to the customary washing of the dead body before interment. (See Bosio, *R. E.* cap. 17.) A similar chamber is found at the entrance of the Jewish Catacomb on the Via Appia. It has a mosaic pavement, and drains to carry the water away.



Entrance to the Catacomb of St. Domitilla, from De Rossi.  
a) Entrance to the Catacomb. b) Porter's lodge with a well and chamber for washing the bodies. c) "Niche," or place of meeting.

Some of these wells probably had no other object than that of draining the catacombs. This was the case with that dug by Damasus in the Vatican Cemetery. The galleries of this catacomb being rendered unfit for the purpose of sepulture by the infiltration of water, Damasus cut away the rock till he found the spring, and diverted its waters to supply a baptistery. It is this spring which now supplies the fountain in front of the Pontifical Palace.

Damasus recorded his good work in the following inscription:—

"Ginghant latens montem tenebre mœstu  
Corpora multorum cineres atque ossa replebant.  
Non tulit hoc Damasus communi luge sepulchro  
Post requiem tristes iterum persolvere pœnas.  
Frustris aggressus magnam superare laborem  
Aggeris immensi deiecit culmina montis,  
In limas sollicitæ scrutatus viscera terras,  
Hincavit totum quicquid mœdificerat humor,  
Invenit fontem præbet qui dona salutis.  
Hæc curavit Mercurius Levita Sceleris."

The singular variety of objects discovered within the *loculi* of the catacombs is an evidence of the permanence of the old heathen idea, which regarded the life after death as a continuation of the present life with its occupations and amusements, as well as of the strength of the universal human instinct, which leads the bereaved to deposit in the grave of their loved ones the tools and ornaments and playthings which had lost their use by the death of their possessor. Boldetti, lib. ii. cc. 14, 15, furnishes us with very interesting details of the results of his investigations in this department, together with engraved representations of some of the more curious and typical objects discovered by him, some of which are still to be seen in the Christian Museum

of the Vatican. Among the objects extracted from children's graves are *jointed dolls* of ivory or bone, similar to those which we learn from Cancellieri de Secr. *Basil. Vaticana*, tom. ii. pp. 985-1000, were found in the bier of Maria, the daughter of Stilicho and wife of Honorius, belonging to the close of the 4th century—little earthenware *money-jars*,—*masks*, and a very great abundance of small bronze bells, such as we know to have been in use in classical times for the amusement of children, frequently met with in heathen tombs, and mice in metal or terra-cotta. Female tombs have furnished numerous examples of *toilet equipage* and *personal ornaments*; *mirrors*, *combs* in ivory or boxwood, *bodkins*, *pins* of ivory or bone, *vinegrettes*, *lucifers*, *toothpicks*, and *earpicks*; *bracelets* and *armlets*, *earrings* and *necklaces*; *buckles* and *brooches*, *rings* and *seals*; *studs* and *buttons*, *bullæ*, and other similar objects, setting before us vividly the Roman Christian ladies of the first ages. In not a few instances, according to the same authority (Boldetti, *Osserv.* p. 297), the *false hair* worn in life was buried with the corpse. Among other objects of interest discovered in the *loculi* we may mention *dice*, *ivory knife-handles*, *nailheads*, a *lock* and *key*, one half of an *ivory egg* with portraits of a husband and wife and the Christian monogram engraved on the flat section; *tortoiseshell*, *weights of stone*, and small *glass flasks* engraved with numbers, the purpose of which has not been determined.

The number of *lamps* discovered in and about the tombs is countless. The majority are of *terra-cotta*, but some have been found of bronze, and some even of silver and amber. One in this last material was found in the catacomb of St. Priscilla (Boldetti, *Osserv.* p. 298, tav. i. no. 7). By far the greater part of these lamps have only the monogram of Christ impressed on them. But there are a very large number which present other familiar symbols, such as the palm-branch, the dove, the fish, the ship, and A and Ω. The Good Shepherd is of frequent occurrence. The lamps found in the Jewish catacombs almost universally bear the seven-branched candlestick.

The so-called *instruments of torture* which the eager imagination of pious enthusiasts, resolved to convert every buried Christian into a martyr, has discovered enshrined in the *loculi*, or incised on their closing slabs, in the opinion of the best informed and most calm judging writers, are nothing more than implements of handicraft. One singular pronged weapon, specimens of which are preserved in the Vatican and the Collegio Romano, has been identified with a heathen sacrificial instrument, and its presence in a Christian catacomb has yet to be explained.

#### TOPOGRAPHY OF THE ROMAN CATACOMBS.

The following catalogue of the ancient Christian cemeteries of Rome, the names of which stand recorded in ancient historical documents, arranged according to the chief lines of road leading from the city, is derived from De Rossi's great work. The first column gives the name of the road. The second that which De Rossi's investigations have led him to believe to have been the primitive names of the larger cemeteries in the first age of the Church. In the third column appear the designations by which they were known in the fourth century, after the

establishment of the peace of the Church. The fourth column gives the titles of certain lesser cemeteries or isolated tombs of martyrs, which are often confused with the larger cemeteries to which they were adjacent, and with which they were sometimes locally connected. The later cemeteries formed, subsequent to the peace of the Church, occupy the last column.

Roda.	Greater Cemeteries.		Lesser Cemeteries, or isolated Tombs of Martyrs.	Cemeteries constructed after the Peace of the Church.
	Primitive Names.	Names in the 4th Century. Time of Peace.		
Appia . . . . .	1. Callixti { Lucinae . Zephyrini . Callisti . Hippolyti }	{ S. Xysti . . . . . S. Caeciliae SS. Xysti et Cornelli S. Januarii. SS. Urbani, Feliciissimi, Agapiti, Januarii, Quirini. SS. Tiburtii, Valeriani, et Maximi. S. Sebastiani . . . . . S. Petronillae . . . . . SS. Petronillae, No- rei, et Achillei . . . . . SS. Marci et Marcel- lini. SS. Felcis et Audacti	27. Soteridia.	
Ardestina . . . . .	2. Praetextati . . . . .			
	3. Ad Catacumbas . . . . .			
	4. Domitillae . . . . .			38. Balbinae sive S. Marci. 39. Damasi.
	5. Basiliei . . . . .			
Ostiensis . . . . .	6. Commodillae . . . . .		28. Sepulcrum Pauli Apostoli in praedio Lucinae. 29. Coemeterium Timothei in horto Theonis. 30. Ecclesia S. Theclae. 31. Ecclesia S. Zenonis.	
Portuensis . . . . .	7. Pontiani ad Ursum Pileatum . . . . .	{ SS. Abdon et Sennen S. Anastasii, pp. S. Innocentii, pp. S. Pancratii . . . . .		40. Julii via Portuensi mill. iii. S. Felcis via Portuensi. 41. S. Felcis via Aurelia.
Aurelia . . . . .	8. . . . .			
	9. Lucinae . . . . .	{ SS. Processi et Martiani. S. Agathae ad Girulium. S. Callisti via Aurelia Julii via Aurelia.		
Cornelia . . . . .	10. Calepodii . . . . .		32. Memoria Petri Apostoli et sepulturae episcoporum in Vaticano.	
Flaminia . . . . .	11. . . . .	S. Valentini.		
Clivus Cucumeris . . . . .	12. Ad Septem Columbas . . . . .	Ad caput S. Joannis. S. Hermetis.		
Salaria Vetus . . . . .	13. Basilae . . . . .	{ SS. Hermetis, Basilae, Proti, et Hyacinthi S. Pamphyl. S. Felicitatis . . . . .		
Salaria Nova . . . . .	14. . . . .		33. Ecclesia S. Hilariae in horto ejusdem. 34. Crypta SS. Chrysanti et Dariae. 35. Coemeterium Novellae.	
	15. Maximi . . . . .			
	16. Thrasonis . . . . .	S. Saturnini. S. Alexandri.		
	17. Jordanorum . . . . .	{ SS. Alexandri, Vitalis et Martialis et VII. Virginum. S. Silvestri. S. Marcelli. Coemeterium majus. Ad Nymphas S. Petri. Fontis S. Petri.	36. Coemeterium S. Agnetis in ejusdem agello. 37. Coemeterium S. Nicomedis.	
Nomentana . . . . .	18. Priscillae . . . . .			
	19. Ostrianum vel Ostriani . . . . .			
Tiburтина . . . . .	20. . . . .	S. Hippolyti.		
	21. Cyriacae . . . . .	S. Laurentii.		
Labicana . . . . .	22. Ad Duas Lauros . . . . .	{ S. Gorgonii . . . . . SS. Petri et Marcellini. S. Tiburtii. S. Castuli. S. Gordiani. SS. Gordiani et Epimachi. SS. Simplicii et Serviliani, Quarti et Quinti, et Sophiae. S. Tertullini. S. Eugeniae.		42. In Comitatu sive SS. Quatuor. Coronatorum.
	23. . . . .			
Latina . . . . .	24. . . . .			
	25. . . . .			
	26. Aproniani . . . . .			

## CATACOMBS OF NAPLES, &amp;c.

To the north of the city of Naples, four subterranean Christian cemeteries are known to exist, in a spur of Capodimonte, no great distance from one another. They have been distinguished by the names of *S. Vito*, *S. Severo*, *S. Maria della Santità*, and *S. Gennaro* (January) *dei poveri*. There is also a fifth at some distance under the monastic Church of *S. Efremo*. That of *S. Gennaro* is the only one now accessible. It has been fully described by Pelliccia (*de Christianae Eccles. Polit. Neapol. 1781, vol. iv. Dissert. V.*), and more recently in an elaborate treatise of great value, embracing the whole subject of interment in the catacombs, by Chr. Fr. Bellermand, Hamburg, 1839.

With many points of resemblance as regards the formation of the graves, and the actual mode of interment, the Neapolitan Catacombs differ very widely in their general structure from those of Rome. Instead of the low narrow galleries of the Roman Catacombs, we have at Naples wide lofty corridors, and extensive cavern-like halls, and subterranean churches. The chief cause of this diversity is the very different character of the material in which they are excavated. Instead of the friable *tufa granolare* of Rome, the stratum in which the Neapolitan catacombs lie is a hard building stone of great durability and strength, in which wide vaults might be constructed without any fear of instability. To quote the words of Mabillon, *Iter Italicum*, "altiores habent quam Romana Coemiteria fornices ob duritiem et firmitatem rupis secus quam Romae ubi arena seu tophus tantum altitudinis non patitur." It is probable that these catacombs were originally stone quarries, and that the Christians availed themselves of excavations already existing for the interment of their dead. On this point Marchi speaks without the slightest hesitation (*Monum. Primitivæ*, p. 13).

The Catacomb of *St. Januarius* derives its name from having been selected as the resting-place of the body of that saint, whose death at *Puteoli* is placed A.D. 303, when transferred to Naples by Bp. John, who died A.D. 432.

Mabillon speaks of three stories: "triplex ordo criptarum alius supra alium." Two only are mentioned by Pelliccia and Bellermand as now accessible. The galleries which form the cemetery proper, are reached through a suite of wide and lofty halls, with vaulted ceilings cut out of the rock, and decorated with a succession of paintings of different dates, in some instances lying one over the other. The earliest frescos are in a pure classical style, and evidently belong to the first century of the Christian æra. There is nothing distinctly Christian about these. In many places these have been plastered over, and on the new surface portraits of bishops, and other religious paintings, in a far inferior style and of a much later date, have been executed. [FRESCO.]

The interments are either in *loculi*, *arcosolia*, or *cubicula*. The *loculi* are cut without order or arrangement, the larger and smaller apertures bring all mixed together, with no attempt at economising space. The *arcosolia* have barrel vaults. Some of them are painted; one contains a fresco of the peacock, and on the wall

above portraits of a mother and daughter whose remains are interred below, with a rudely-written inscription, "Vixit Rufina annos lv. et filia ejus . . . . xxxvii." Another also presents the portraits of its occupants, all in prayer; a bearded father, *Michelinus*; a girl, *Hilarias* aged 14, and a child *Nonnosa* aged 2 years 10 months, with spotted frock, pearl head-dress and earrings, necklace, and buckle to belt. In a third is the bust of a young man in white tunic and red pallium, with the inscription "Hic requiescit Proculus." A fourth contains full-length figures of *St. Paul* and *St. Lawrence*. The *cubicula* average 7 palms broad, by 10 palms in height and depth. The roof is horizontal or slightly coved. Each contains from 3 to 8 *loculi*. The graves were hermetically sealed with slabs of marble. But all have been opened and ransacked. The interments in the lower *piano* occur in two long parallel galleries, one much wider than the other, communicating with one another by 14 transverse passages. In the upper story the graves are cut in the sides of three large, broad, low vaulted halls excavated out of the rock, and certainly with no original view of sepulture.

At the entrance of the lower *piano* we find a so-called martyrs' church, with a slightly vaulted roof. It was divided into a nave and sanctuary by two pillars, the bases of which remain, with *cancelli* between. In the sanctuary stands the altar, built of rough stone, and a rude bishop's seat in an apse behind it. On the South wall are the *arcosolia* of *John I.* A.D. 432, and *Paul* A.D. 764, who, according to *Joannes Diaconus*, desired to be buried near *St. Januarius*. In other rooms we find a well and a cistern, recesses for lamps, and the remnants of a Christian mosaic painting. In a niche in the upper *piano*, which was traditionally the place of the font, is the symbol

IC	XC
NI	KA

 Here, according to Pelliccia, iv. 162, a marble shell was discovered, since used as a holy water-basin in the church of *St. Gennaro*. The inscriptions in these catacombs go down to the 9th or 10th century.

Among other Christian catacombs known to exist in different parts of the shores of the Mediterranean, of which we are still in want of fuller and more scientific descriptions, we may particularize those of *Syracuse* known as "the grottoes of *St. John*," and described by *D'Agincourt* as "of immense size," and believed by him to have passed from pagan to Christian use: the Saracen catacomb near *Taormina*, with *ambulacra* as much as 12 feet wide; the *loculi* at right angles to, not parallel with, the direction of the galleries; each, as in the Roman catacombs, hermetically sealed with a slab of stone: those of *Malta*, supposed by *Denon* (*Voyage in Sicile*, Par. 1788), to have served a double purpose, both for the burial of the dead, and as places of refuge for the living; and which, according to the same authority, "evidence a purpose, leisure, and resources far different from the Roman catacombs:" and those of *Egypt*. Of these last *D'Agincourt* gives the ground-plans of several of pagan origin. The most remarkable is one beyond the canal of *Canopus*, in the quarter called by *Strabo*, xvii. p. 795, "the *Necropolis*." The plan of this *hypogæum* is drawn with great regularity, very unlike the intricate maze of those of Rome. The

walls are pierced with three ranges of *loculi*, running, as at Terni, at right angles to their length. Very recently a small Christian catacomb has been discovered at Alexandria, described by De Rossi (*Bullettino*, Nov. 1864, Aug. 1865). It is entered from the side of a hill, and is reached by a staircase, which conducts to a vestibule with a stone bench and an apse. This is succeeded by a *cubiculum*, with an *arcosolium* on three sides, opening into an *ambulacrum* containing 28 *loculi*, all set endways to the passage. The whole is full of paintings, of various dates, on successive layers of stucco. One, of a liturgical character, is assigned by De Rossi to the 4th century. But this is probably much too early.

**Authentic.**—Arlinghi, *Roma Subterranea*. Baldetti, *Ossezioni sopra i cimiteri de' santi martiri ed antichi Christiani di Roma*. Bosio, *Roma Subterranea*. Bottari, *Sculture e pitture sopra entrance dei cimiteri di Roma*. Fabretti, *Inscriptionum antiquarum explicatio*. Lupi, *Dissertationes*. Mabillon, *De Rebus*. Marchi, *I monumenti delle arti oratorie primitive nella metropoli del Cristianesimo*. Northcote (J. S.) and Bevanlow (W. R.), *Roma Subterranea*. Panvinus, *De ritu sepulchrali mortuorum apud veteres Christianos et eorum cimiteria*. Perret (Louis), *Les catacombes de Rome*. Rasoul-Rochette, *Tableau des Catacombes*. Roset (J. B. de), *Inscriptiones Christianae*. Roset (J. B. de) and Mich. A. de', *Roma Subterranea*. Servais D'Agincourt, *Histoire de l'art par les monuments*. [R. V.]

**CATALOGUE HIERATICUS**, the name given in the Apostolic Canons (15 and 51, or 14 and 50) to the list of the clergy of a particular church. The term is also said to be applied to that part of the *DIRECTIO* which contained the names of those, still living, who were named in the Eucharistic service; viz. of those who had made offerings, emperors, patriarchs, &c., and lastly of the bishop and clergy of the particular church, as above said. [A. W. H.]

**CATECHUMENS**. The work of the Church in admitting converts from heathenism or Judaism presented, from the nature of the case, very different features, according to the varying circumstances with which she had to deal. Discipline might be more or less highly organised, converts of higher or lower grades of knowledge or character. If we attempt to form a complete picture from data gathered from different churches and centuries, it must be with the reserve that all such pictures are more or less idealised, and that practically there were everywhere departures more or less important from it. It will be convenient to arrange what has to be said under the heads (I.) The Catechumens. (II.) The Catechists or Teachers. (III.) The Place of Instruction. (IV.) The Substance of the Teaching.

I. Instruction of some kind, prior to the admission of converts by baptism, must have been given from the first, and the word, which afterwards became technical, meets us in the N. T. Apollos was "instructed" (*εὐεργασμένος*) in the way of the Lord (Acts xviii. 25). Theophilus had been "instructed" in the main facts of the Gospel history which St. Luke ascribes to him (Luke i. 4). The *ἀκούοντες* of the apostolic epistles, though not confined to the stage prior to baptism, would naturally include those who were passing

through it; and in the *εὐεργασία τῶ ἀποστόλου* *ἀκούοντες* *τοῦ Θεοῦ* of Heb. v. 12, we have, probably, a summary of the instruction which the writer looked on as adapted for such persons. In practice, however, as in the instances of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii. 36\*), and the Philippian gaoler (Acts xvi. 33), it must have been of the briefest and simplest kind. The traces of the process and method of instruction in the sub-apostolic age, and the two centuries that followed, are fragmentary and vague. It is not till we get to the 4th century, with its stirrings after a more elaborate organisation, that we meet with the developed system which has now to be described. So far as we may think of it as having actually prevailed, it deserves attention as presenting the most complete plan of systematic mission-work that the Church has ever known.

The converts, it is obvious, might be of any age—might have been Jews, or heathens, or heretics—might be ignorant or educated, of good or bad character. They might have been led to offer themselves by the influence of personal friends, or by the sermons preached in Christian assemblies at the religious services to which even outsiders were admitted. They presented themselves to the bishop or priest, and were admitted sometimes after inquiry into character, sometimes without any delay, by the sign of the cross (August. Conf. l. 11, *De peccat. merit. li. 20*) and imposition of hands, to the status of catechumens (1 Conc. Arelat. c. 4, Conc. Epa. c. 3). The Councils, as might be expected, prescribe conditions and allow immediate admission only in cases of sickness and of at least decent conduct. St. Martin, however, in his mission work in Gaul, is reported to have admitted his hearers to be catechumens as they rushed to him *in confertim* on the spot (Sulpicius, *Vita*, li. 5, p. 204). From that moment they were recognised as Christians, though not as "fideles" (1 Conc. Constant. c. 7; Cod. Theod. xvi. tit. vii. *de Apostat. leg. ii.*), and began to pass under instruction. The next epoch in their progress was the time when they were sufficiently advanced to give in their names as candidates for baptism; and some writers (e. g. Saicer and Beaune) have accordingly recognised only two great divisions, the *AUDIENTES*, and the *COMPETENTES*. Others, like Bons and Bingham, have made three or four divisions, though differing in details; and it will be well for the sake of completeness to notice these, though it is believed that the classification was never a generally received one.

(1.) Bingham's first class are the *ἀκούοντες*, those, i. e., who were not allowed to enter the church, and received whatever instruction was given them outside its walls. The existence of such a body is, however, very doubtful. It rests only upon an inference drawn from the fifth canon of the Council of Neo-Cæsarea, ordering that a catechumen (one of the *Audientes*) who had been guilty of grievous offences should be driven out (*ἐξοστρέφω*), and there is no mention of such a class either in the canon itself or elsewhere. What is described is the punishment of an individual offender; and even if the offenders

\* The interpolation of the question and answer of v. 37 in the MS. of later date shows an uneasy consciousness of the difference between the confessional and the apostolic practice.



were numerous enough to attract notice, there would be no ground for classing them as in a distinct stage of instruction.

(2.) The next division, that of the *AUDIENTES*, or ἀκροώμενοι, rests on better evidence. The Greek term is, indeed, not found as the designation of a class till the 4th century, but the *Audientes* or *Auditores* are mentioned both by Tertullian (*de Poenitent.* c. 6) and Cyprian (*Epist.* 13 to 34). Over and above the instruction they received from their teachers, they were allowed to attend in churches and to listen (hence their name) to the scriptures and to sermons, sharing this privilege with the unbelievers, but probably occupying a distinct place in the congregation.<sup>b</sup> They were not allowed, however, to be present when the strictly liturgical worship of the church began, and when the sermon was over, the deacon, mounting on a rostrum of some kind, proclaimed that it was time for them to go (*Constt. Apost.* viii. 5). As applied to these, or to the whole body of those who were under catechetical training, the *missa catechumenorum* became the dividing point between the more general worship of the church and the λειτουργία, properly so called.

The feeling which showed itself in this disciplina arcani kept them in like manner from hearing the Creed or the Lord's Prayer till they took their place among the *fideles* (Chrysost. *Hom.* xix. in *Matt.*). Sozomen (*H. E.* i. 20) even hesitated about inserting the Nicene Creed in his history lest it should fall into the hands of those who were still in the earlier stage of their Christian training. The practice of repeating the Lord's Prayer *secretò*, which still prevails in the Western Church, probably originated in a like precaution. Assuming the *Audientes* to represent the first class of beginners in Christian training, we may fairly identify them with the "rudes" of Augustine's treatise (*De catechiz. rudibus*) and the ἀτελέστεροι of the Greek Canonists (Balsamon *ad Conc. Neocaesar.* c. 5). The time of their probation probably varied according to the rapidity of their progress, and the two years specified by the Council of Eliberis (c. 42), or the three fixed by the Apostolical Constitutions (viii. 32), can hardly be looked on as more than rough estimates of what was thought advisable. Any lapse into idolatrous practices or other open sins involved, in the nature of things, a corresponding prolongation of the time of trial. Where the offence was flagrant, the term, in which penance rather than instruction was now the dominant element, might be extended to the hour of death, or to some great emergency (*Conc. Elib.* c. 68).

(3.) Writers who maintain a threefold or fourfold division of the body of catechumens see the third class in the *prostrati* or *genuflectentes* (γονυκλίνοντες). These were admitted, not only to stand and listen, but to kneel and pray. As being thus more prominent, they seem to have been known as specially the catechumens, as, e.g., in the εὐχὴ κατηχουμένων of the C. of Laodicea, c. 19. The name, it will be remembered, was applied also to those who were in one of the stages of the penitential discipline of the Church,

the *fideles* being degraded from their rightful position and placed on a level with those who were not as yet entitled to the privileges of membership. [PENITENTS.]

(4.) After these stages had been traversed, each with its appropriate instruction, the catechumens gave in their names as applicants for baptism, and were known accordingly as *Competentes* (συναιτούρτες). This was done commonly at the beginning of the Quadragesimal fast, and the instruction, carried on through the whole of that period, was fuller and more public in its nature (Cyril Hieros. *Catech.* i. 5; Hieron. *Ep.* 61, *ad Pammach.* c. 4). To catechumens in this stage the great articles of the Creed, the nature of the Sacraments, the penitential discipline of the Church, were explained, as in the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem, with dogmatic precision. Special examinations and inquiries into character were made at intervals during the forty days. It was a time for fasting and watching and prayer (*Constt. Apost.* viii. 5; 4 *C. Carth.* c. 85; Tertull. *De Bapt.* c. 20; Cyril. *l. c.*), and, in the case of those who were married, of the strictest continence (August. *de fide et oper.* v. 8). Those who passed through the ordeal were known as the *perfectiores* (τελειώτεροι), the *electi*, or in the nomenclature of the Eastern Church as βαπτιζόμενοι or φωτιζόμενοι, the present participle being used of course with a future or gerundial sense. Their names were inscribed as such in the *album* or register of the church. They were taught, but not till a few days before their baptism, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer which they were to use after it. The periods for this registration varied, naturally enough, in different churches. At Jerusalem it was done on the second (Cyril. *Catech.* iii.), in Africa on the fourth Sunday in Lent (August. *Serm.* 213), and this was the time at which the candidate, if so disposed, might lay aside his old heathen or Jewish name and take one more specifically Christian (Socrat. *H. E.* vii. 21). The ceremonies connected with their actual admission will be found under BAPTISM. It is only necessary to notice here that the *Sacramentum Catechumenorum* of which Augustine speaks (*De Peccat. Merit.* ii. 26) as given apparently at or about the time of their first admission by imposition of hands, was probably the εὐλογία or *panis benedictus*, and not, as Bingham and Augusti maintain, the salt which was given with milk and honey after baptism.<sup>c</sup>

<sup>c</sup> It may be well to quote the passage referred to:—"Non unus est modi sanctificatio; nam et catechumenos secundum quendam modum suum per signum Christi et orationem et manus impositionem puto sanctificari: et quod accipiunt, *quamvis non sit corpus Christi*, sanctum est tamen, et sanctius quam cibi quibus alimur, quoniam sacramentum est." Bingham (x. 2, 16), following Bona, infers from a canon of the 3rd Conc. Carth. c. 5, forbidding any other *sacramentum* than the "solitum sal" to be given to catechumens during the Easter festival, that this must be that of which Augustine speaks; and it is beyond question that this was given during the period of probation, as well as immediately after baptism. It would seem, however, from the canon itself, that some other *sacramentum* was given at other times: and the words of Augustine, "*quamvis non sit corpus Christi*," imply, it is believed, something presenting a greater outward likeness to the Eucharistic bread than could be found in the salt. The proviso would hardly have been needed on Bingham's supposition.

<sup>b</sup> The place assigned for the *Audientes* was the *Narthex* or portico of the church. (Zonaras *ed. Conc. Nicaen.* c. 11.)

It is clear that many cases would present themselves in which the normal order of progress would be interrupted. (1.) The catechumen might lapse into idolatry or other grievous sin. In that case he was thrown back, and had to go through a penitential discipline, varying, according to the nature of the offence, from a few months to three or five years, or even to a life-long exclusion (*C. Elib.* c. 4, 10, 11, 68; *C. Nicæn.* c. 14; *C. Neo. Caesar.* c. 5). In no case, however, was the sacrament, which was thought of as indispensable to salvation, refused to the penitent when the hour of death approached. Their sins were looked on as committed in their unregenerate state, and therefore less heinous than they would have been in those who had been admitted to full Christian fellowship. (2.) They might, however, through their own neglect, die without baptism. In that case, they were buried without honour, with no psalms or oblations (1 *C. Bracar.* c. 35), and were not mentioned in the prayers of the Church. The one comfort left to their surviving friends was to give alms to the poor in the hope that thus they might obtain some alleviation for the souls that had passed beyond the grave without the new birth that admitted men to the Kingdom (Chrysost. *Hom.* 3 in *Philipp.*). (3.) Where the loss of baptism was not incurred by their own default, the will was accepted, at least in special cases, for the deed. The death of the younger Valentinian led Ambrose (*de Obit. Valent.* p. 12) to the wider hope. What was true of catechumen-martyrs and the baptism of blood, as supplying the lack of the baptism of water—and this was received almost as an axiom by all Christian writers from Tertullian downwards (see Bingham, x. 2, 20)—was true of one of whom it might be said “hunc sua pietas abluit et voluntas.” Augustine, following in the footsteps of his master, appealed to the crucial instance of the penitent thief against the rigorous dogmatism of those who thought that baptism was absolutely indispensable (*de Bapt.* iv. 22). (4.) Another common case was naturally that of those who were stricken down by some sudden sickness before the term of their probation had expired. In this case the Church did not hesitate to anticipate the wished-for goal, dispensed with all but the simplest elements of instruction, and administered baptism on the bed of death. [BAPTISM, p. 169.]

II. It is noticeable that, with all this systematic discipline as to the persons taught, there was no order of teachers. It was part of the pastoral office to watch over the souls of those who were seeking admission to the Church, as well as of those who were in it, and thus bishops, priests, deacons, or readers might all of them be found, when occasion required, doing the work of a catechist. The DOCTOR AUDIENTIUM, of whom Cyprian speaks, was a *lector* in the church of Carthage. Augustine's treatise, *de Catechizandis Rudibus*, was addressed to Deogratias as a deacon, the *Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem were delivered by him partly as a deacon, partly as a presbyter. The word Catechist implied, accordingly, a function, not a class. Those who undertook that function were known sometimes as *παιδαγωγοί* (*Constt. Apost.* ii. 37), as having a work like that of those to whom that title was applied on board ship. It was their part to

of Christ's Church, to tell them of the perils of the voyage which they were about to undertake, and take their pledge for payment of the fare. The word was part of the metaphor which saw in the bishop the steersman, and in the presbyters the sailors, in the Church itself the *navis* or ship.

III. The places in which catechetical instruction was thus carried on must have varied widely at different times and in different places: sometimes the room or building in which the *fideles* met to worship, before or after service; sometimes a room in the presbyter's or deacon's house, probably at Alexandria, from the special nature of the case, a lecture-room, like the “school” of Tyrannus in Acts xix. 9. It is not till we come to the fully-developed organisation of the Church that we read of special buildings for the purpose, under the name of *κατηχουμενεῖα*. They are mentioned as such in the 97th canon of the Trullan Council, and appear, from a Novella of the Emperor Leo's, to have been in the *ὑπέρρονον*, or upper chamber of the church; probably, i.e. in a room over the portico. In some instances the baptistery seems to have been used for this purpose (Ambros. *Ep.* 33), while in others, again, perhaps with a view to guarding against premature presence at the rite of baptism, they were not allowed to enter the building in which it was administered (*Conc. Arausic.* c. 19).

IV. The ideal scheme of preparation involved obviously a progress from lower to higher truths. The details varied probably according to the discretion of the teacher and the necessities of the taught; but two great representative examples are found of the earlier stage in Augustine's treatise *de Catechizandis rudibus*, and in the *Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem. The range of subjects in the former includes the sacred history of the world from the Creation downwards, and then proceeds to the truths of the resurrection and judgment according to works. The better educated may be led to the allegorical meaning of Scripture, and the types of the law. Then came the Gospel narratives, and the Law of Christ. The teaching of Cyril, as intended for the *competentes*, took a wider and higher cycle of subjects, and are based (*Catech.* iv.) upon a *regula fidei*, including the dogmas (1) of God, (2) of Christ, (3) of the birth from the Virgin's womb, (4) of the cross, (5) of the burial, (6) of the resurrection of Christ, (7) of the ascension, (8) of judgment to come, (9) of the Holy Spirit, (10) of the soul, (11) of the body, (12) of meats, (13) of the general resurrection, (14) of the Holy Scriptures. [E. H. P.]

CATHEDRA (*Καθέδρα*).—(1) First and properly, in ecclesiastical usage, the actual throne or seat of the bishop in his episcopal church; the *βῆμα καὶ θρόνος ὑψηλός* of Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 30), to which Paul of Samosata arrogantly added a *σκήνητρον*,—distinguished by the same Eusebius from the *δέντροι θρόνοι* of the presbyters (*ib.* x. 5. 23);—who also speaks of the *ἀποστολικὸς θρόνος* of St. James at Jerusalem, meaning the actual seat itself still preserved there (*ib.* vii. 19, 32);—called *cathedra velata* by St. Augustin (*Epist. ad Maxim.* cciv.), and *linteata* by Pacian; and inveighed against by St. Greg. Naz. (*Carm.* xi.) as *ὑψηλοὶ θρόνοι*; and so Prudentius speaks of the bishop's seat, “Fronte sub adversa [i.e. as the upper end of the apse] gradibus sublimē

tribunal Tollitur" (*Peristeph. H.* iv. 225). St. Mark's chair is said to have existed for a long time at Alexandria (Vales. ad Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 9). And one assigned to Pope Stephen is said to have been found in the catacombs by Pope Innocent XII. The wooden chair, with its heathen ivories, representing the labours of Hercules, which is so carefully honoured in St. Peter's at Rome as St. Peter's, is at once the most celebrated, and the most unfortunately chosen, specimen of the class. Episcopal chairs are frequently represented in ancient Christian mosaics or marbles, sometimes adorned with two lions' heads, sometimes with two dogs' heads, sometimes with our Lord Himself represented as sitting in them, sometimes with the B. Virgin, sometimes with the open Gospels laid upon them, sometimes with the bishop himself (Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.* I. tab. 2, 37, 47, II. tab. 41; and cf. St. Aug. *Epist. ad Diosc.* lvi.); sometimes raised upon steps (*gradatas*, St. Aug. *Epist. ad Maxim.* cciii., and see Aringhi, ii. 325); sometimes "veiled" (*velatae*, St. Aug. as above, see Bosio, *Rom. Sotter.* p. 327). And certain chairs or seats, cut in the tufa stone in the catacombs, are conjectured to have been intended for the bishop at the time when persecution compelled the Christians to hold service there. A Council of Carthage, A.D. 535, forbids a bishop "cathedram collocare in monasterio," i. e. to ordain there.

But hence (2) the word was transferred to the see itself of the bishop, as in Victor Vitens. *De Persec. Vandal.* iv. So *Conc. Milevit.* ii. cans. 21, 24; and "Cathedrae viduatae" in *Collat. Carthag.* i. c. 185, 217; "Cathedrae matrices," in *Conc. Milev.* ii. c. 25; and *Cod. Can. Afric.* 123; and "Cathedrae principales," in *Cod. Can. Afric.* 38. So also Greg. Tur. *H. F.* iii. 1, and Sidon. Apollin. repeatedly. And earlier than all these, Tertullian (*De Praescript.* xxxvi.) speaks of "Cathedrae Apostolorum," as still existing in the "Ecclesiae Apostolicae;" meaning, not the literal chairs, but the specially Apostolic succession of the bishops of those sees.

(3) The word became used for the Episcopal Church itself, "principalis cathedra," in *Conc. Aquagr.* A.D. 789, can. 40, meaning the cathedral as opposed to the other churches in the diocese: "Ecclesia Cathedralis," *Conc. Tarracon.* A.D. 516, c. ult.: called also "Ecclesia mater," in the *Conc. Rom. sub Sylvestro*, c. 17; and "Ecclesia matrix," in *Conc. Mogunt.* i. c. 8; and "matrix," simply, by Ferrand. *Breviar.* cc. 11, 17, 38. But "cathedral," used absolutely for the "ecclesia cathedralis," dates from the 10th century, and belongs to the Western Church only. [CATHEDRAL.]

[Du Cange; Bingham; Martigny; Walcott, *Sacr. Arch.*] [A. W. H.]

**CATHEDRA PETRI.** [PETER, FESTIVALS OF.]

**CATHEDRAL**, also in later times DOM-KIRCHE, DUOMO: the chief and episcopal church of a diocese; not so called however until the 10th century, when the epithet, derived from the bishop's *cathedra* or chair, became a substantive name; called previously the mother church, or the *ecclesia matrix*, in distinction from the parish churches, which were called *tituli* or *ecclesiae dioecesanæ*. [CATHEDRA.] It was also sometimes called the "Catholic" church. [CATHOLIC.] The architectural features

of a cathedral are treated in the article CHURCH. The gradual formation and character of the cathedral chapter will be found under CHAPTER. And for the immunities belonging to it simply as a church, see CHURCH, SANCTUARY. As a cathedral church, it was held to be—what at first and in the earliest times it literally was—the parish church of the diocese, to which the others stood as it were in the relation of chapels. In it the bishop was formally enthroned: so *cathedrare* and *incathedrare*, to enthrone. And in it he was to be consecrated, according to ordinary rule. [BISHOP.] Ordinations also, and diocesan synods, were commonly held there. And manumissions of serfs, in Celtic and Saxon England, took place at the altar of the cathedral in the presence of the bishop. Schools and libraries were attached in course of time to cathedrals. And Charlemagne, who ordered monastic schools, and founded palatine schools, found episcopal schools ready to his hand. [SCHOOLS; CANONICI, p. 281.] [A. W. H.]

**CATHEDRATICUM.**—(1) A pension paid annually to the bishop by the churches of his diocese, "in signum subjectionis;" acc. to *Conc. Bracar.* ii. c. 2, "pro honore cathedrae;" and to *Conc. Ravenn.* A.D. 997, c. 2, "pro respectu Sedis;" both councils limiting the payments in each case to two shillings severally. So also *Conc. Bracar.* iii. A.D. 572, and *Tolet.* vii. c. 4.—(2) Τὸ ἐνθρονιστικόν, a fee paid by the bishop to the bishops who had consecrated him, and to the clerks and notaries who assisted (Julian. Antecessor, *Constit.* 115, 431; Justinian, *Novell.* cxxiii. c. 3; quoted by Du Cange). [A. W. H.]

**CATHISMA** (Κάθισμα). A section of the psalter.

(1) The psalter in the Greek Office is divided into twenty sections, called *Cathismata*. Each *Cathisma* is sub-divided into three *Staseis*, and "Gloria" is said at the end of each stasis only. These divisions and the order of reciting the psalter will be explained in a later article. The reason for the name assigned is that, while the choir stand two and two by turns to recite the psalms, the rest sit down.

(2) A short hymn which occurs at intervals in the offices of the Greek Church. It consists of one stanza, or *troparion* (τροπᾶριον), and is followed by "Gloria." The name is said to indicate that while it is sung the choir sit down for rest. [H. J. H.]

**CATHOLIC**, Καθολικός, *Catholicus*, used in its ordinary sense of "universal," not only by heathen writers (as, e. g. Pliny), but also not uncommonly by ecclesiastical writers also (as, e. g. Justin Martyr, *Dial. cum Tryph.* 81, Καθολικὴ ἀνδοτασις, and Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.* ii. 17, "Catholica . . . bonitas Dei," &c. &c.); but commonly employed by the latter as an epithet of the Christian Church, Faith, Tradition, People; first in St. Ignatius (*Ad Smyrn.* viii.), in the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp (in Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 14, &c.), in the *Passio S. Pionii* under Decius (ap. Baron. in an. 254, n. ix.), in St. Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* vii. p. 899, Oxf. 1715), and thenceforward commonly, being embodied in the Eastern (although not at first in the Western) creed:—indicating (1) the Church as a whole, as in St. Ignatius above quoted; and so in Arius' creed (Socrat. i. 26), = ἡ ἀπὸ περάτων ἕως περάτων:



(2) That portion of the universal Church which is in any particular place, as ἡ ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, as in the *Mart. S. Polycarp.*: (3) (when it had grown into an epithet ordinarily attached to the word church), used as equivalent to Christian, "Catholica fides" in Prudent. *Peristeph.* iv. 24, "Catholici populi," *id. ib.* 30: or to "orthodox," as opposed to "heretical;" as in Pacian. *Epist.* 1, *ad Sempron.* "Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus cognomen;" and in *Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, αἱ καθολικαὶ ἐκκλησίαι, as opposed to the Samosatensians; and in *Conc. Arimin.* A.D. 359, ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, in like opposition to heretics; and in St. Cyril. Hieros. *Lect. Catech.* xviii. advising, in a town where there are heretics, to enquire, not, ποῦ ἐστὶν ἀπλῶς ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἀλλὰ, ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, &c. &c. So also in the Athanasian Creed, "the Catholic religion," and "the Catholic faith." (4) When men began to look about for a rationale of the epithet, or when driven to do so as in the Donatist controversy (the Donatists meeting the argument against them, drawn from the word, by explaining it, "non ex totius orbis communionem, sed ex observatione omnium praeceptorum divinorum atque omnium sacramentorum," St. Aug. *Epist.* 93, § 23), taken to indicate the universality of the Church; so in St. Aug. *Epist.* 52, § 1, "Καθολικὴ Graece appellatur, quod per totum orbem terrarum diffunditur;" and similarly Isidor. *Sentent.* i. 16, &c. &c. And St. Cyril. Hieros. (*Lect. Catech.* xviii. § 23) dilates upon the word rhetorically in this sense, as intimating that the Church subjugates all men, teaches all truth, heals all sin, &c. In somewhat like way, the Catholic Epistles are so called (= Ἐγκύκλιοι) as early as the 3rd century (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25, vii. 25); because written, οὐ πρὸς ἐν ἕνός ἀλλὰ καθόλου πρὸς πάντα (Leont. *De Sect. Act.* 2). And not only these, but such epistles also as those of Dionysius of Corinth (Καθολικαῖς πρὸς τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιστολαῖς, Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 23). So Tertullian, again (*De Monog.*), of Catholic tradition. And similarly the well-known definition of "vere Catholicum," in St. Vinc. of Lerins, as that which had been held "semper, ubique, et ab omnibus." Optatus (*Cont. Donat.* ii.), in explaining the term by "rationalis et ubique diffusa," was possibly in the first half of his definition thinking of the "Rationalis," who was also called Καθολικός, being the general receiver of the imperial revenue under the Roman empire; but more probably was confounding the real derivation καθ' ὅλον, with a supposed one from κατὰ λόγον. (5) Used also somewhat later of the Church as a building: viz. as the distinctive epithet of the bishop's or cathedral church, as against the parish churches; e.g. in Epiphanius, *Haer.* lix. § 1 (ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, in opposition to the smaller churches there, and so also Niceph. xv. 22). (6) In *Conc. Trull.* can. lix. (Labbe. vi. 1170), as the name of the church, as opposed to an oratory (εὐκτηρίῳ οἴκῳ), baptisms (and by inference the eucharist) being celebrated in the καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, but not in the oratory. (7) In Byzantine Greek times, an epithet of the parish church, which was open to all, in distinction from the monastic churches (Codinus, Balsamon, &c.). (8) Still later, the Patriarchs or Primates of Seleucia, of the Armenians, of the Ethiopians, were styled Καθολικοὶ

(Du Cange). See also Thomassin, I. i. 24. The Catholicus of the Persian Church was so called as early as Procopius (*De Bell. Persico*, ii.); and the Catholicus of Seleucia was made so independently of the Patriarch of Antioch (*Arabic Vers. of Nicene Canons*). The term means, more exactly, a primate, having under him metropolitans, but himself immediately subject to a patriarch. [CATHOLICUS.] Καθολικοὶ θρόνοι, in Theophan. (in *V. Constant. Copronymi*), were the sees of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. (9) The term became a title of the King of France, Pipin being so called A.D. 767; and very much later, of the King of Spain also. (Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. 'Holy Catholic Church'; Du Cange; Suicer.) [A. W. H.]

CATHOLICUS. "I have ordered the catholicus of Africa to count out 3000 purses to your holiness," said the Emperor Constantine to Caecilian, bishop of Carthage (Euseb. *H. E.* x. 6). A similar order to indemnify Eusebius the historian for the costs of getting 50 copies of the Bible transcribed for general use was issued by him to the catholicus of the diocese; that is, of the civil diocese called the East (*ib. Vit. Const.* iv. 36). A former holder of this office, Eusebius elsewhere tells us, named Adauctus, had been martyred under Diocletian (*H. E.* viii. 11). Apparently there was one such for each of the 13 civil dioceses, and a 14th attached to the imperial household—ἐπὶ τῶν καθόλου λόγων λεγόμενος εἶναι βασιλέως (*ib. vii.* 10)—who was in later times, according to the Basilica, or code of the Emperor Basil I., called the "logothete" (*lib. vi. tit.* 23). Various ordinances relating to this office are to be seen there. The two prominent ideas attaching to it were that of a receiver-general, and of a deputy-receiver. It was formerly discharged in England by the sheriff or vicecomes of each county, who forwarded his annual account of receipts and disbursements to the king's exchequer. The ecclesiastical officer called "catholicus" was of a piece with the civil. Procopius, in his history of the Persian war (ii. 25) under Justinian, says that the chief dignity among the Christians of Dubis was called "catholicus," as presiding over the whole country, namely, Persia. But according to Dr. Neale (*Eastern Ch.* i. 141), this title had been assumed at a much earlier date by the bishops of Seleucia, meaning by it that they were "procurators-general," in the regions of Parthia, for the Patriarch of Antioch, to whose jurisdiction they were subject, till for political reasons their independence was allowed. The "catholicus" mentioned by Procopius was doubtless head of the Nestorians in Persia, whose teaching was speedily carried thither from Edessa, as the well-known letter of Ibas, bishop of the latter place, to the Persian Maris, alone would shew. Having on the death of Acacius, twenty-second catholicus of Seleucia, A.D. 496, obtained possession of that see, they established their head-quarters there, constituting its archbishop patriarch, and styling him "catholic patriarch." By this phrase they must have meant however not deputy-patriarch, which he was no longer, but oecumenical patriarch, which to them he was in fact. So that when the title got into sectarian hands, it seems to have shifted its meaning to some extent, and implied universal rather than vicarious powers. But as it



was a dignity confined at first to the eastern portions of the single patriarchate of Antioch, and there common to the orthodox and heterodox alike, we must not expect to find the accounts given of it clear or always consistent. As a general rule the "catholicus" was subordinate to the patriarch, and had metropolitans under him; but the officer answering to this description among the Jacobites was more commonly called "*maphrian*," or "fruit-bearer;" the Nestorians on all occasions doing their best to monopolize the other title. Still we read of a "catholicus" for Armenia and for Georgia among the former, as well as for Chaldaea and Persia among the latter; and Jacobite patriarchs also called themselves "catholic," in imitation, and to the annoyance, of the Nestorian. (Asseman. *De Monoph.* § 8, and *De Syris Nestor.* c. xi.; Du Cange, *Gloss. Graec.* s. v.) Later writers, again, speak of a "catholicus" of Ethiopia, of Nubia, of the isles and elsewhere: that is to say, this title came to be applied in time to any grade between metropolitans and patriarchs (Bever. *Synod.* i. 709), and to be no longer peculiar to a single patriarchate. [E. S. F.]

CATULINUS, deacon, martyr at Carthage, is commemorated July 15 (*Mart. Carthag.*, Usuardi). [C.]

CAUPONA, CAUPONES, tavern, tavern-keepers. The Apostolical Constitutions enumerate the *caupo* amongst the persons whose oblations are not to be accepted (bk. iv. c. 6). If such oblations were forced on the priest, they were to be spent on wood and charcoal, as being only fit for the fire (*ib.* c. 10). A later constitution still numbers the *caupo* amongst those who could not be admitted to the church unless they gave up their mode of life (bk. viii. c. 32). Bingham, indeed, holds the *caupo* of the Apostolical Constitutions not to have been strictly a tavern-keeper, but a fraudulent huckster, and there is no doubt that the word is to be found used in a more extended sense in many instances. But there is in the present one no reason for diverting it from its ordinary use. It is clear from too many evidences that the ancient tavern—the *caupona* of the Romans—differed little from a brothel; see for instance Dig. bk. xxiii. t. ii. l. 43; Code, bk. iv. t. l. vi. l. 3. A Constitution of Constantine (A.D. 326), whilst declaring that the mistress of a tavern (the words *caupona* and *taberna* are here used indifferently) was within the laws as to adultery, yet if she herself had served out drink, assimilated her to a tavern-servant, classing such persons among those whom "the vileness of their life has not deemed worthy to observe the laws" (Code, bk. ix. t. ix. l. 29). In the work called the "*Lex Romana*," which is considered to represent the law of the Roman population in Italy during Lombard times, and which is mainly founded on the Theodosian Code, a similar provision is contained, but with the use of the word *taberna* alone (bk. ix.). This evidently implies that the *caupo* himself, or the *cauponas* or *tabernae domina*, was undistinguishable from the brothel-keeper, and the forbiddance to receive the *caupo's* offering resolves itself into that contained in Deut. xxiii. 18.

This view is confirmed by almost all later church authorities. Thus a cleric found eating in a *caupona*, unless through the necessities of

travel, was by the 46th (otherwise 53rd) of the Apostolical Canons—supposed to be of the 4th century—sentenced to excommunication, the Canon evidently intending a tavern and not a mere huckster's shop. The 24th Canon of the Council of Laodicea (latter half of the 4th century, but the alleged dates varying from 357 to 367), enacts that none of the priestly order (*ιερατικούς*), from the presbyter to the deacon, nor outside of the ecclesiastical order to the servants and readers, nor any of the ascetic class shall enter a tavern (*καπηλείον*; see also the 7th Canon of the so-called African Council, which however itself only designates a general collection of African Canons). The book of Canons of the African church, ending with the Council of Carthage of 419, c. 40, repeats substantially the above-quoted article of the Apostolical Canons.

In spite of these enactments, we find by later ones that clerics, who were forbidden to enter taverns, actually kept them. Thus certain "Sanctions and Decrees" printed by Labbé and Mansi, after the various versions of the Nicene Canons, from a codex at the Vatican, but evidently from a Greek source, require (c. 14) that the priest be neither a *caupo* nor a *tabernarius*, making thus a distinction between the two terms, which often appear in later days to be synonymous. A canon ascribed by Ivo to the Synod of Tours, A.D. 461, states that "it hath been related to the holy synod that certain priests in the churches committed to them (an abuse not to be told) establish taverns and there through *caupones* sell wine or allow it to be sold;" so that where services and the word of God and His praise should alone be heard, there feasting and drunkenness are found. Such practices are strictly forbidden, the offending priest is to be deposed, the laymen, his accomplices, to be excommunicated and expelled (cc. 2, 3). In the East, indeed, it appears certain from the 43rd Novel, that in the first half of the 6th century, and presumably since the days of Constantine, taverns were held on behalf of the church, and must have been included among the 1100 separate trading establishments which were the property of the cathedral church of Constantinople. But apparently this tavern-keeping for the church was not held equivalent to tavern-keeping by clerics, since about sixty years later, the 9th Canon of the Council of Constantinople in Trullo, A.D. 691, bears "that it shall not be lawful for any cleric to have a tavern. For if it be not permitted to him to enter one, how much less can he serve in it, and do there that which is not lawful?" He must therefore either give it up or be deposed. And although the 68th Canon of the same Council uses a compound of the Greek Synonym for *caupo*, in a more general sense (*τοῖς βιβλιοκαπηλοῖς*, translated *librorum cauponatoribus*, i.e. book-sellers), yet in the 76th the strict idea of the tavern seems to recur, where it is enacted that no *καπηλείον* is to be set up within the holy precincts, nor food or other things to be exhibited for sale. And by the 8th century the original sense of *caupo*, *caupona* is palpable through the more modern word (in this application) *taberna*, which occurs in numerous repetitions more or less literal of the above-quoted Apostolical Canon; as in a Capitulary of Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, to his clergy, A.D. 797, forbidding them to go from

tavern to tavern, drinking or eating (c. 13); one of the injunctions of Charlemagne, from a MS. of the Monastery of Angers, forbidding priests to enter a tavern to drink; the 19th Canon of the Council of Frankfort, and the emperor's Frankfort Capitulary (794) to the same effect, but extending also to monks; a capitulary of 801 (general coll., bk. i. c. 14), quoting the Council of Laodicea and the African; the 325th chapter of the 5th book; the Canons of the Councils or Synods of Rheims (c. xxvi.), applying to monks and canons, and of Tours (c. xxi), both in A.D. 813; the Edict of Charlemagne in 814, c. 18.

It will thus appear that whilst the severity of the Apostolical Constitutions against the individual tavern-keeper is not followed in later times, yet that the Western Church, at least during the period with which this work is occupied, persistently treated the use of the tavern by clerics, otherwise than in cases of necessity, still more their personal connexion with it, as incompatible with the clerical character. The witness of the Eastern Church is also to the same effect, but its weight is marred by the trade, including that in liquors, which for two centuries at least seems to have been carried on at Constantinople for the benefit, not indeed of individual devices, but of churches and charitable foundations. [See also DRUNKENNESS.]

[J. M. L.]

CAVERNENSE CONCILIUM. [AFRICAN COUNCILS.]

CEALCHYTHER, COUNCILS OF. [CALCHUTHENSE.] Exact locality unknown, but certainly in Mercia, and probably Chelsea, originally called Chelcheth, Chelchyth, &c. (1) A.D. 787, or possibly 788, a legatine council, George, bishop of Ostia, and Theophylact, bishop of Todi, being the legates for Pope Adrian I. Its object was to renew the "antiquam amicitiam" between Rome and England, and to affirm "the Catholic faith" and the six Oecumenical Councils. But it also appears to have been made the occasion of preparing the way for the erecting of Lichfield into an archbishopric independent of Canterbury, which actually took place in 788. A companion council was held in Northumbria (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc. iii.* 444, sq.). (2) A.D. 789, called "Pontificale Concilium;" grants made there now extant (K. C. D. 155; Haddan and Stubbs, *iii.* 465). (3) A.D. 793, at which a grant was made to St. Alban's (K. C. D. 152; Haddan and Stubbs, *iii.* 478). (4) A.D. 799, at which a cause was adjudicated between King Coenulf and the Bishop of Selsey (K. C. D. 116, 1034; Haddan and Stubbs, *iii.* 528). There were several councils at the same place after A.D. 800. [A. W. H.]

CELEDEI. [COLIDEI.]

CELEDONIUS, martyr at Leon in Spain, is commemorated March 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CELENENSE CONCILIUM, A.D. 447, held in a small place close to Lugo in Galicia, against the Priscillianists; an appendage to the 1st Council of Toledo (*Labbe. Conc. iii.* 1466).

[A. W. H.]

CELEBRINA, martyr in Africa under Decius, is commemorated with CELERINUS, Feb. 3 (*Mart. Hieron., Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CELIBACY. The history of Christian thought and legislation in reference to this subject is essentially one of development. From the first there were the germs of two different systems, at first in due proportion, each the complement of the other. Then, under influences which it will be our work to trace, one passes through rapid stages of growth till it threatens to overpower or crush the other. Protests are uttered from time to time, with more or less clearness. The idea which seemed threatened with extinction finally revives and in its turn dominates unduly. It remains for the future to restore the balance which we recognise in the primitive records of the faith.

1. Any preference of celibacy over marriage was, it need hardly be said, foreign to the ethics of the Old Testament. Wedlock and the fruits of wedlock were God's best gifts. To be unmarried or childless was to be under a "reproach," which it was difficult to bear. The asceticism of the later sects of Jews made in this respect no difference. Even the Essenes lived the life of a communist rather than a monastic society and had wives and children with them. No book of the Canonical Scriptures is stronger in its praises of marriage, or its condemnation of the sins that mar its perfection than that which represents the ethical teaching of the Judaism of Alexandria (*Ecclus. xxv. xxvi.*). Preference for the celibate life had, it must be confessed, so far as the Christian Church was concerned, its origin in the New Testament. The birth from the Virgin's womb, the virgin-life of the Baptist and of the Son of Man, the strange words of implied blessing on those who "made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake" (*Matt. xix. 12*) could not fail to make an impression on the minds of many disciples. The work of the great Apostle, whose activity threw that of all others into the shade, tended in the same direction. He declared without reserve that it was a good and noble thing for a man not to "touch a woman" with the touch even of wedded love (*1 Cor. vii. 1*). Himself leading a celibate life,\* he wished that all men could follow his example (*1 Cor. vii. 7*), and laid down principles which, though limited by his reference to a "present necessity" (*1 Cor. vii. 26*), led on almost inevitably to a wider generalisation. If the man or woman unmarried was more free from "care," more able to render an undivided service to their Lord, it would be a legitimate inference to think of that life as the more excellent of the two. The degree of its superiority might be exaggerated at a later period, but a higher excellence of some kind was certainly implied in the language of St. Paul. The vision of the 144,000 in the Apocalypse as of those who were "virgins, who were not defiled with women" (*Rev. xiv. 4*) seemed to carry the recognition of that higher excellence into the glorified life of the heavenly Jerusalem.

2. All this was, however, balanced by the fullest recognition of the sacredness of marriage, and was as far as possible removed from the Manichaean tendencies which afterwards cor-

\* This is not the place to discuss the question. It may be enough to say that it is a rash exegesis which sees a reference to a wife in the "true yoke-fellow" of *Phil. iv. 3* or finds, not celibacy, but married continence, in *1 Cor. vii. 7, 8*.

rupted it. The presence of Christ at the marriage-feast of Cana (John ii. 1), his vindication of the sacredness of marriage against the casuistry of the scribes, as resting on God's primeval ordinance and the laws of human life (Matt. xix. 4), his choice of Apostles who had wives (Matt. viii. 14), and probably children (Matt. xix. 27, 29), guarded against any tendency to treat marriage as among the things common and unclean. Nor was the teaching of St. Paul less clear. The great casuistic Epistle recognises it as a divine institution, makes all limitation on the *jus conjugii* but a temporary means to an end beyond itself (1 Cor. vii. 3-5); allows even, though not approving, the marriage of widowers and widows (1 Cor. vii. 39). The duties of husbands and wives are enforced on new and more mystic grounds than in the ethics of Judaism or Heathenism (Eph. v. 22-33). Their life, in all its manifold relations, was recognised as giving scope for the development of a high and noble form of Christian holiness (1 Pet. v. 1-7). With what might seem an almost startling contrast to his own example St. Paul required the bishop-presbyter to have had the experience of marriage and with at least a preference for those who had brought up children (1 Tim. iii. 2, 4), and extended the requirement even to the deacons of the Church (1 Tim. iii. 11, 12). The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews at least implied, perhaps asserted, that marriage was, or might be, "honourable in all things and the bed undefiled" (Heb. xiii. 4). "Forbidding to marry" is classed by St. Paul as one of the "doctrines of devils" which were to be the signs of the apostasy of the latter days (1 Tim. iv. 1).

3. The two lines of thought thus traced, ran on through the Church's history, but in unequal measure. Gradually the teaching which St. Paul condemned mingled itself with his, and the celibate life was exalted above that of marriage, not only because it brought with it a scope of more uninterrupted labour and more entire consecration, but on the ground that there was in marriage and its relations something impure and defiling. In the language of some Gnostic sects, it belonged to the kingdom of the Demiurgus, the creator of the material universe and of the human body as a part of it, not to that of the higher Christ-Aeon, who was Lord of the kingdom (Tertull. *de Praescript.* c. 33; Irenaeus, i. 28; Hippolytus, *Refut. Omn. Haer.* i. 16). First, women [VIRGINS], and then men, devoted themselves to unwedded life, as offering a higher spirituality. At first, indeed, the more prominent teachers kept within the limits of Apostolic thought. Hermas (ii. 4, 4) almost reproduced the language of St. Paul. Ignatius (*Ep. ad Polyc.* c. 5) while introducing another thought, that the life of celibacy is "in honour of Our Lord's flesh," warns men against boasting of this, and exalting themselves above others. Even Tertullian, reproducing his own experience, while declaiming vehemently against second, or against mixed marriages, draws, with great power, a picture of the beauty and blessedness of a marriage in which husband and wife are both true worshippers of Christ (*Ad. Uxor.* ii. 8). Clement of Alexandria even ventures to depict the true ideal Gnostic as one who marries and has children and so attains to a higher excellence, because he conquers more temptations than that of the

celibate life (*Strom.* vii. 12 p. 741). There were not wanting, however, signs of a tendency to a more one-sided development. Putting aside the treatise *de Virginitate* ascribed to Clement of Rome,<sup>b</sup> as probably one of the many spurious writings for which the authority of his name was claimed, and belonging to the 3rd century rather than the 1st, there remain the facts (1) that, outside the Church, TATIAN and the ENCRATITES developed their rigorous asceticism into a total abstinence from, and condemnation of, marriage; (2) that Athenagoras (*Legat.* c. 33), while not condemning it, speaks of many men or women as "growing old unmarried, in the hope of living in closer communion with God," and passes sentence upon second marriage as being no better than a "decent adultery"; (3) that Justin confirms at once his statement and his opinion (*Apol.* i. 15); (4) that Origen claims a special glory in the world to come for those that have chosen the life of consecrated celibacy (*Hom.* xix. in *Jerem.* 4), and gave a terrible proof in his own self-mutilation of the excesses to which a literal interpretation of the mysterious words of Matt. xix. 12 might lead. Many bye-currents of theological thought and feeling tended to swell the stream. The influence of Eastern Dualism, the assimilation by the Church of the feeling, if not of the dogma, which culminated in Manichaeism, the growing honour for the mother of the Lord as the Ever-virgin, the deepening sense of the awfulness of the Eucharistic sacrifice, the embarrassment caused by domestic ties in times of persecution, perhaps also the difficulty of maintaining the purity of married life in the midst of the fathomless social corruption of the great cities of the empire<sup>c</sup>—all these led men to take what seemed to them at once the easier and the shorter road to the higher blessedness of heaven. As the monastic life spread, those who embraced it thought of themselves, and were looked upon by others, as being already "as the angels in heaven." The praises of the virgin-state became a common topic for the rhetoric of sermons and treatises; and the dialogue of Methodius of Tyre (*Convivium decem Virginum*) is probably far from being an exaggerated specimen of its class.

Through all this, however, strong as might be the influence of dogma or of feeling, the question, as regards the lay-members of the Church, was left as St. Paul had left it, as a matter for each man's conscience. The common sense of Christian writers led them to see the absurdity of a rule of life which would have led rapidly to the extinction of the Christian society: their reverence made them shrink from condemning what had been from the first a divine ordinance and had now become the symbol of the mystic union between Christ and his Church. There was no attempt so far to enforce the higher life by any legislation.<sup>d</sup> Even second marriages, though

<sup>b</sup> The authenticity of the treatise has been defended by Roman Catholic theologians. An English translation has been published in Clark's *Ante-Nicene Library*.

<sup>c</sup> Comp. the picture drawn by Clement of Alexandria (*Paedagog.* iii. 2, 3), as shewing what was possible even among those who were nominally Christians.

<sup>d</sup> A solitary exception is found in the correspondence between Dionysius of Alexandria and Pinytus of Gnosus in Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 23). The latter, it would seem, had tried to enforce celibacy among those committed to his care. The former warns him against rashly placing on

condemned by the more rigorous moralists, were not forbidden. But it was otherwise with the clergy. The feeling that they were bound to exhibit what men looked on as the higher pattern of holiness gained strength in proportion as that pattern was more and more removed from their common life. The passage already referred to in Ignatius (*Ep. ad Polyc.* c. 5) shews that even then there were laymen who, because they were celibates, looked down superciliously on bishops who continued, after their appointment, to cohabit with their wives.

The practice of the Church of the first three centuries has hardly been fairly dealt with by Protestant controversialists. It is easy to point to the examples of married apostles, of bishops and presbyters, who had wives and to whom children were born long after their ordination,\* and these prove, of course, that marriage was not looked on as incompatible by the Church's law with ministerial duties. But it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to point to one instance in which the marriage was contracted after ordination.† The unwritten law of the ancient Church was indeed like that of the Greek Church at the present day. Marriage was permitted in the clergy, but, as such, they were not allowed to marry. There were obviously many reasons for a rule which, at first sight, appears illogical and inconsistent. It carried into practice the principle that a man should abide in the state in which a sacred vocation had found him (1 Cor. vii.). It fulfilled the condition laid down by St. Paul, that the bishop-presbyter was to be the husband of one wife, and yet guarded against the risk, so imminent in all religious sects, of priestly influence being exercised to secure a wealthy marriage. It allowed the holiness of married life, yet tacitly implied the higher excellence of the celibate. Towards the close of the 3rd century the principle was formulated into a law, and both the so-called Apostolical Canons (c. 25) and Constitutions (vi. 17) rule that only the lower orders of the clergy, sub-deacons, readers, singers, door-keepers, and the like, might marry after their appointment to their office. Those who disregarded the law, and the offenders were numerous enough to call for special legislation, were to be punished by deposition (*Conc. Neo-Cæsar.* c. 1). Another council, held about the same time (A.D. 314) at Ancyra, made a special exception (c. 10) in favour of deacons who, at the time of their ordination, gave notice to the ordaining bishop that they did not intend to remain single. If they did not give notice, and yet married, they were to lose their office.

The growing feeling that celibacy was a higher state than marriage affected before long what has been just described as the law of the Church for the first three centuries. The married clergy might from various motives, genuine or affected

their shoulders a burden which they could not bear. It is obvious that the rule would be applied with greater stringency to the clergy, who were more immediately under him.

\* One striking example is found in the history of Novatus, who, being a priest, is charged by Cyprian (*Epist.* 49) with having so ill-treated his wife that she miscarried.

† Hefele, a singularly fair and accurate writer, says that there is absolutely no example of such a marriage (*Beiträge*, i. p. 123).

aspirations after greater purity, desire to be free from what they had come to regard as an impediment to attaining it. The penalty of deposition pronounced by the Apostolic Canons (c. 6) on any bishop, presbyter, or deacon who separated himself from his wife "under the pretence of piety," shows that so far the Church was determined to maintain the validity of the contract as still binding.

A more difficult question, however, presented itself. Admitting that the contract was not to be dissolved, on what footing was it to continue? The rigorous asceticism of the time did not hesitate to answer the question by affirming that the husband and wife were to live together as brother and sister, that any other intercourse was incompatible with the life of prayer, and profaned the holiness of the altar. The Council of Elvira (A.D. 305), representing the more excited feelings that had been roused by the persecution of Diocletian, made the first attempt to enforce on the clergy by law, and under pain of deposition (c. 33), what had probably been often admired as a voluntary act of self-control. The Council of Nicaea was only saved from adopting a like decree as a law for the whole Church by the protest of Paphnutius, a confessor-bishop from the Upper Thebaid, who, though himself a celibate all his life, appeared as the advocate at once of the older law of the Church, and of the married life as compatible with holiness (*Sozom. H. E.* i. 23; *Socrat. H. E.* i. 11).‡

It is probable, however, that over and above the ascetic view which looked on marriage as impure, there was also a strong sense of some of the inconveniences connected with a married clergy. The wives of bishops took too much upon them, spoke and wrote as in their husbands' name even without their authority, and interfered with the discipline of the diocese. It is significant that the same council which took the lead in condemning the cohabitation of bishops, priests, or deacons with their wives, should have, as its last canon, one directed against the practice, apparently common, of women receiving or giving *litteras pacificas* in their own name (*C. Elib.* c. 81).

The contrast between the decrees of the Nicene Council and that of Elvira on this matter shows the existence of opposite tendencies in Eastern and Western Christendom, and from this point the divergence, first in feeling and afterwards in legislation, becomes more marked. It will be convenient to trace the paths taken by the two great divisions of Christendom separately. The Council of Gangra was, in this as in other respects, the representative of a healthier and more human feeling. Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, had taught men to look on marriage as incompatible with holiness, on the ministrations of married priests as worthless, and his followers accordingly held aloof from them. The Council did not hesitate to pass a solemn anathema on those who thus acted. (*C. Gangr.* c. 4.) The more ascetic view, however, gained ground in Macedonia, Thessaly, and Achaia, and the man who was most urgent

‡ The narrative has been called in question by Baronius and other Roman writers on this ground, that Socrates was biased by his prepossession in favour of the Novatians, who allowed the marriage of the clergy, but is defended by Hefele (*Beiträge*, i. 123).



in pressing it was the Heliodorus, then bishop of Tricca, who, in earlier life, had written the sensuous, erotic romance of the *Aethiopica* (Socr. *H. E.* v. 22). This is one of the instances, however, in which the exception proves the rule, and the general practice of the Eastern Church was not affected by the rigorous asceticism of its European provinces. Even bishops had children born to them after their consecration. This, however, was in its turn opposed to the dominant practice, and the fact that Synesius (A.D. 410) refused to accept the bishopric of Ptolemais unless he was allowed to continue to cohabit with his wife, shews that a dispensation was necessary, and that he too was an exception to the general practice. It came accordingly to be the rule of the Eastern Church that men who were married before their ordination might continue, without blame, to live with their wives, but that a higher standard of self-devotion was demanded of bishops, first by public opinion and afterwards by ecclesiastical and even civil legislation. The feeling found a formal expression in the Council in Trullo, which sanctioned cohabitation in the case of subdeacons, deacons, and priests (c. 13) married before ordination, but ordered the wife of a bishop to retire to a convent or to become a deaconess (c. 48).<sup>a</sup> Those who had married after their ordination were however to be suspended, and in future absolutely deposed (c. 36). The strong protest in c. 33 against the growth of a Levitical hereditary priesthood in Armenia may indicate one of the elements at work in bringing about the more stringent enforcement of celibacy. Even the former were subject to restrictions analogous to those which governed the ministrations of the Jewish priesthood, and were not allowed to contract marriage after their ordination, the rule being based on the canon of the Council of Ancyra already referred to, but excluding the power which that conceded of giving notice of the intention to marry, at the time of ordination. The Theodosian Code (*De Episcop.* 14, 2) enforced the same rule, and children born of marriages so contracted were to be treated as illegitimate (Cod. Theod. *de bonis cleric.*, Justinian. *Novell.* v. c. 8). The Emperor Leo the Wise (A.D. 886-911) confirmed the Trullan canon, with a modification tending towards leniency. Clergy who so married were not to be reduced as before to lay communion, but were simply degraded to a lower order and shut out from strictly priestly functions. The results of this compromising legislation were probably then, as they are now, (1) that nearly all candidates for the priesthood married before they were admitted to the diaconate, (2) that they continued to live with their wives, but did not marry again, if they were left widowers; and (3) that the great mass of the secular clergy being thus ineligible for the episcopate, the bishops were mostly chosen from among the monks.

[It is interesting to note that the Nestorians till the middle of the 6th century relaxed considerably the rules of the Trullan Council, and that the Monophysite Abyssinians allowed their bishops to retain their wives and live with them.

<sup>a</sup> The Council, however, recognised, while it deplored, the fact that bishops continued to live with their wives in Africa, Libya, and elsewhere (c. 12). It forbade the scandal for the future, and punished offenders with deposition.

Zacharias, *Nuova Giustificazione del Celibato Sacro*, pp. 129, 130.] [I. G. S.]

It remains to trace the progress of a more stringent and "thorough" policy in the Churches of the West. The principle asserted at Elvira extended to Western Africa, and was carried further in application. Not only bishops, presbyters, and deacons, but those of a lower grade who ministered at the altar were to lead a celibate life (2 *C. Carth.* c. 2). It was assumed as an axiom that the intercourse of married life was incompatible with prayer and the sacrifice of the altar, and as the priest ought always to pray, and daily to offer that sacrifice, he must of necessity abstain altogether (Hieron. *Contr. Jovinian.* i. 34). The bishops of Rome used their authority in the same direction. Siricius, in the first authentic Decretal (A.D. 385), addressed to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona, forbade absolutely the marriage of presbyters and deacons. Innocent I. (A.D. 405) in two Decretals addressed to Victricius, bishop of Rouen, and Exsuperius of Toulouse, enforced the prohibition under pain of degradation (*Corp. Juris Can.* c. 4, 5, and 6 Dist. 31). Leo I. (A.D. 443) tried to unite the obligation of the marriage vow and the purity of the consecrated life by allowing those who were already married to continue to live with their wives, but "habere quasi non habeant . . . quo et salva sit charitas connubiorum et cessent opera nuptiarum" (*Epist.* 167 *ad Rusticum*). If this law were not kept, they were to be subject to the extreme penalty of excommunication. So in like manner the 1st Council of Toledo (c. 1) forbade the promotion of deacons or presbyters "qui incontinenter cum suis uxoribus vixerint" to a higher grade. So also the 1st Council of Orange (can. 22, 23, 24) forbade the ordination of deacons unless they make a vow of chastity, and punishes subsequent cohabitation with deprivation. The 1st Council of Tours, as it afraid of the consequences of this extreme rigour, reduced the penalty to the suspension of those who were already priests from priestly functions, and, in the case of others, excluded them from any higher grade than that which they already occupied (1 *C. Turon.* c. 1, 2), but allowed both to partake of the sacrament of the altar. The subdeacons, perhaps as finding less compensation in the respect of the people and in the nature of their work, held out longer than those of higher grade. The yoke was, however, pressed on them too by Leo (*Epist.* 34 to *Leo of Catania*) and Gregory the Great (*Corpus Juris Can.* c. 14, Dist. 31), and Spain still kept its old pre-eminence in ascetic rigour. The 8th Council of Toledo (c. 6), A.D. 653, condemned both the marriage of subdeacons after their ordination, and continued cohabitation if they were married before. Their work as bearing the vessels of the altar required that they should keep themselves free from the pollution which was inseparable from that union. Offenders were to be sentenced to something like perpetual imprisonment in a monastery. The 9th Council (c. 10), A.D. 659, described every such union, from bishops to subdeacons, as a "connubium detestandum," and their issue were not only treated as illegitimate and excluded from all rights of inheritance, but treated as slaves "jure perenni" of the Church against which their fathers had offended. It is melancholy, but instructive, to find another Council of the same Church, seventy-two years later (A.D. 721), com-

pelled to pass canons on the one hand against the spread of unnatural crime among the clergy, pronouncing the sentence of deposition and exile on the bishops, priests, and deacons who were guilty of it, and, on the other, against the attempts at suicide which were becoming frequent among those who had been subjected to the discipline of the Church, with its censures and its penances (16 *C. Tolet.* c. 3 and 4). Stephen IV. (A.D. 769) enforced the rule of the Western as contrasted with that of the Eastern Church (*Corpus Juris Can.* c. 14, Dist. 31).

[The contrast between Eastern and Western feeling is shown singularly enough in their estimate of the relative guilt of clerical marriage and fornication. The Council of Neo-Caesarea (c. 1) punishes the latter with greater severity than the former. That of Orleans (c. 1) calmly puts the two on the same level, "si quis pellici vel uxori se jungat."] [I. G. S.]

One marked exception has to be noted to the general prevalence of this rigour. The Church of Milan, in this as in other things, maintained its independence of Rome, and, resting on the authority of Ambrose, was content with the Eastern rule of monogamy, and applied it even to its own archbishops. "The practice of marriage was all but universal among the Lombard clergy. They were publicly, legally married, as were the laity of Milan" (Milman's *Latin Christianity*, b. vi. c. 3).<sup>1</sup> The practice against which Peter Damiani raved in the 11th century was clearly of long standing, and it may be noted that it bore its fruit in the high repute, the thorough organization, which made the Milanese clergy famous through all Italy.

It does not fall within the limits of this work to carry on the history further. Enough has been said to shew that when Hildebrand entered on his crusade against the marriage of the clergy he was simply acting on and enforcing what had for about seven centuries been the dominant rule of the church. The confusions of the period that preceded this had relaxed the discipline, but the law of the Church remained unaltered. The exceptional freedom enjoyed by the Church of Milan would but make one who strove after the unity of a theocracy more zealous to put a stop to what he regarded as at once a defilement of the sacred office and a rebellion against divine authority.

[Obviously this rapid and yet gradual development which has been traced of clerical celibacy was very largely, if not mainly, due to the influence of monasticism. Celibacy becomes, step by step, compulsory on all the clergy, while the monastic obligation is rivetted more and more tightly by an irrevocable vow. In the monk celibacy was, as has been indicated, an aspiration after superhuman holiness, intensified by that feeling of despair with which he was apt to regard the world around him, and its apparently hopeless state of corruption; and in subtle combination with motives of this kind was the hankering after wonder and veneration. In every

<sup>1</sup> The passages from Ambrose have been much tampered with, and the text is doubtful. "Monogamia sacerdotum" and "castimonia" present themselves as various readings. One text permits, another prohibits, cohabitation after marriage. See the discussion in Milman's note, l. c.

way the example of the monks told powerfully on the clergy. The more devout longed to attain the monk's moral impassibility; lower natures were attracted by the prospect of gaining for themselves the monks' commanding position. Thus the rivalry, which never ceased, between the regular and the secular clergy, made the clergy generally more willing to accept the hard conditions exacted of them by the policy of their rulers. So at least it was in Western Christendom. In the East there was a more complete severance between the monks and the secular clergy, the former being debarred more closely from intercourse with the world, and the latter acquiescing in what was for them ecclesiastically a lower standing.] [I. G. S.]

It is obvious that just in proportion to the stringency with which the law of celibacy was carried into effect were its evils likely to shew themselves. One—and that for a time a very formidable one—will form the subject of a separate article. If men had not wives, while the habits of society made them dependent on the domestic services of women, they must have housekeepers. The very idealism of purity which held that husband and wife might live together as brother and sister, seemed to imply that any man and any woman might live together on the same footing without risk or scandal. The scandal came, however, fast enough—and the SUB-INTRODUCTAE or *ὑποεισακτοὶ* came to occupy a very prominent position in the legislation of the Church. [E. H. P.]

[See, further, Alteserrae, *Asceticon vel Origo Rei Monasticae*, Par. 1674; S. Bonaventurae, *Sentent.* iv. xxxvii. Opp. Venet. 1751; Hallier, *De Sacr. Elect. et Ordin.* v. i. 10, Paris, 1536; Gerson, *Dialogus sup. Coelibatu*, Opp. ii. p. 617, Antwerp. 1606; Ferraris, *Bibliotheca*, s. vv. Clericus, Conjuges, Venet. 1778; Launoy, *Impediment. Ordin.* Opp. I. ii. p. 742, Colon. 1731; Schramm, *Compend. Theolog.* iii. p. 694, Augsburg, 1768; Bingham, *Origines Eccles.* VII. iv. Lond. 1727; Concina, *De Coelibatu*, Romae, 1755; Paleotimo, *De Coelibatu, Summa Orig. Eccles.* Venet. 1766; Mich. de Medina, *De Sacr. Hom. Continentiâ*, Ven. 1568; Campegius, *De Coelib. Sacerdotum*, Ven. 1554; G. Callixtus, *De Conjug. Cleric.* Helmstadt, 1631; Osiander, *Exam. Coelib. Cleric.* Tübingen, 1664; H. C. Lea, *History of Christian Celibacy*, Philadelphia, 1867.] [I. G. S.]

CELLA or CELLA MEMORIAE, a small memorial chapel erected in a sepulchral area over the tomb of the deceased, in which at stated times, especially the anniversary of his decease, his friends and dependents assembled to celebrate an *agape*, and partake of a banquet in his honour. These were often built over the tombs of martyrs, and were then known as *Martyria*, *Memoriae Martyrum*, *Concilia Martyrum*, and *Confessiones*. Sepulchral buildings of this character were common both to heathens and Christians. Indeed here, as in so much else, Christianity simply inherited existing customs, purged them of licentious or idolatrous taint, and adopted them as their own. Thus heathen and Christian monuments mutually throw light on one another. A Christian inscription, recording the formation of an area and the construction of a *cella*, is given in the article CEMETERY.

Directions for the erection of a building bearing

the same title, and devoted to a similar purpose by a pagan, are given in a very curious will, once engraved on a tomb at Langres, a copy of a portion of which has been discovered in the binding of a MS. of the 10th century in the Library at Basle. The will is printed by De Rossi in the *Bullettino di Arc. Crist.*, Dec. 1863. In it we find most particular directions for the completion of the *cella memorae*, which the testator had already begun, in exact accordance with the plan he left behind him. This *cella* stood in the centre of an *area*. In front of it was to be erected an altar of the finest Carrara marble in which the testator's ashes were to be deposited. The *cella* itself was to contain two statues of the testator, one in bronze, one in marble. Provision was to be made for the easy opening and shutting of the *cella*. There was to be an *antrum*, which was to be furnished with couches and benches on the days on which the *cella* was opened. Coverlets (*induciae*) and pillows (*corvinae*) to lay upon the seats were also to be provided, and even garments (*obolis* and *tunicae*) for the guests who assembled to do honour to the departed. Orchards and tanks (*lacus*) formed part of the plan. It was also ordered that all the testator's freedmen were to make a yearly contribution out of which a feast was to be provided on a certain day, and partaken of on the spot. Additional light is thrown upon the last-named provision by the terms of a long and curious inscription relating to a *collegium* for the burial of the dead, consisting chiefly of slaves, of the year A.D. 133. One of the regulations was that the members of the confraternity were to dine together six times in the year (Northcote, *R. S.* p. 51). These *cellae* were memorial halls for funeral banquets. The Christians were essentially men of their country and their age, following in all things lawful the customs of the time and place in which their lot was cast. The recent investigations of De Rossi do much to dispel the idea of the specific and exclusive character of the Christianity of the primitive Church. Rejecting the abuses arising from the license of pagan morals, there was nothing in itself to take exception at in the funeral feast. Indeed the primitive agapes or love-feasts were often nothing more than funeral banquets held in *cellae* at the tombs of the faithful, the expenses of which, in the case of the poorer members, were provided out of the *arca communis* or church-chest. We are familiar with pictorial representations of banquets of this nature derived from the Catacombs. Bettari supplies us with two such of remarkable interest from the cemetery of St. Marcellinus and Peter (Bettari, *Pitture*, tom. ii. tav. 107, 108, 127), and one from St. Callistus (*ibid.* tom. iii. p. 1, 110, 118) [CATACOMBS.] There was a remarkable correspondence between the arrangements of the Christians and heathens in these matters. In both not only was the cost of the funeral banquet paid out of the general fund, but suitable clothing was also provided for those who were present at these banquets. In an inventory of furniture confiscated in the Diocletian persecution in a house where Christians were in the habit of meeting at Ciris in Numidia, in addition to chalices of gold and silver, and lamps, &c., we find articles of attire and shoes (*tunicas mulierum laxeas, tunicas viriles aut, caligas viriles parvis viri, caligas mulierum parvis viri*), and other articles of a similar

nature. These *cellae* were not only used for the funeral feasts, which were uncommonly infrequent, but also formed oratories to which the faithful resorted at all times to offer up their devotions over the remains of their departed brethren. The name *cella*, as applied to such places of reunion, seems to have been restricted to subterranean buildings erected in the funeral *area*, above the grave of the individual whom it was desired to commemorate. Chambers constructed for this purpose in the subterranean cemeteries were known as *cubicula* [CATACOMBS.] Another appellation by which they were known whether above ground or below, was *memoriae martyrum* or *martyria* until they lost their primitive name of *cellae*, and became known as *basilicae* (Hierom. *Ep. ad Vigilant.*). In fact, the magnificent basilicas erected above the tombs of the martyrs in the age of the peace of the Church, by Constantine and other Christian emperors, were nothing more than amplifications of the humble *cellae* or *memoriae* built in the *area* of the cemeteries.

We know from Anselmus (§ 31) that many buildings were erected in the cemeteries by the direction of Pope Fabianus (A.D. 236-250), "*multas fabricas per coemeteria fieri praecipit.*" These *fabricae* we may safely identify, with Clamipal, Anselmi, De Rossi, &c. with the *cellae memorae* of which we have been speaking. "They were probably little oratories constructed either for purposes of worship, or the celebration of the agapes, or of mere guardianship of the tombs according to the common practice of the Romans" (Northcote, *R. S.* p. 86). The peace which the Church had at this time enjoyed for nearly 50 years would have encouraged the erection of such buildings, and rendered the use of them free from apprehension.

*Cella* and *cubula* were employed at a later time for sepulchral chapels built along the side walls of a church. It is used in this sense by Paulinus of Nola, in whose writings such chapels are more frequently termed *cubicula*. [CUBICULUM.]

An example of the use of the word in the sense of a monastic cell is given by Combafis, De Temple S. Sophie p. 260, *ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῆς κελίας αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*.

[K. V.]

CELLERARIUS, *Cellarius*, *καλλάριος*, *καλλάρης*. One of the highest officials in a monastery. As the prior was next to the abbat in spiritual things, so the Cellerarius, under the abbat, had the management and control of all the secular affairs. He was sometimes called *oeconomus* (*οικονόμος*), dispenser or procurator. According to most commentators on the Benedictine Rule he was to be appointed by the abbat with consent of the seniors, and was to hold office for one year or more (*Reg. S. Bened. c. 31, cf. Concord. Regul. c. 40*). [I. G. S.]

CELLITAE, *Κελίται*. A class of monks, midway between hermits and coenobites. Strictly speaking, they were the anchorites, *ἀγκυράται*, so called because they withdrew or retired from the coenobia, whereas the monks dwell together, to small cells in the immediate vicinity. On festivals they repaired to the church of the monastery, and thus, being still semi-attached to the community, they differed from the hermits, *ἐρημίται*, who were independent of control

(*Bek. Thea. s. v.*). As preferring the more complete privacy and quiet of these cells to living in common, they were sometimes called hesychastae, ἡσυχασταί, and their cells ἡσυχαστήρια (Bingh. *Orig.* VII. ii. 14.; Justin. *Novell.* v. 3).<sup>a</sup>

The word "cella," κελλῖον, originally meaning the cave, den, or separate cell of each recluse (Soz. *H. E.* vi. 31; Greg. *Dial.* ii. 34),<sup>b</sup> soon came to be applied to their collective dwelling-place; in this resembling the term monasterium, which signified at first a hermit's solitary abode, and subsequently the abode of several monks together. "Cella," in its later use, was applied even to larger monasteries (Mab. *Ann.* v. 7); but usually to the offshoots or dependencies of the old foundation (Du Cange, s. v.) "Cellula" is used for a monastery by Gregory of Tours (*Hist.* vi. 8, 29, &c.). In the Rule of St. Fructuosus "cella" stands for the "black-hole," the place of solitary confinement for offenders against the discipline (Mab. *Ann.* xiii. 41). The Regula Agaunensis forbade separate cells for the monks; but it is not clear whether this prohibition refers to cells within the walls or to the cells outside of the "cellitae."

Cassian, in his account of the different kinds of monks in Egypt, condemns the "Sarabaitae," who dwelt together in small groups of cells without rule or superior (Cass. *Coll.* xviii. 17). The same distrust of what inevitably tended to disorder and licence is shown in the decrees of Western Councils (e. g. *Conc. Aurel.* l. c. 22; *Agath.* c. 38). But the cells of the "Cellitae," properly so called, resembled rather a "Laura" in Egypt and Palestine, each Laura being a quasi coenobitic cluster of cells, forming a community to which, in the earlier days of monachism, the abbat's will was in place of a written rule. The first of these "Lauras" is said to have been founded by St. Chariton, about the middle of the 4th century, near the Dead Sea (Bulbeau, *Hist. Mon. d'Orient.* 282). Other famous lauras were those of St. Euthymius, near Jerusalem, in the next century, and of St. Sabas, near the Jordan; to the former only grown men were admitted, to the latter only boys (Helyot, *Hist. des Ordr. Mon.* Dissert. Prelim. § 5).

The motive for withdrawing from a monastery to one of those little cells clustering round it was, apparently, a desire in some cases of solitude, in others of a less austere mode of life. Each cell had a small garden or vineyard, in which the monk could occupy himself at pleasure (Du Cange, s. v.). But sometimes the "Cellita" was a monk with aspirations after more than ordinary self-denial. Thus it was a custom at Vienna, in the 6th century, for some monk, selected as pre-eminent in sanctity, to be immured in a solitary cell, as an intercessor for the people (Mab. *Ann.* iv. 44, cf. vii. 57).

A strict rule for "Cellitae" was drawn up in the 9th century by Grimalac. Their cells were to be near the monastery, either standing apart one from another or communicating only by a window. The cellitae were to be supported by

their own work or by alms: they might be either clergy or laymen. If professed monks, they were to wear the dress of the order; if not, a cape as a badge. None were to be admitted into the "Cellitae" except by the bishop or the abbat, nor without a noviciate. They were to have their own chapel for mass; and a window in the wall of the church, through which they might "assist" at the services, and receive the confessions of penitents. A seal was to be set by the bishop on the door of each cell, never to be broken, except in urgent sickness for the necessary medical and spiritual comfort (Helyot, *Diss. Prot.* § 5; Bulbeau, *Hist. de l'Ordre S. B. I.* ii. 21).

The term *cellulanus* has been supposed equivalent to *celhita*. It is used by Sidonius Apollinaris for the Lerinensian monks (IX. *Ep.* 3, *ad Faust.*). According to Du Cange it sometimes means a monk sharing the same cell with another. [I. G. S.]

**CELSUS.** (1) Child-martyr at Antioch under Diocletian, is commemorated Jan. 9 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr with Nazarius at Milan, June 12 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

The *Mart. Rom. Vet.* places the invention of the relics of these saints on this day, the martyrdom on July 28. The *Cal. Byzant.* commemorates them on Oct. 14. [C.]

**CEMETERY** (Κοιμητήριον, Coemeterium). In the familiar term *cemetery* we have an example—one among many—of a new and nobler meaning being breathed by Christianity into a word already familiar to heathen antiquity. Already employed in its natural sense of a "sleeping place" (Dosit. apud Athenaeum, 143, C.), it became limited in the language of Christians to the places where their brethren who had fallen asleep in Christ were reposing until the morning of the Resurrection. Death, through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, had changed its nature and its name. "In Christiania," writes St. Jerome, *Ep.* 29, "mors non est mora, sed dormitio et somnus appellatur." "Mortuos consuevit dicere dormientes quia evigilatos, id est resurrecturos vult intelligi" (Aug. *Ra. in Ps.* lxxxvii.). And the spot where the bodies of the departed were deposited also changed its designation and received a new and significant title. The faithful looked on it as a κοιμητήριον, "a sleeping-place; the name being, as St. Chrysostom says, a perpetual evidence that those who were laid there were not dead but sleeping: διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὺς ὁ τόπος κοιμητήριον ὀνόμασται ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι οἱ τελευτηκότες καὶ ἐνταῦθα κείμενοι οὐ τεθνήκασι ἀλλὰ κοιμῶνται καὶ καθεύδουσι. (*Homil.* lxxxi.)

The earliest example of the use of the word is, perhaps, in the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus, c. 222, where we read that Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome, "set" Callistus, afterwards his successor, "over the cemetery," εἰς τὸ κοιμητήριον κατέστησεν (*Philosophum.* lib. ix. c. 7). Here the word is recognized as an already established term. That its origin was exclusively Christian, and that in its new sense it was a term unknown, and hardly intelligible to the heathen authorities, is evidenced by the form of the edicts which supply the next examples of its use. In the persecution under Valerian, A.D. 257, Aemilianus

<sup>a</sup> Κελλιωνίης also meant an imperial chamberlain at the court of Constantinople.

<sup>b</sup> "Ad propriam cellam revertisart" is taken by some commentators as referring to a convent of nuns already founded by St. Scholastica (Greg. *Dial.* ii. 34).



the prefect prohibited the Christians of Alexandria, *εἰς τὰ καλούμενα κοιμητήρια εἰσεῖναι*. This edict was revoked by Gallienus on the cessation of the persecution, c. 259, and an imperial rescript again permitted the bishops *τὰ τῶν καλουμένων κοιμητηρίων ἀπολαμβάνειν χωρία*. Had the term been one in familiar use among the heathen inhabitants, it would have been needless to have thus specified them.

A distinction between the burial places of Christians and those of another faith had its origin in the very first ages of the Church. This principle of jealous separation after death between the worshippers of the True God and the heathen was inherited from the Jews. The Jews wherever they resided had their own places of sepulchre, from which all but their co-religionists were rigidly excluded. In Rome they very early had a catacomb of their own in the Monte Verde on the Via Portuensis, outside the Trasteverine quarter of the city, which was their chief place of residence. Another has been investigated by De Rossi on the Via Appia; the construction of which he considers takes us back as far as the time of Augustus. So also the Christians, in death as well as in life, would seek to carry out the apostolic injunction to "come out, and be separate, and touch not the unclean thing." The faithful brethren of the little flock, the "peculiar people," lay apart, still united by the ties of a common brotherhood, waiting for "the great and terrible day" which according to the universal belief of the primitive church was so near at hand. As an evidence of the abhorrence felt in very early, though not the earliest, times of uniting Christians and pagans in one common sepulchre, we may refer to the words of Cyprian, A.D. 254. This Father upbraids a lapsed Spanish bishop named Martialis, among other crimes, with having associated with the members of a heathen funeral college and joined in their funeral banquets, and having buried his sons in the cemetery over which they had superintendence—"Praeter gentilium turpia et lutulenta convivia et collegia diu frequentata, filios in eodem collegio, exterarum gentium more, apud profana sepulchra depositos et alienigenis consepultos" (Cyprian. *Epist.* 67). Hilary of Poitiers, c. 360, also commenting on the text, "let the dead bury their dead," asserts the same principle, "Ostendit Dominus . . . inter fidelem filium patremque infidelem jus paterni nominis non relinqui. Non obsequium humandi patris negavit, sed . . . admonuit non admisceri memoriis sanctorum mortuos infideles" (*Comm. in Matt.* cap. vii.). These Christian cemeteries were in their first origin private and individual. The wealthier members of the Church were buried each in a plot of ground belonging to him, while the tombs of the poorer sort, like that of their Lord, were dug in the villas or gardens of rich citizens or matrons of substance who had embraced the faith of Christ, and devoted their property to His service. The titles by which many of the Roman cemeteries are still designated, though often confused with the names of conspicuous saints and martyrs who in later times were interred in them, are derived from their original possessors, some of whom may with great probability be referred to very early if not apostolic times. The cemeteries which are designated as those of *Lucina, Domitilla, Commodilla, Cynaca, Priscilla,*

*Praetextatus, Pontianus, &c.*, were so called, not as being the burial places of these individuals, but because the sepulchral area which formed the nucleus of their ramifications had been their property. Not that in every instance the original cemetery received this large extension. Underground Christian tombs have been found in the vicinity of Rome consisting of no more than a single sepulchral chamber, so that some of these cemeteries may have been always limited to the members and adherents of a single family. The only necessary restriction was that of a common faith. A few years ago a gravestone was found in the catacomb of Nicomedes outside the Porta Pia, bearing an inscription in which a certain Valerius Mercurius, according to the Roman custom, bequeathed to his freedmen and freedwomen and their posterity the right of sepulture in the same cemetery, provided that they belonged to his own religion, AT (ad) RELIGIONEM PERTINENTES MEAM. We have another example of the same kind in an inscription which may still be seen in the most ancient part of the cemetery of Nereus and Achilleus. In this it is recorded that M. Antonius Restitutus made a *hypogaeum* for himself and his family trusting in the Lord, "sibi et suis fidentibus in Domino." We have no example of language of this kind in any heathen epitaph. The strongest tie of brotherhood among Christians was a common faith. This bond outlasted death, and nowhere was its power more felt than in their burials. Nor was there anything in the social or religious position of the first Christians in Rome and elsewhere to curtail their liberty in the mode of the disposing of their dead. They lived in, and with their age, and followed its customs in all things lawful. No existing laws interfered with them. On the contrary, all the ordinances of the Roman legislation under which, as citizens, they lived, were favourable to the acquisition and maintenance of burial places by the Christians. In Rome land used for interment became *ipso facto* invested with a religious character which extended not only to the area in which the sepulture took place, but to the *hypogaea* or subterranean chambers beneath it, and perhaps also to the *cellae memoriae*, the gardens, orchards, and other appurtenances belonging to them. The violation of a tomb was a crime under the Roman law visited with the severest penalties. According to Paulus (*Digest.* lib. xlvii. tit. xii. § 11) those convicted of removing a body or digging up the bones were, if persons of the lowest rank, to suffer capital punishment; if of higher condition, to be banished to an island, or condemned to the mines. This privilege reached even to those who, as martyrs, had forfeited their lives to the law. The *Digest* contains the opinions of some of the most eminent Roman lawyers that the bodies of criminals might legally be given up to those who asked for them. "Corpora animadversorum quibuslibet petentibus ad sepulturam danda sunt" (Paulus ap. *Digest.* lib. xlviii. tit. xxiv.). Ulpian (*ibid.* § 1) adduces the authority of the Emperor Augustus for the restoration of the bodies of criminals to their relations. In his own time, he remarks, a formal petition and permission was requisite, and the request was sometimes refused, chiefly in cases of high treason. This exception may have sometimes interfered with the Christians obtaining possession of the body of a martyr

who had refused to swear "by the fortune of Caesar." But for the first two centuries there is no evidence of any such prohibition, and unless the "Acts of the martyrs" are to be altogether discredited, the nucleus of many of the existing catacombs was created by the burial of some famous martyr on the private property of a wealthy Christian. The facilities for burial would be also further enlarged by the existence of legalized funeral guilds or confraternities (*collegia*), associated together for the reverent celebration of the funeral rites of their members. The Christians were not forbidden by any rules of their own society, or laws of the empire, to enter into a corporate union of this kind. The jurist Marcian, at the beginning of the third century, as quoted in the *Digests* (*De Colleg. et Corpor.* lib. xlvii. tit. xxii. 1), when stating the prohibitions against *collegia sodalicia*, soldiers' clubs, and other illicit combinations, expressly excepts meetings the object of which was religious, "religionis causa coire non prohibentur," provided they were not forbidden by a decree of the senate; as well as associations of the poorer classes meeting once a month to make a small payment for common purposes, one of which was the decent burial of their members, "permittitur tenuioribus stipem menstruam conferre, dum tamen semel in mense coeant" (*Digest. ibid.*). That such associations existed among Christians with the object, among others, of defraying the funeral expenses of their poorer brethren, is clear from the Apology of Tertullian. He says, speaking of the *arca publica*, or public chest: "Every one makes a small contribution on a certain day of the month (*modicam unusquisque stipem menstrui die. . . . apponit*), or when he chooses, provided only he is willing and able, for none is compelled. . . . The amount is, as it were, a common fund of piety. Since it is expended not in feasting, or drinking, or indecent excess, but in feeding and burying the poor, &c. (*egenis alendis humanis-que*)." Tertull. *Apolog.* c. xxxix. The first historical notice we have of any interference with the Christian cemeteries is found in Africa, A.D. 203. And this was not an act of the civil power, but was simply an outbreak of popular bigotry. "Areæ non sint," Tertull. *ad Scapul.* c. iii. [AREA]. We do not find any general edict aimed at the Christian cemeteries before that of the Emperor Valerian, A.D. 257; and even this is directed not against the cemeteries themselves but against religious meetings in the sacred precincts, and is absolutely silent as to any prohibition of burial. After this, the cemeteries became expressly recognized by the civil power.

We cannot doubt that places of interment must have been provided by the Church, in its corporate capacity, for its members at a very early period. It was not every Christian whose dead body would be sure of receiving the pious care that attended the more distinguished members of the Church. Their abhorrence of cremation, and repugnance against admixture with the departed heathen forbade their finding a resting place in the heathen *columbaria*. The horrible *puticuli* where the bodies of the lowest slaves were thrown to rot in an undistinguished mass, could not be permitted to be the last home of those for whom, equally with the most distinguished members of the

Church, Christ died. "Apud nos," writes Lactantius, "inter pauperes et divites, servos et dominos, interest nihil" (*Lact. Div. Inst.* v. 14, 15). A common cemetery would be one of the first necessities of a Christian Church in any city as soon as it acquired a corporate existence and stability. Rome could not have long dispensed with it. And when we read of Callistus being "set over the cemetery," by Pope Zephyrinus (c. 202), we cannot reasonably question that the cemetery which we know from Anastasius "Callistus made (*fecit*) on the Appian way, and which is called to the present day the cemetery of Callistus" (*Anastas.* § 17), was one common to the whole Christian community, formed by Callistus on a plot of ground given to him for this purpose by some Roman of distinction. It is a plausible conjecture of De Rossi that the example of those who had bestowed this cemetery on the Christian community would speedily be followed by other believers of wealth, and that others of the larger cemeteries which surround Rome owe their origin, or fuller development to this epoch. This probability is strengthened when we find it recorded by Pope Fabian, in the early part of the same century (A.D. 238), that "after he had divided the regions among the deacons he ordered numerous buildings to be constructed in the cemeteries" (*multas fabricas per coemeteria fieri praecepit*), *Anast.* § 21. It was in one of these memorial chapels that in all probability Pope Xystus II. was martyred, A.D. 261, "in coemeterio animadversum," Cyprian, *Ep.* 80 (81). Anastasius records that the charge under which he suffered was contempt for the commands of Valerian (*Anast.* § 25), and, as we have seen, one of the persecuting edicts of that emperor forbade the Christians to enter their cemeteries. Among the internal arrangements of the church attributed in the *Liber Pontificalis* to Dionysius (A.D. 261-272) is the institution of cemeteries, "coemeteria instituit" (*Anast.* § 26). From this period large public cemeteries became a recognized part of the organization of the Christian Church. It was considered a duty incumbent on the richer members to provide for the reverent interment of the poor, and where other means were wanting, St. Ambrose sanctioned the sale of the sacred vessels by the Christian community rather than that the dead should want burial (*Ambros. de Offic.* lib. ii. c. 28).

The form, position, and arrangements of the early Christian cemeteries were not regulated by any uniform system, but were modified according to the customs of the country, the nature of the soil, and the conditions of climate. Attention having been for a long time chiefly drawn to the subterranean cemeteries of Rome, it has been too hastily inferred that all the early Christian burial places were underground vaults. But as Mommsen says, "the idea that the dead were usually buried in such vaults in early Christian times is as erroneous as it is prevalent" (*Contempor. Rev.*, May 1871, p. 166). We know that at Carthage the Christian dead were buried, not in *hypogaea*, but in open plots of ground, "*areæ sepulturarum nostrarum*." Against these burial places the populace directed their mad attack with the wild cry, "Down with the burial places" (*areæ non sint*), and with the fury of Bacchanals dug up the graves, dragged forth the decaying corpses, and tore them into fragments

(*Fortin. ad Rom. 2, Apol. c. xxviii.*) Half a century later we find the word in use at Carthage. St. Cyprian was buried "ad arces Maeroidi Candidiani procuratoris" (Rulhiart, *Acta Martyrum Sincera*, p. 363). It also occurs in the *Acta* of Montanus and Lucius, "in medio eorum in area solum servari fecit (Montanus) at non sepulture consuetudo privaretur" (A. 279). The same term is found in connection with a monumental cemetery chapel, *cella memorie*, in a very remarkable inscription from Cannara in Mauretania (1st) given by De Rossi (*Bull. di Arch. Crist. April, 1864*):—

"Anima et (ad) sepulchrum cultus verbi conciliat.  
Et celum strepit omnis concilio conciliat.  
Nobis sanctas hanc reliquit memoriam.  
Sacerdos fratres pure corde et simplici,  
Mortuus est vobis concilio Spiritus.  
Munda Fratrum hunc positum thalamum.  
Et reg. Astarti."

"This graveyard was given by the servant of the Word, who has also built the chapel entirely at his own expense. He left the memory to the Holy Church. Hail, brethren! Exult with a pure and simple heart greet you, born of the Holy Spirit." The remainder of the inscription records the restoration of the titulus, which had been damaged in one of the former persecutions, by the *Scolonia Fratrum*. The concluding words, "ex ingenuis Astarti," give the name of the poet.

We find sufficient evidence of this custom of burying in enclosed graveyards, according to the modern usage, prevailing in other districts. The language of St. Chrysostom with respect to the immense concourse of people who assembled on Easter Eve and other special anniversaries for worship and the celebration of the Eucharist in the cemetery and at the martyrion, with which the city of Antioch was surrounded, can only be interpreted of cemeteries above ground. There is not the slightest reference to subterranean vaults, which would have been altogether inadequate to receive the multitudes who thronged thither (cf. Chrysost. Hom. 81, *de vrb. hom. comp. p. 100*; Hom. 85, *de Martyriis*; Hom. 87, *de Dorotheis*). The same inference as to the position of the cemetery may be legitimately drawn from other passages of early writers. This is the only satisfactory interpretation of the passage in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. vi. c. 30), relating to assemblies held in the cemetery "for reading the sacred books, singing in behalf of the martyrs which are fallen asleep, and for all the saints from the beginning of the world and for the brethren that are asleep in the Lord, and offering the acceptable Eucharist." We learn also from Athanasius (*Apol. pro Aeg. p. 704*) that during the week after Pentecost the people fasted and went out to pray *extra vrb. ad sepulchra*. The prohibitions of the Council of Elvira (A.D. 305, Canon, 24, 35) of the custom of females passing the night in the cemetery, which was the cause of many scandals under the colour of religion (cf. Petron. Arbit. *Matrona Aplex.*), and of the lighting of candles in them during the day-time, "placuit ut in cimiteriis non accendi, inquietandi enim sanctorum spiritus non sunt" (cf. 1 Hom. xxviii. 15, "Quare inquietati ne ut accenderet?"), indicate open-air cemeteries furnished with martyrs, monuments, and memorial

chapels, not subterranean vaults. We would explain in the same way the 110th canon of the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 366) forbidding members of the Church to resort to the cemetery or martyrion of heretics for the purpose of prayer and divine services, *extra & sepulchra locum*. Sidonius Apollinaris, bishop of Clermont, A.D. 482, describes the burial place of his grandfather as a grave (acrole) in a field (*campus*) (Sidon. Apoll. lib. iii. ep. 12).

Nor even in Rome itself, though the actual place of interment was as a rule in a subterranean excavation, now known as a *catacomb*, does the word *cimiterium* exclusively denote these underground vaults. De Rossi, following Bettele (*Atti della Pont. Acad. d'Arch. tom. ii. p. 51*) has abundantly shown in his *Roma Subterranea* (cf. vol. i. pp. 88, 93, &c.), that *cimiterium* when it occurs in the *Lives of the Popes* and other early documents frequently denotes the monumental chapels and oratories, together with the buts of the *funerary* and other officials, erected in the funeral enclosure. "The long peace from the reign of Caracalla to that of Decius might well have encouraged the Christians to erect such buildings, and allowed them to make frequent use of them notwithstanding occasional disturbances from popular violence" (Northcote, *R. & S. p. 86-87*). When we read of popes and other Christian confessors taking refuge in the cemetery and living in them for a considerable period, we are not to suppose that they actually passed their time underground, under circumstances and in an atmosphere which would render life hardly possible, but in one of the buildings annexed to the cemetery, either for religious purposes, or for the guardianship of the sacred enclosure. Thus when we read in Anastasius (§ 60) that Boniface I. in the stormy period that accompanied the double election to the papedom, A.D. 418, "habuit in cimiterio sanctae Felicitatis," we find Symmachus, his contemporary, writing without any allusion to the place of his retirement, "extra murum deductus non longe ab urbe remoratur" (Symmach. *Ep. x. 73*). We have a distinct example belonging to the same period, of residence in a *cella* of a cemetery. This is the priest Barbattianus, who having come from Antioch to Rome retired to the cemetery of Callistus, "clam latens in cellula sua" (Agnellus, *Vitas Pont. Roman.*). Ptolemaeus Silvius, quoted by De Rossi, *Bullettino*, Giorgio, 1863, writing A.D. 448, speaks of the innumerable *cellulae* dedicated to the martyrs with which the arena of the cemetery were studded. All these buildings taken collectively were often comprised under the name *cimiterium*. Onuphrius Panvinus (d. 1568), one of the earliest writers on Christian interment, *De Ritu sepulch. Mort. apud vet. Christ.*, p. 85, expressly states that "inasmuch as worshippers were wont to assemble in large numbers at the tombs of the martyrs on the anniversaries of their death, the name of cemetery was extended to spacious places adjacent to the cemetery, suitable for public meetings for prayer." "We read," he continues, "that the early Roman pontiffs were in the habit of keeping these stations, that is, performing all their public pontifical acts among the tombs of

\* Suppose reference is made by Ulpian to the habit of dwelling in sepulchra (*Sigant. lib. xlviii. tit. 28. § 5*).

the martyrs. And thus these cemeteries were to the Christians as it were temples, and places of prayer in which bishops used to gather their synods, administer the sacraments, and preach the word of God." <sup>b</sup> [CHURCHYARD.]

That the term *coemeterium* was not restricted to the subterranean places of interment is also clear from the fact that though interment in the catacombs had entirely ceased in the 5th century, we read of one pope after another being buried in *coemeterio* (cf. Siricius, A.D. 398, Anast. § 55; Anastasius A.D. 402, *ib.* § 56; Bonifacius, A.D. 422, *ib.* § 61; Coelestinus, A.D. 432, *ib.* § 62). Even of Vigilius, who died A.D. 555, long after the catacombs were disused for burial and had become nothing more than places of devotion at the tombs of the martyrs, we read (*ib.* § 108), "corpus . . . sepultum est . . . in coemeterio Priscillae" (Anast. § 108). Hadrian I. in his celebrated letter to Charlemagne on images, also makes mention of the pictures executed by Coelestinus "in coemeterio suo" (*Concilia*, Ed. Mansi xiii. p. 801). (For fuller particulars, see De Rossi, *Rom. Sott.* vol. i. p. 216, 217). There is an apparent exception in the case of Zosimus, A.D. 418, Sixtus III. A.D. 440, and Hilarius, A.D. 468, all of whom are stated to have been buried "ad Sanctum Laurentium in crypta" (Anast. § 59, 65, 71). But as De Rossi remarks the exception only proves the rule. For this crypt did not at this time form part of the extensive cemetery of St. Cyriaca, but was the substructure of the altar (*confessio*) of the Basilica erected over it by Constantine, A.D. 330, of which it formed the nucleus. The result of his investigation is thus summed up by De Rossi, *u. s.*: "It is manifest that the *cemeteries* in which during the fifth century the bodies of the popes were interred were all buildings under the open sky, and that history is in accord with the monuments in presenting no single example in that period of a burial performed according to the ancient rites in the primitive subterranean excavations."

Although the words *κοιμητήριον*, *coemeterium*, were generally applied to the whole sepulchral area, and the buildings included within it, yet instances are not wanting in which it is used of a single grave. The examples adduced by De Rossi (*R. S.* p. 85) are exclusively Greek. He refers to *Corpus Inscr. Graec.*, n. 9298; 9304-6; 9310-16; 9439-40; 9450; and mentions a bilingual inscription from Narbonne of the year 527, in which the tomb is styled KYMETEPION. In Boldetti, p. 633, we have an inscription from Malta stating that the KOIMHΘHPION had been purchased and restored by a Christian named Zosimus. Aringhi also (*Rom. Subt.* tom. i. p. 5) adduces an example of a sarcophagus bearing this designation, KOIMHΘHPION TOTTO ΩK-TABIAAH TH IDIA ΓΥΝΑΙΚΙ ΛΑΤΑΚΙΕ. The word is of excessive rarity in the catacombs themselves. The epitaph of Sabinus (Perret V. xxix. 67), in which we read CYMETERIUM BAL-BINAE, is perhaps the only instance known.

The Latin equivalents for *κοιμητήριον* most usually found were either *dormitorium*—e.g., FECIT IN PACE DOMINI DORMITORIUM (cf. Reines, *Syntagm. Inscr. Antiq.* 356); "Pompeiana ma-

trona corpus ejus de iudice eruit et imposuit in dormitorio suo" (*Acta S. Maximil.* apud Ruinart, p. 264)—or in Africa, *accubitorium* (De Rossi, *R. S.* i. p. 86). A long list of other names by which at various epochs and in different countries, Christian places of interment were designated may be found in Boldetti (*Osservazioni*, pp. 584-586).

(Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. viii. ch. 8-10, bk. xxiii. ch. 1-2; Boldetti, *Osservazioni sopra i Cimiterii*; Bottari, *Sculture e pitture sagre*; Bosio, *Roma Sotterranea*; Aringhi, *Roma Subterranea*; Panvinus, *De Ritu Sepeliendi*; Anastasius, *De Vitis Rom. Pontif.*; Raoul-Rochette, *Tableau des Catacombes*; De Rossi, *Roma Sotterranea*; Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotterranea*). [E. V.]

#### CENSER. [THURIBLE.]

CENSURIUS, bishop and confessor at Auxerre (about A.D. 500, is commemorated June 10 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

CEREALIS. (1) Martyr at Rome under Hadrian, is commemorated June 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

(2) Soldier, martyr at Rome under Decius, Sept. 14 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

CEREMONIALE. A book containing directions or *rubrics* for the due performance of certain ceremonies. The more ancient term for such a book is ORDO, which see. [C.]

#### CEREUS. [TAPER.]

CEREUS PASCHALIS. [MAUNDY THURSDAY.]

#### CHAIR. [CATHEDRA: THRONE.]

CHALCEDON (COUNCILS OF). (1) A.D. 403, better known as "the Synod of the Oak"—a name given to a suburb there—at which St. Chrysostom was deposed. To appreciate its proceedings, we should remember that St. John Chrysostom had been appointed to the see of Constantinople five years before, and that Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, had been summoned thither by the emperor Arcadius to ordain him. Theophilus had a presbyter of his own whom he would have preferred, named Isidore, so that in one sense he consecrated St. Chrysostom under constraint. It was against the 2nd of the Constantinopolitan canons likewise for him to have consecrated at all out of his own diocese: but in another sense he was probably not loth to make St. Chrysostom beholden to him, and be possessed of a pretext himself for interfering in a see threatening to eclipse his own, where he could do so with effect. Hence the part played by him at the Synod of the Oak, over which he presided, and in which no less than 12 sessions were occupied on charges brought against St. Chrysostom himself, and a 13th on charges brought against Heraclides, bishop of Ephesus, who had been ordained by him (Mansi iii. 1141-54). The number of charges alleged against St. Chrysostom was 29 at one time and 18 at another. When cited to appear and reply to them, his answer was: "Remove my avowed enemies from your list of judges, and I am ready to appear and make my defence, should any person bring aught against me; otherwise you may send as often as you will for me, but you will get no farther." And the first of those whom he reckoned as such

<sup>b</sup> In the *Sacramentarium Eccl. Roman.* the *Missa in Cymeteriis*, cap. 103, contains prayers for the souls "omnium fidelium in hac Basilica quiescentium."



was Theophilus. One of the charges against him was some unworthy language that he had used to St. Epiphanius, lately deceased, who had supported Timotheus in condemning the originists, regarded by St. Chrysostom with more favour. The others refer to his conduct in his own church, or towards his own clergy. The synod ended by deposing St. Chrysostom, having cited him four times to no purpose; when he was immediately expelled the city by the emperor, and withdrew into Bithynia, to be very shortly recalled.

(2) The 4th general—held its first session, October 8, A.D. 451, in the church of St. Euphemia—for the architectural arrangements of which see Evagrius (ii. 3)—having been convened by the emperor Marcian shortly after his elevation. In his circular to the bishops (Mansi, vi. 551-4), he bids them come to Nicaea—the place chosen by him originally—to settle “some questions that he says had arisen apparently respecting the orthodox faith, and been also shown him in a letter from the archbishop of Rome.” But in reality St. Leo had urged a very different course. In his last epistle to the late emperor he had indeed petitioned that a council might be held in Italy, should a council be required at all (ib. 83-5): and when Marcian applied to him “to authorise” the council about to be held (ib. 93-4), his reply was that he would rather it were postponed till the times were more favourable (ib. 114-5). It was only when he found his advice unheeded that he decided on sending representatives thither (ib. 126-9), and then on the solemn understanding that there should be no resettlement attempted of the Nicene faith. Even so, he reminds the empress (ib. 138-9) that his demand had been for a council in Italy; and tells the council expressly that his representatives are to preside there, custom forbidding his own presence (ib. 131-5). His representatives, on their part, warn the emperor that unless he is present in person they cannot attend (ib. 557-8). Hence, to facilitate this arrangement, the council is transferred to Chalcedon. Bishops to the number of 360 attended, in some cases by deputy, the 1st action, and 19 of the highest lay dignitaries represented the emperor. Usually 630 bishops are said to have been at the council sooner or later (Bever. ii. 107). It might have been supposed this total had been gained originally by placing the 6 before, instead of after, the 3: still there are 470 episcopal subscriptions to the 6th action, and members of the council themselves spoke of it as one of 600 bishops (Mansi, vii. 57, and the note).

As to their places in church, the lay dignitaries occupied the centre, in front of the altar-screen; and one of the most remarkable traits of this council is their control of its proceedings all through. On their left were the legates from Rome, and next to them Anatolius of Constantinople, Maximus of Antioch, Thalassius of Caesarea, Stephen of Ephesus, and other Easterns. On their right were Dioscorus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, with the bishops of Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine generally. On the motion of Paschasius, the first legate, Dioscorus was ordered by the magistrates to quit the seat occupied by him in the council, and to take his place in the midst where the accused sat. The charges alleged against him by the legates were that he

had held a council and sat as judge, without permission of the apostolic see. Eusebius of Dorylaeum, sitting in the midst as his accuser, complained of the iniquitous sentence passed upon Flavian and himself at the council of Ephesus (see the art. on this) two years before. Dioscorus begged its acts might be read. This was done: but meanwhile Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, who had been deposed there, having since been restored by St. Leo, and invited to this council by the emperor, entered and took his seat, amidst vehement protests from the bishops on the right. After the acts of the “Robbers’ Meeting” had been read, which included those of the two synods of Constantinople preceding it, all agreed that Dioscorus, Juvenal, Thalassius, and three more, who had been most forward in deposing Eusebius and Flavian, deserved to be deposed themselves. The rest might be pardoned, as having acted in ignorance or under coercion.

Action or session 2 followed, October 10. The judges or lay dignitaries proposing that the faith should be set forth in its integrity, the bishops replied that they were limited to the creed of Nicaea, confirmed at Ephesus, and interpreted by the letters of SS. Cyril and Leo more particularly. On this it was recited by command of the judges, from a book by Euno-mius, bishop of Nicomedia, amidst shouts of adhesion. And immediately after, without a word more, by order of the same judges, Aetius or Atticus, deacon or archdeacon of the church of Constantinople, recited from a book what purported to be the creed of the 150 fathers, that is, of the 2nd general council, on which some remarks have been made elsewhere. [CONC. CONST. and ANTIOCH.] But the abruptness of its introduction here merits attention, especially when viewed in connection with a short scene in the 1st action (Mansi, vi. 631-2). Diogenes, bishop of Cyzicus, there remarked that Eutyches had dealt fraudulently in professing his faith in the words of the creed of Nicaea, as it stood originally; for it had received additions from the holy fathers since then, owing to the false teaching of Apollinarius, Valentinus, Macedonius, and their followers; two such being “from heaven” after “descended,” and “by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary” after “incarnate.” This is the first clear reference to the new clauses of the Constantinopolitan creed in this or any other council extant. And it is to be observed that even the creed of Nicaea, quoted in the definition, contains them. But Diogenes had hardly finished his sentence, when the Egyptian bishops exclaimed, “nobody will hear of any additions or subtractions either: let what passed at Nicaea stand as it is.” Dioscorus had urged this all along. Thus advantage was promptly taken of his condemnation to promulgate this creed in the same breath with that of Nicaea, while the account given of the additions occurring in it by Diogenes is such as to connect it at once with those synods of Antioch and Rome, at which the errors of Apollinarius and Macedonius were condemned. Its recital was followed by the same shouts of adhesion as the older form, which is the more remarkable as, up to that time, stress had been laid exclusively, both here and at the synods rehearsed in the first action, on the creed of Nicaea, confirmed at

Ephesus, without the slightest reference to anything that had ever passed at Constantinople. After this, the two letters of St. Cyril were read that had been heard already from the acts of the council under Flavian, and then the letter of St. Leo to Flavian—the reading of which had been prevented at the “Robbers’ Meeting”—in a Greek translation. Three passages in it were called in question by the bishops of Illyria and Palestine; but Aetius and Theodoret producing similar expressions from St. Cyril, they were accepted. Five days were allowed for further deliberation.

At the 3rd action, however, October 13, two days in advance from which the lay dignitaries were absent, Eusebius of Dorylaeum having brought another indictment against Dioscorus, fresh charges were produced against him also by two deacons and one layman of his own church, and he not appearing to meet them, after having been twice summoned, was formally deposed—the Roman legates, by general consent, delivering their judgment first, and the rest in order assenting to it—but the sentence of his deposition was framed on the model of that of Nestorius. Letters were written to the emperor and empress and to his own clergy, acquainting them with it.

Action 4 followed, October 17, or rather 15 (see Mansi, vii. 83), when the judges appeared true to their engagement. By their order minutes of the 1st and 2nd actions were read out, to the marked exclusion of what had passed at the 3rd. They then called upon the bishops to declare what had been decided by them respecting the faith. The legates replied by pronouncing the faith of Nicaea, Constantinople, and Ephesus to have been embraced by the council and expounded faithfully by St. Leo in his epistle to Flavian. To this, all present assented; and Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius, Basil, and Eustathius, the five bishops who had, in the 1st action, been classed with Dioscorus, were permitted to sit in the council on subscribing to it. Consideration of a petition from 13 Egyptian bishops who objected to do so was adjourned till they had elected a new archbishop. Eighteen priests and archimandrites who had petitioned the emperor were next heard. Among them was Barsumas the Syrian, accused of having murdered Flavian. The burden of their petition was that Dioscorus should be restored. The 4th and 5th canons of Antioch were quoted from a book—in it numbered as canons 83 and 4—against them, and they were allowed 30 days for consideration whether to submit to the council or be deposed. Lastly, Photius of Tyre was heard in behalf of the rights of his church against Eustathius of Berytus, whose city had been created a metropolis by the late emperor. The council ruled, and the judges concurred, that the question between them should be settled according to the canons, and not prejudiced by any pragmatistical constitutions of the empire.

On the 5th action, commencing October 22, the judges called on the bishops to produce what had been defined by them on the faith. When read it gave offence to the legates and some few Easterns, as not including the letter of St. Leo. The former threatened to leave, and were told they might; but on reference to the emperor, he said a synod should be held in the West, if

they could not agree. A committee was therefore formed of the principal bishops, and at length the definition appeared with the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople following in succession, but authorised equally, in the first part of it; and in the second, the synodical letters of St. Cyril to Nestorius and to the Easterns, and the letter of St. Leo to Flavian, as their received exponents on the mystery of the Incarnation. On the doctrine of the Trinity, those creeds, it was particularly said, required no further explanation; nor was any other faith to be taught, or creed proposed for acceptance, to converts from what heresy soever, under pain of deposition in the case of the clergy and excommunication in that of the laity.

At the 5th action, October 25, all subscribed to this definition—the Roman legates attesting merely that they subscribed, the rest that they defined as well. This was done in the presence of the emperor Marcian, the empress Pulcheria, and a splendid suite; the emperor telling them in a short address that he had come thither, like Constantine, to confirm what they had done, not to display his power. After which, he approved of their definition, and announced his intention of punishing all who contravened it, according to their station. At his instance three rules were made; one for making monks more dependent upon bishops, and two more forbidding the clergy to undertake secular posts, or migrate from the church to which they belonged. And here the council, doctrinally speaking, ends.

The other actions, to the 14th inclusively, related to matters between one bishop and another, and occupied the rest of October. At action 7 sanction was given to a territorial arrangement between the bishops of Antioch and Jerusalem, by which the former was in future to have jurisdiction over the two provinces of Phoenicia and that of Arabia—the latter over the three called Palestine. At the 8th action Theodoret, who had already subscribed to the definition with the rest, was called upon to anathematise Nestorius, which he did, including Eutyches, and three more bishops similarly called upon did the same. The 9th and 10th actions passed in enquiring into what had been decided at the synods of Tyre and Berytus respecting Ibas, bishop of Edessa, three years before. Their acts having been rehearsed, and the sentence passed upon him at the “Robbers’ Meeting” summarily cancelled, he was declared orthodox on anathematising Nestorius and Eutyches, and restored to his see. Yet, inconsistently enough, in another case, that of Domnus of Antioch, the judgment of the “Robbers’ Meeting” was allowed to stand, his successor, Maximus, having been consecrated by Anatolius of Constantinople, recognised by St. Leo, and received at this council. Domnus, whose piety was admitted by all, was adjudged a pension out of the revenues of the see in which he had been uncanonically superseded. The Greek account of this proceeding indeed has been lost, but two of the Latin versions containing it purport to have been made from the Greek (Mansi, vii. 177–8, 269–72, and 771–4). Actions 11 and 12 were taken up in hearing a contention between Bassianus and Stephen for the see of Ephesus, as bishop of which, Stephen had hitherto sat and voted at this council. Neither had been canonically ordained in the judgment

of the council, so that a fresh election had to be made, but both were allowed their rank and ordered a pension of 200 aurei respectively out of the revenues of that see. In the former of these actions, the 16th and 17th canons of Antioch were read out of a book by Leontius, bishop of Magnesia, numbered as 95th and 96th, and applied to their case. At the 13th action Eunomius, bishop of Nicomedia, complained that the privileges of his church had been infringed by the bishop of Nicaea. Imperial constitutions were quoted on both sides, which, according to the judges themselves, had nothing at all to do with the rights of bishops: and the 4th Nicene canon which Eunomius read out of a book as the 6th, settled the question in his favour. The insertion of a salvo to the see of Constantinople, proposed by its archdeacon, was negatived by the judges, who said that its rights of ordaining in the provinces would be declared in their proper order. At the 14th action, Athanasius and Sabinianus, who had each sat and subscribed as bishop of Perrhe, submitted their respective claims—the former adducing two letters in his favour from SS. Cyril and Proclus, the latter the acts of the synod of Antioch under Domnus, deposing his rival, and the fact of the “Robbers’ Meeting” having restored him. For the judgment of the council, see *Concil. Hierap.* A.D. 445.

What is printed as the 15th action, without date or preface, would seem to be, strictly speaking, a mere continuation of the 10th action by the hierarchy for framing canons after the judges had retired. This would follow from what is said to have passed in the 16th action, October 28—at least, if this date is correct. There the legates complained to the judges of what had been done *yesterday*, after the *latter* had retired, and subsequently to their own withdrawal also. Now, October 27 had been the day of the 10th action, and the 11th action was not till October 29. Consequently there was just the interval required for them to have complained on October 28, and had the canon to which they objected read out publicly. Thus, when Ibas had been acquitted, the judges withdrew, and the bishops, probably not expecting any more business, remained to make canons. Twenty-seven in all, including those previously recommended by the emperor, were drawn up, and, according to one of the oldest Latin versions extant, were subscribed to by all, not excepting the legates (*Mansi*, vii. 400–8). After the legates had retired, the Eastern bishops again remained, and agreed to three more, making a total of 30; but to the last three the legates had not been parties, and equally declined subscribing the day after (*Mansi*, *ib.* 429–54). As Beveridge remarks, they are omitted as well by John Scholasticus as by Dionysius Exiguus (ii. 124), nor have they ever been received in the West.

Only the 28th, however, demands any notice. Those who were most interested in it said in their defence that they had asked the legates to take part in framing it, and they had replied that they were without instructions. The judges, on the other hand, had bade them refer it to the council. And doubtless it was as much a question for the council as those which had been settled in the 7th and 13th actions. In one sense it merely renewed the 3rd canon of Con-

stantinople, A.D. 381, conferring honorary precedence (*πρεσβεία*, throughout—erroneously rendered by the Latins in each case “*primatum*”) upon the bishop of that city next after Rome, and for the same reason as had there been given. And if, in addition, it gave the bishop of that city the right of ordaining metropolitans in the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, still this was *afterwards* proved to have been done with the full consent of the bishops of those dioceses. And so we are brought to what really passed at the 16th action, opening abruptly with a speech of the legate Lucentius (*Mansi*, vii. 441), as reported in the Greek version. Here both sides were called upon by the judges to produce the canons on which they relied; and the legates, in quoting the 6th of Nicaea, substituted for the first clause of it, “*Quod ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum.*” No protest was actually made to these words, but it was cited in its genuine form afterwards by the Constantinopolitan archdeacon. And as for the 3rd of Constantinople, Eusebius of Dorylaeum testified to having read it himself at Rome to the Pope, and to his having received it (*ib.* 449). The judges at last having delivered their opinion that the primacy before all, and chiefest honour, according to the canons, should be preserved to the archbishop of elder Rome, but that the archbishop of Constantinople ought to have the honour and power assigned him in this canon, it was accepted by all present, in spite of the legates, who had previously desired to have their protest recorded against what had been passed in their absence, for this 2nd speech of Lucentius clearly followed the reading out of the canon, October 28. Afterwards it was denounced in a series of epistles by St. Leo, who nevertheless, neither by his legates, nor in his own name, seems ever to have objected to the 9th and 17th canons of this council, authorising appeals to the see of Constantinople far more fully than the Sardican canons ever had to Rome (*Bever.* ii. 115–6). Yet these form part of the 27 subscribed to by all, including the legates, and received in the West. No others among them, save the first, are worth noticing; but these, perhaps, have never been sufficiently noticed. By the first it is decreed that “the canons of the Holy Fathers, made in every synod to this present time, be in full force”—in other words, the collection of canons published by Beveridge, Justellus, and others, as the “code of the universal Church,” is ordered to become law (*Bever.* ii. 108; *Cave, Hist. Lit.* i. 486–7). It only remains to observe that Evagrius attributes no more than 14 actions to this council (ii. 18), and seems to say that most of the canons were framed at the 7th. Other accounts, that of Liberatus, for instance (*Brev.* i. 13), vary from his. Before separating, the bishops addressed the emperor in vindication of their definition, and the Pope in vindication of their 28th canon (*Mansi*, vii. 455–74 and vi. 147–61), telling St. Leo that he had interpreted the faith of Peter to them in his epistle, and presided over their deliberations in the person of his legates, as the head over the members. The Pope was deaf to all argument on the subject of the canon, while setting his seal to their definition. In one of his letters to Anatolius (*Mansi*, vi. 203) he goes so far as to say that the 3rd canon of Constantinople had never been notified to the apostolic see, though Eusebius of Dorylaeum had

testified at the council to his having publicly received it himself. In the same spirit it is, perhaps, too, that he never once mentions the creed of the 150 fathers; in other words, that of Constantinople, by name, though he must have received it with the definition of this council: and indeed he said of it latterly, "tam plenae atque perfectae definitionibus cuncta firmata sunt, ut nihil ei regulas quas ex divina inspiratione prelatas est, aut addi possit aut minui" (*Ep. ad Leon. Imp.*, Mansi, vi. 308). Such, however, was his zeal against the canon that he was at one time thought not to have approved of the definition.

Edicts in succession issued from the emperor, ordering all persons to submit to the council, and forbidding all further discussion of the points settled by it. The law of the late emperor, confirming the acts of the "Robbers' Meeting," was repealed; Eutyches deprived of the title of priest; and Dioscorus exiled to Gangra in Paphlagonia. Great opposition was nevertheless made to its reception by their admirers, in Egypt especially, to which the "Codex Euclycina," or collection of letters in its favour, addressed for the most part to the emperor Leo, on his accession, A.D. 458, was intended to be a counter-demonstration (Mansi, vii. 475-627 and 785-98). [E. S. F.]

#### CHALDAEL [ASTROLOGIA]

**CHALICE.** (Latin, *calix*; Greek, *ποτήριον*, *potērion*; French, *calice*; Italian, *calice*; German, *Kelch*; Anglo-Saxon, *calic*.) The cup in which the wine is consecrated at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and from which the communicants drink. Chalices have been divided into several classes, of which the more important are—offertorial, in which the wine brought by the communicants was received; communal, in which the wine was consecrated; and ministerial, in which it was administered to the communicants.

Vessels of this description being indispensably required for the celebration of the most important of the rites of the Christian religion it is obvious that from the very earliest period some such must have been in use, but it does not seem possible to determine how soon they began to be distinguished by form, material, or ornament from the cups used in ordinary life. Perhaps the earliest notice which we have of any mark by which a cup used for eucharistic purposes was distinguished from those in ordinary use, is the passage in Tertullian (*De Pudicit.* c. 16): "Si forte patrocinabitur pastor, quem in calice depingis, prostitutorem et ipsum Christiani sacramenti, merito et ebrietatis idolum et mœchæ asylum post calicem subsequetur."

It seems indeed quite possible that at that early period when the administration of the Eucharist was connected both as regards time and locality with the feasts of charity (*agapæ*) the distinction between the vessels used for each purpose was less strongly drawn than afterwards came to be the case, and that in the earliest centuries there was little or no distinction of either form or decoration between the eucharistic cup and that of the domestic table.

The eventually exclusive adoption of the word "*calix*" as signifying the eucharistic cup, may

perhaps be deemed to imply that the form of cup most generally employed in the celebration of the Communion, was that specifically called "*calix*." This word is held usually to denote a cup with a somewhat shallow bowl, two handles and a foot. Vases of various forms are often depicted on the walls or vaults of the catacombs, but it is generally uncertain how far these are merely ornaments, and it would not appear that in any one instance a representation of what can with certainty be assumed to be a eucharistic chalice has been observed among these paintings. It would at first sight appear extremely probable that among these numerous representations of vases, some at least should be intended to represent that which was above all precious to those for whom these decorations were executed, but the paintings of the earlier period are with hardly an exception allegorical or symbolical, scarcely ever in a primary sense historical, and never liturgical, unless the allusions to the sacraments conveyed by figures of fishes, baskets of bread, and the like deserve to be so called.



Vases from Sarcophagus at Bordeaux.

It has been supposed by some, Boldetti (*Osservazioni sopra i Cimiteri dei SS. Martiri*) among others, that the glass vessels decorated with gold leaf, the bottoms of which have been found in considerable numbers in the catacombs attached to the plaster by which the tiles closing the loculi were fixed, were, if not actually chalices, at least drinking-vessels in which the com-



Vase from the Sarcophagus of Amelphus at Milan.

municants received the consecrated wine, and from which they drank. Padre Garrucci (*Pecci Ornati d'Oro*, Pref. xi) has however shown that this opinion does not rest on any secure foundation. It has also been thought that the figures of vases so often found incised on early Christian



memorial stones were intended to represent chalices, and thereby to indicate that the deceased person was a priest. Though this may possibly have sometimes been the case, other and more probable explanations of the occurrence of these figures of vases may be suggested; but there is a marked similarity between the type of vase usually employed and the forms of the earliest chalices of which we have any positive knowledge.

The woodcut represents one of these vases as shown in low relief on the sarcophagus in the chapel of St. Aquilinus attached to the church of S. Lorenzo at Milan, which is supposed to have contained the remains of Ataulphus king of the Goths (ob. A.D. 415), or of his wife Placidia.

The earliest chalice still existing is probably that found with a paten at Gourdon in France,



Chalice found at Gourdon.

and now preserved in the Bibliothèque Impériale in Paris. This is represented in the annexed woodcut, and is of gold ornamented with thin slices of garnets. With it were found 104 gold coins of Emperors of the East, 25 of which of Justin I. (518-527) being in a fresh and unworn condition and the latest in date of the entire hoard, it is reasonable to conclude that the deposit was made in the earlier part of the 6th century.

Of not much later date were the splendid chalices belonging to the basilica of Monza, no longer in existence, but of which representations, evidently tolerably accurate, have been preserved in a large painting probably executed in the latter half of the 15th century, and now in the library



Chalices from Monza.

of that church. This painting represents the restitution to the basilica of the contents of its treasury which took place in 1345. These chalices are represented in the accompanying woodcuts, both were of gold set with jewels; their weight is variously stated at from 105 to 170 ounces. These there is ground to believe, were


in the possession of the church of Monza before the year 600, and may indeed with great probability be supposed to be of even greater age. A rude sculpture over the west doorway of that church, believed to date from circa A.D. 600, represents several chalices of various sizes, some with and some without handles.

Chalices of glass of very similar form are met with, and may with much probability be attributed to the 6th or 7th centuries; two examples are in the British Museum; these are of blue glass and somewhat roughly made. As, however, these bear neither inscriptions nor any Christian symbol, it cannot be affirmed with certainty that they were sacramental chalices. Moroni (*Dir. di Erudizione Storico-Ecclesiastica*) mentions a chalice of blue glass as being preserved in the church of the Isola S. Giulio in the lake of Orta in Lombardy, as a relic of the saint who lived in the 5th century; this, he says, was without a foot. It is not now to be found there.

In the sacristy of the church of Sta. Anastasia at Rome a chalice is preserved as a relic, as it is said to have been used by St. Jerome; the bowl is of white opaque glass with some ornament in relief, the foot is of metal.

A chalice is preserved (? at Maastricht), which is believed to have belonged to St. Lambert, bishop of that city (ob. 708); it is of metal (? silver) gilt, the bowl hemispherical, the foot a frustum of a cone; the whole without ornament.

A chalice of exactly the same form is to be seen in an illumination in the very ancient gospels preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College at Cambridge, and known as St. Augustine's.



Chalice formerly at Chelles.

Until the year 1792 the abbey of Chelles, in the diocese of Paris, possessed a most splendid

example of a golden chalice (see woodcut), which ancient inventories asserted to have been the work of St. Eligius (or Eloi), and therefore to date from the first half of the 7th century. Fortunately an engraving of it has been preserved in the *Penoplia Sacerdotalis* of Du Saussay, and the character of the work corresponds with the alleged date. It is obviously an instance of transition from earlier to later forms, though somewhat exceptional from the great depth of the bowl. It was about a foot high and nearly ten inches in diameter, and held about the half of a French litre.

A singular exception in point of form was the chalice which was found with the body of St. Cuthbert when his relics were examined in the year 1104; this is described as of small size and in its lower part of gold and of the figure of a lion, the bowl which was attached to the back of the lion being cut from an onyx (*Act. Sanct. Roll. 2 Mart.*). It may be surmised that this was not really made for a chalice, but had been presented to him and converted to that use.

Of the next century, the 8th, a very remarkable example still exists in the convent of Krems-



Chalice at Kremsmünster

münster in Upper Austria; this chalice is (*vide* woodcut) of bronze ornamented with niello and incrustations of silver. As the inscription shows that it was the gift of Tassilo, duke of Bavaria, it is probably earlier than A.D. 788, the year when that prince was deposed by Charles the Great.

One of the bas-reliefs of the altar of S. Ambrogio at Milan (finished in 835) gives a good example of the form of a chalice in the beginning of the 9th century. It has a bowl, foot, and handle.

So much may be gathered from still existing examples, or representations of them; much may also be collected, especially as regards the size and weight of chalices and the materials of which they were composed, from the notices to be

found in various historical documents, and particularly in the *Liber Pontificalis*.

It has been asserted that in the apostolic age chalices of wood were in use; but for this assertion there is no early authority; St. Boniface indeed is reported in the 18th canon of the Council of Tribur to have said that once golden priests used wooden chalices, and Platina (*De Vit. Pont.*) asserts that Pope Zephyrinus (A.D. 197-217) ordered that the wine should be consecrated not as heretofore in a wooden but in a glass vessel. The *Liber Pontificalis* in the life of Zephyrinus, however, merely says that he ordered patens of glass to be carried before the priests when mass was to be celebrated by the bishop. Glass was no doubt in use from a very early date; St. Jerome (*ad Rustic. Mon. Ep. 4*) writes of Eusepius, bishop of Toulouse, as bearing the Lord's blood in a vessel of glass, and St. Gregory (*Dialog. lib. i. c. 7*) says that St. Donatus, bishop of Arezzo, repaired by prayer a chalice of glass broken by the heathens. The use of wood for chalices was prohibited by several provincial councils in the 8th and 9th centuries (*Conc. Tribur. can. 18*), of born by that of Carthage (*Conc. Carth. can. 10*), and Pope Leo IV. (847-855) in his homily, *De Cura Pastoralis*, lays down the rule that no one should celebrate mass in a chalice of wood, lead, or glass. Glass, however, continued to be occasionally used to a much later date. Martene (*De Antiq. Eccl. Rit. t. iv. p. 78*) shows from the life of St. Winocus that in the 10th century the monks of the convent in Flanders founded by him still used chalices of glass. Pewter was also in use, and it would seem was considered as a material superior to glass, for we are told of St. Benedict of Aniane (ob. 821) that the vessels of his church were at first of wood, then of glass, and that at last he ascended to pewter (see his *Life*, by Ardo, c. 14, in Mabillon's *Act. SS. ord. S. Benedicti, Rec. iv*).

A chalice of glass mounted in gold is mentioned in the will of Count Everhard, A.D. 837 (Miræus, *Op. Dip. t. i. p. 19*). A chalice of ivory and one of coco-nut (?) (*de nucos*) set with gold and silver are mentioned in the same document; these however may have been drinking-cups, not sacramental chalices.

The use of bronze appears to have been exceptional and perhaps peculiar to the Irish monks. St. Gall (*Mabillon's Act. SS. ord. S. Ben. Sac. 2, p. 241*), we are told, refused to use silver vessels for the altar, saying that St. Columbanus was accustomed to offer the sacrifice in vessels of bronze (*aerels*), alleging as a reason for so doing that our Saviour was affixed to the cross by brazen nails. This traditional use of bronze was no doubt continued by the successors of the Irish missionaries in the South of Germany, and explains why the Kremsmünster chalice is of that material, a circumstance which has caused the question to be raised whether that vessel was anything but a mere drinking cup. The use of niello and of damascening with thin silver in the decoration of this vessel, and the peculiar patterns of its ornamentation, connect it closely with the Irish school of artificers, who were in the habit of employing bronze as the main material of their works.

The precious metals were however from a very early, perhaps the earliest, period most pre-

hably the usual material of the chalice. The earliest converts to Christianity were not by any means exclusively of humble station, and it was not until it spread from cities into remote villages that many churches would have existed whose members could not afford a silver chalice: nor do we until a later age find traces of a spirit of asceticism which would prefer the use of a mean material. We have at least proof of the use of both gold and silver in the sacred vessels in the beginning of the 4th century, for we are told by Optatus of Milevi that in the Diocletianian persecution the church of Carthage possessed many "ornamenta" of gold and silver (*Opt. Mil. De Solum. Donat. l. 17*). The church of Cirta in Numidia at the same time possessed two golden and six silver chalices (*Gen's Purgat. Cocidiani*, in the Works of Optatus). That it was believed that the churches possessed such rich ornaments at an earlier period is shown by the language which Prudentius puts into the mouth of the Prefectus Urbis interrogating St. Lawrence—

"Argente scypha ferat,  
Fertur aurum sanguinem," &c.  
(*Perseph. Epim. III. 60*).

The passages in the *Lit. Pont.* which relate the gifts of Constantine to various churches are with reason suspected as untrustworthy, but are at least of value as recording the traditions existing at an early age. They make mention of many chalices, some of gold, some of silver; 40 lesser chalices of gold, each weighing 1 lb., and 50 lesser ministerial chalices of silver, each weighing 2 lbs., are said to have been given to the Constantinian Basilica (St. John Lateran), and in lesser numbers and of very various weights to many other churches. Whatever, however, may be the historical value of these passages, that churches in the 4th and 5th centuries possessed great numbers of golden or silver chalices, cannot be doubted. Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc. l. III. c. 2*) tells us that Childobert in the year 531 took among the spoils of Amalaric sixty chalices of gold. Many instances of gifts of chalices of the precious metals to the churches of Rome by successive popes are to be found in the *Lit. Pont.* Of these the following may deserve special mention: a great chalice (calix major) with handles and adorned with gems, weighing 58 lbs.; a great chalice with a syphon (cum scypho) or tube, weighing 36 lbs.; a covered (opacoclystus, i.e. *deinde clausus*) chalice of gold, weighing 32 lbs.; all three given by Pope Leo III. (795).

Little is to be found as to the decoration of chalices; occasionally they bore inscriptions, as in the case of that made by order of St. Remigius (Remi, ob. 533), which Frodoard tells us bore the following verses:—

"Hauriat hinc populum vitam de sanguine sacro,  
Inja te accipere quoniam fuit vulnere Christus,  
Remigius reddat Domino sua vota sacerdos."

The golden chalice of Monza, it will be seen by the woodcut, were splendidly adorned with gems, which in the painting from which these figures have been drawn, are coloured green and red, but the only symbol betokening their destination is the cruciform arrangement of the larger gems on one of them. The chalice found at Gourdon also has neither inscription nor Christian symbol, and if it had not been found in

company with a paten bearing a cross its destination might have been a matter of doubt.

On the chalice of Krommstader are on the bowl half-length figures of Christ and the four Evangelists, on the foot like figures of four prophets.


The division of chalices into various classes evidently belongs to a period when primitive simplicity of ritual underwent a change to a more complex and elaborate system. The earlier *Ordo Romanus* speaks of a "calix quotidianus," and opposes to this the "calix major" to be used on feast-days ("diesbus vero festis calicem et patenam majores"), but says nothing of any distinction between the "calix sacerdotis" and the "calix ministerialis." Reasons of convenience no doubt caused the use of chalices of very different sizes. The great number of chalices of small size mentioned in the *Lit. Pontif.* and elsewhere may lead to the supposition that at one period the communicants drank not from one but from many chalices; but this matter is involved in doubt.

A practice existed of communicating the clergy alone by means of the chalice in which the wine was consecrated, and of pouring a few drops from this into the larger chalice which was offered to the laity. When this practice originated or how long it lasted seems obscure. It is suggested in the article "Calix," in Ducange's *Glossary*, that the verses engraved by order of St. Remi on the chalice which he caused to be made (v. ante) allude to this practice; but this does not seem certain. It is mentioned in the *Ordo Rom.* (c. 28), but the vessel in which the drops of consecrated wine were mixed with the unconsecrated, and from which the laity drank through a "fistula" or "pagillaria," is called scyphus, and is apparently the same vessel as that carried by an acolyte at the time when the oblations were received from the laity and into which the contents of the calix major (c. 13) were poured when the latter had become filled. Pope Gregory II. (A.D. 731-735), in his epistle to Boniface, disapproves of the practice of placing more than one chalice on the altar ("congruum non esse duos vel tres calices in altaris pueris"). When this practice was in use we may conclude that the large chalices with handles were those used for the laity.

The large chalices were also used to receive the wine which the intending communicants brought in amulæ; as in the 1st *Ordo Rom.* c. 13 ("Archidiaconus cumit amulæm Pontificis . . . et refundit super calicem"). When used in this manner it is called "offerentarius" or "offerendarius." "Calices baptismi" or "baptismales" were probably those used when the Eucharist was administered after baptism, and possibly for the milk and honey which it was the custom in some churches (Conc. Carth. III. c. 24) to consecrate at the altar and to administer to infants. Pope Innocent I. (A.D. 403-417) is said in the *Lit. Pontif.* to have given "ad ornatum baptisterii" (apparently of the basilica of St. Gervasius and Protasius at Rome) three silver "calices baptismi," each weighing 2 lbs. Whether the baptismal chalices differed from other chalices in form or in any other respect is not known.

Besides the chalices actually used in the rites of the church, vessels called "calices" were com-

pended from the arches of the ciborium and even from the intercolumniations of the nave and other parts of the church as ornaments. In the *Lit. Pontif.* we find mention of sixteen "calices" of silver placed by Pope Leo IV. (847-8) on the enclosure of the altar (*super circuitu altaris*) in the Vatican basilica, of sixty-four suspended between the columns in the same church, and of forty in a like position at S. Paolo f. l. m. Many of these were, however, most probably cups or



Suspended Chalices.

vases, not such as would have been used for the administration or consecration of the Eucharist. The drawings in MSS. show suspended vessels of the most varied forms; some examples taken from the great Carolingian bible formerly in the Bibl. Imp. Paris, now in the Musée des Souverains in the Louvre, are shown in woodcuts. [A. N.]

**CHALICE, ABLUTION OF.** [PURIFICATION.]

**CHÂLONS-SUR-SAÔNE, COUNCILS OF.** [CARILLONENSIS, provincial:—(1) A.D. 470, to elect John bishop of Châlons (Labb. Conc. iv. 1870). (2) A.D. 579, to depose Solonius and Battarius, bishops respectively of Embrun and Gap, deposed by a previous council (of Lyons, A.D. 567), restored by Pope John III., and now again deposed (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. 21, 28; Labb. Conc. v. 983, 984). (3) A.D. 594, to regulate the psalmody at the church of St. Marcelinus after the model of Agune (Labb. Conc. v. 1853). (4) A.D. 603, to depose Desiderius, bishop of Vienne, at the instigation of Queen Brunehilde (Fredegar. 24; Labb. Conc. v. 1612). (5) A.D. 850, Nov. 1, of thirty-three bishops, with the "vicarii" of six others, enacted 20 canons respecting discipline: dated by La Comte A.D. 694 (Labb. Conc. vi. 387). [A. W. H.]

**CHANCEL** (αὐτὸς τὸν ὑψιστὸν, Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 18). The space in a church which contains the choir and sanctuary, and which was generally separated from the nave by a rail or grating (cancelli), from which it derives its name. "Cancellus, cantorum excellens locus" (Papian, in Ducange, s. v.; compare CANCELLI). It is a characteristic difference between Eastern and Western churches that in the former the distinction between the bema (or sanctuary) and the choir is much more strongly marked than that between the choir and the nave, in the latter the distinction between the nave and the choir is much more strongly marked than that between the choir and the sanctuary. Compare CHOR, PRESBYTERY. [C.]

**CHANT.** [GREGORIAN MUSIC.]

**CHAPEL.** A building or apartment used for the performance of Christian worship in cases in

which the services are of an occasional character, or in which the congregation is limited to the members of a family, a convent, or the like. Greek, *ναπηλαριον*; Latin, *capella*, *oratorium*. In the languages of the Latin and Teutonic families a modification of the word 'capella' is in use, as also in Polish. In Russian *pridel*.

The derivation of the word 'capella' is a matter of doubt. The Monk of St. Gall (*Vita Car. Mag.* l. 4) states that the name was derived from the 'capa' or cloak of St. Martin: "Que nomine (i.e. 'capella') Francorum reges propter capam St. Martini sancta sua appellare solebant." The word 'capella' is said to be found in inscriptions in the Roman catacombs in the sense of a sarcophagus, a grave, or place of burial. It occurs at a later time as used for a reliquary, and for the chamber in which relics were preserved; as in a charter of Childbert of A.D. 710, published by Mabillon (*De Re Dipl.*), in which the passage "in oratorio suo seu capella S. Marthini" occurs. The canopy over an altar was also called 'capella' (compare *CUPELLA*). In the sense of a chamber or building employed for divine worship, it does not seem to have been in use in early times. Among early instances of its employment which have been noticed, are, in the capitularies of Charles the Great (*Capit.* v. 182), where it is applied to chapels in or annexed to palaces; and in the passage in the laws of the Lombards (iii. 3, 32), "ecclesie et capelle quae in vestra parochia sunt," where detached buildings are probably referred to. In the earlier centuries "oratorium" would no doubt have been used in either sense, as in the 21st cap. of the Council of Arles, A.D. 506, "Si quis etiam extra parochias in quibus legitimus aut ordinariusque conventus oratorium in agro habere voluerit reliquis festivitatibus ut ibi missae tenent propter fatigationem familie iusta ordinatione permittimus;" but with the proviso that the greater festivals should be celebrated "in civitatibus aut in parochia."


Chapels may be divided into several classes:—1st, as regards their relation to other churches; being (A) dependent on the church of the parish, or (B) independent, in some cases even exempt from episcopal visitation. 2dly, as regards their material structure; being (A) apartments in palaces or other dwellings; (B) buildings forming part of or attached to convents, hermitages, or the like; (C) buildings forming parts of or attached to larger churches; (D) sepulchral or other wholly detached buildings. No strictly accurate division is, however, possible, for in some cases buildings might be placed in either of two classes.

It is here proposed to speak of chapels with regard to their material aspect only; and buildings which from an architectural point of view do not differ from churches will be mentioned under the head CHURCH. As however it is impossible to draw a clear line between churches and chapels, several buildings will be found treated of under CHURCH, which in strictness should perhaps be rather deemed chapels; some of these, as Sta. Costanza at Rome, being too important in an historical point of view, or too extensive and magnificent, to be omitted from any attempt to trace the progress of church building in its main line.

Gotticus (*De Orat. Dom.*) has collected many



proofs of the early existence of domestic or private chapels; but the earliest existing example of the first class is probably the small chapel now known as the Sancta Sanctorum (originally St. Lawrence) in the fragment of the ancient palace of the Lateran which still remains. It was the private chapel of the popes, and appears to have existed as early as A.D. 383; for Pope Pelagius II. then placed there certain relics (MSS. *Bibl. Vat.* ap. Baronius). It is a small oblong apartment on an upper floor. The example next in date has fortunately been singularly well preserved. It exists in the palace of the archbishops of Ravenna, being their private chapel. It was constructed, or at any rate decorated with mosaic, by the Archbishop Peter Chrysologus (elected in A.D. 429). It is a simple oblong with a vaulted roof. Of the same character is the chapel at Cividale in Friuli, which, although forming part of a Benedictine convent, as it measures only 30 feet by 18 feet, can hardly have been other than a private chapel, probably of the abbat. It is attributed on historical evidence to the 8th century. It is a parallelogram without an apse, about two-fifths being parted off by a low wall, to serve as a choir.



Oratory at Gallerus.

Buildings of the second class, viz., conventual chapels, were intended for the private and daily use of the community; the larger churches for celebration on great festivals, when large numbers of strangers attended the services. In some instances even more than two chapels existed in a monastery; for Adamnan (*De situ terrae Sanctae*, ii. 94) says that at Mount Thabor, within the wall of enclosure of the monastery, were three churches, "non parvi aedificii." In the tower or keep of the convent of St. Macarius in the Nitrian valley are three chapels, one over the other (Sir Gardner Wilkinson, *Handbook of Egypt*); but it does not appear what their date is. Sir Gardner Wilkinson (*Handbook of Egypt*, p. 305) states that a tradition among the monks attributes the foundation of the convent to the 5th century.

In Ireland still exist some small chapels which may be assigned with probability to very early dates. Mr. Petrie (*The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Ireland*, p. 233) thinks that such structures

as the Oratory at Gallerus in Kerry, shews in the woodcut, may be considered to be the first erected for Christian uses, and as ancient as, if even not more ancient, than the conversion of the Irish by St. Patrick. This example measures externally 23 feet by 10, and is 16 feet high, the walls being 4 feet thick. It has a single window in its east end. On each of the gables were small stone crosses, of which the sockets only now remain.

Of somewhat later date, but Mr. Petrie thinks as early as the 5th or 6th centuries, are such buildings as Tempull Ceannanach, on the middle island of Arran, in the bay of Galway. This measures internally 16 feet by 12, and is built of very large stones, one not less than 18 feet in length. The church of St. MacDara, on the island of Cruach Mhic Dara, off the coast of Connemara, measures internally 15 feet by 11. Its roof was of solid stone, built in courses until they met at the top.

The above-mentioned examples are simple quadrangular buildings without distinction between nave and chancel, but others are met with, apparently of equal antiquity, in which a small chancel is attached to the nave and entered by an archway. In no case is an apse found in Ireland.

The buildings of this class are so rude and simple that it is not easy to establish satisfactorily any chronological arrangement founded on their architectural character; it would appear, however, that buildings of similar character were constructed until in the 11th or 12th centuries more ornate structures were erected.

Many of these small chapels were, however, constructed of wood, and the whole class was known (Petrie, p. 343) as 'dair-theacha,' or 'deritheacha,' the probable etymology of which is "house of oak." It appears from a fragment of a commentary on the Brehon laws (Petrie, p. 365) that 15 by 10 were customary dimensions for such buildings, and the stone chapels are usually found

not to differ very greatly from them.

Buildings of very similar character exist in Cornwall, and their foundation is attributed to missionaries from Ireland: such was the chapel of Perranzabuloe, or, St. Piran in the sand, said



St. Piran.

to have been founded by St. tnan (or as he is called in Ireland St. Kieran) in the 5th century. It had been completely buried in the shifting sand of the coast, but in 1835 the sand was re-

moved, and the building discovered in an almost perfect state; it is 29 ft. long externally by 16½ ft. broad; as will be seen from the plan, it was a simple parallelogram, but divided into two parts by a wall or screen. The tomb of the saint apparently served as an altar.

The chapel of St. Maddern is very similar in plan, but has the peculiarity of having a well in one angle; that of St. Gwythian has both nave and chancel, the latter entered by a narrow doorway. Mention of several others of like character will be found in a paper by the Rev. W. Haslam, in vol. ii. of the *Architectural Journal*. The masonry of these buildings is very rude and irregular, but the huge stones, and roofs constructed of stone, which are found in Ireland do not seem to occur in Cornwall. A building of like character was disinterred from the sands of the coast of Northumberland in 1853, near Ebb's Nook, not far from Bamborough; it closely resembles the Cornish oratories. The name seems to connect it with St. Ebba (ob. 683), sister of St. Oswald, king of Northumberland.

Some of the Cornish chapels were perhaps rather those of hermitages than of convents, and the same observation may be applied to the like buildings in Ireland.

Chapels of the third class, those attached to churches, may be divided into three sections: A, those forming part of the main building above ground; B, those connected with the main building, but distinct from it; C, those under ground, or crypts.

Although very many churches built before A.D. 800, exist in such a state that we may feel tolerably certain that we possess an accurate knowledge of their original ground-plans, scarcely any clear examples of chapels which could be placed in the first section can be pointed out. We cannot suppose the apartments which are found in very many of the churches of the 5th and 6th centuries in central Syria on either side of the narthex to have been chapels in the sense of having been used for divine worship; nor were the lateral apses originally constructed for a like use, since we have contemporary testimony (Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* xxxii.) that one was used as a sacristy, and the other as a place in which the devout might read the scriptures and offer prayers; if, however, we define the word chapel so as to admit apartments destined to serve as places for prayer, but not for the celebration of the rites of the church, we must consider the lesser apse on the left of the great apse as a chapel. In the description which St. Paulinus has given (*Ep.* xxxii.) of the basilica of St. Felix, mention is, however, made of 'cubicula' in the following passage: "Totum extra concham basilicae, spatium alto et lacunato culmine geminis utrinque porticibus dilatatur, quibus duplex per singulos arcus columnarum ordo dirigitur. Cubicula intra porticus quaterna longis basilicae lateribus inserta secretis orantium vel in lege Domini meditantium praeterea memoriis religiosorum et familiarium accommodatos ad pacis aeternae requiem locos praebent." [CUBICULUM.]

This passage seems to show clearly that in some instances apartments were placed by the sides of the nave, but this was probably very exceptional, for, as has been said above, no example of such a plan now exists. It should, however, be noticed that in two churches of very early

date openings have existed in the side walls with which chapels may have been connected; these are the churches of Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme and that of Sta. Balbina, both at Rome; in the first were five openings on each side of the nave, in the second six. The first of these buildings is, however, held to have been the hall of the palace of the Sessorium, and not originally constructed to serve as a church; the second is believed to date from the 5th century, but to have been reconsecrated by St. Gregory about A.D. 600.

At a very much later date we find in the church of Sta. Christina at Pola de Lena, near Oviedo, in Spain, apartments attached to and entered from the nave. These are no doubt contemporary with the church, the date of which is probably near A.D. 809. These apartments may have been chapels, but it has been surmised that they were really built to serve as sacristies. The like arrangement occurs at Sta. Maria de Naranco, near Oviedo, which dates from A.D. 848.

One almost unique example exists in the church of Romain Motier, where the upper story of the narthex has a small apse on the east, and was therefore probably intended to serve as a chapel; it is nearly square in plan, and divided into three aisles by two ranges of columns supporting groined vaults. As the church of which this forms a part was a large conventual one, this was probably intended to serve as the smaller chapel generally found in convents. The church is believed to date from 753, the narthex to be somewhat later.

The chapels which belong to the second section, viz. those attached to churches, but distinct buildings, are not very numerous, and in most cases their primary object was sepulchral. Such the three attached to the church of St. Lorenzo at Milan would appear to have been, though it has been suggested that that on the south was a baptistery, and that on the north a porch or vestibule.

That on the south, now called the church of St. Aquilinus, is octagonal externally, while internally semicircular and rectangular niches alternate, one in each face; in it are two massive sarcophagi, one of which is believed to contain the remains of Ataulphus, king of the Goths. The conchs of two of the niches retain some mosaics of a very early period, perhaps the 5th century. This building is connected with the church by a vestibule, supposed by Hübsch (*Alt-Christliche Kirchen*, p. 22) to be of later date; it is a square vaulted chamber with apses east and west. The chapel of St. Sixtus on the north side has exactly the same plan, but is much smaller; that of St. Hippolytus at the east end of the church is also octangular externally, but internally forms a cross with four equal limbs. All three are probably not remote in date from the church itself, which would seem to have been built about the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th century.


In like manner Pope Hilarus (461-467) added to the baptistery of the Lateran chapels dedicated in honour of St. John the Baptist and St. John the Evangelist.

Of the early part of the 9th century we have a most interesting example in the chapel of St. Zeno attached to the church of St. Praxedes (Sta. Prassede) at Rome, built by Pope Paschal I.

about 819, and fortunately preserved almost unaltered. It is in plan a square with three rectangular recesses, the walls are covered with marble and the lunettes and vaults with mosaic.

This chapel is entered from the nave, and the doorway is very remarkable, being partly made up of ancient materials and partly original work, as the inscription testifies, of Pope Paschal's time. Over this doorway is a window, and the wall around it is covered with medallion portraits of our Lord, the Apostles, and some other saints in mosaic. The execution is but rude. This chapel is contemporaneous with the church to which it is attached, and is perhaps the earliest undoubted instance of such an arrangement; it is, however, so constructed as both externally and internally to seem an independent building attached to the church and not a portion of it.

The practice of constructing such appendages to a church seems, however, to have continued exceptional until the end of our period. None appear on the plan for the monastery of St. Gall, no doubt prepared between 820 and 830; nor do any seem to have formed parts of the minster of Aix-la-Chapelle.



Crypt under Ripon Cathedral.

In the East, as the rule that there should be only one altar in a church has always existed, chapels (in the sense of apartments in which celebrations of the eucharistic service could take place) have rarely formed parts of churches, but sometimes are found attached to them. One instance of a chapel attached to a church would appear to exist in the church of St. Demetrius at Thessalonica, where a small triapsal building is attached (v. Texier and Pullan, *Byzantine Arch.* pl. xviii.) to the east end of the south side of the church. It has been suggested that this was a sacristy, but its form seems to show that it was really a chapel; it may possibly have belonged to the adjacent monastery. To the church of the convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai six chapels are attached on each side of the nave, but these are doubtless not of the original fabric.

The third class, viz. subterranean chapels, doubtless had their origin from the chambers in

the catacombs in which the remains of martyrs or confessors had been placed. What could be more natural than that when a church or an oratory was built over the spot where a martyr had been interred, the chamber should be preserved and made accessible?

We have probably an instance of one of these chambers preserved in the remains of the basilica of St. Stefano, in Via Latina, built by Pope Leo I., 440-461. Where, however, no chamber existed, a crypt was not constructed. Hence, in the earlier churches of the city of Rome, we find no crypt forming part of the original plan, but small excavations under the altar, to receive some holy corpse brought from the extramural cemeteries. [CONYNGHAM.]

St. Gregory, we are told, "fecit ut super corpus beati Petri et beati Pauli Apostolorum Mimae celebrarentur." He probably formed a crypt and placed the 'loculus' in it, erecting an altar in the church above over the bodies. After this time frequent mention is made of the confession as a vault with stairs leading into it. In those churches of the earlier period at Rome, which remain in a tolerably unaltered

state as Sta. Sabina (A.D. 425) and Sta. Maria in Trastevere, only very small vaults are found as confessions, but in S. Apollinare in Classe, at Ravenna, a crypt appears as part of the original structure; it consists of a passage running within the wall of the apse, and another passing under the high altar.

French antiquaries (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chréti.* sri. 'Crypte') have claimed a very high antiquity for crypts under several churches in France, e.g. that under the church of St. Mellon (? St. Gervais), at Rouen, is alleged to

show the construction of the 4th century. It would seem probable that in most cases where they belong to early periods they are ancient sepulchral chapels or oratories, or, possibly, tombs of the Roman period, and not structural crypts. Two crypts, however, exist, which were, it would seem, structural; these are those of St. Irenaeus at Lyons and of St. Victor at Marseilles. The first of these has a central and side aisles divided originally by columns which carry arches, the courses of which are of brick and stone alternately, above there is a string and a barrel vault. The central aisle ends in an apse; the church is said to have been founded in the 4th century. The crypt of St. Victor is in connection with some catacombs, the original church dated from the 5th century. The crypt consists of a series of vaulted compartments divided by very massive rectangular piers.

Two remarkable crypts exist in England, those in the cathedral of Ripon and in the abbey church

of Hexham: both are attributed to St. Wilfrid, who founded monasteries at both places; that at Ripon between 670 and 678, that at Hexham about 673. It appears from the testimony of Leland (*Itin.* i. 89, 2nd ed.) that the actual cathedral of Ripon does not occupy the same place as the church of the abbey built by Wilfrid, and there is much uncertainty whether the like is not true of the church of Hexham.

The similarity of the plans and the peculiarity of the structures can leave no doubt that one person planned both, and this can hardly have been any other than St. Wilfrid. The model which he followed was evidently not the confession of a church but the cubiculum and galleries of a Roman catacomb, and the principal vault in each does in fact bear considerable resemblance to the cubiculum adjacent to the cemetery of St. Callixtus (about two miles from Rome in the Via Appia), in which the bodies of SS. Peter and Paul are said to have remained for a considerable time.

The vault in question (Marchi, *Roma Sott.* pl. xli.; CATACOMBS, p. 310) has an arched roof nearly semicircular, but really formed by five small segments of circles, and has the same height, about 9 feet, and the same width, 8 feet, as the two crypts, but being in plan nearly square, while the crypts are oblong, is only 8 feet long, while they are 11·3 and 13·4. It is evidently by no means unlikely that St. Wilfrid may have intended to construct models of a place in his time most highly venerated and much resorted to, just as models of the Holy Sepulchre were built in later times. Some of the small niches in the walls were probably intended to contain relics or to hold lamps. The ante-chamber to the principal vault is stated to be covered by a demi-vaulted roof, as Mr. Walbran surmises, in order that the steps of the altar might be carried on it. If these structures were not beneath churches, probably small "cellae memoriae," such as will be hereafter noticed, covered and protected the access to them. Whether they were originally provided with altars is uncertain.

A crypt existed in the Saxon church of Canterbury, and was, we are told by Edmer, the chanter (quoted by Gervase, *De Combust. et Rep. Dorob. Eccle.*), "ad instar confessionis S. Petri fabricata," it was beneath a raised choir, and appears to have had several passages or divisions. Whether this formed part of the early church, or was one of the additions made by Archbishop Odo (cir. 950), is unknown.

A crypt also appears in the plan for the church of St. Gall (made cir. A.D. 800). It consisted of two parts, a "confessio," which was reached by steps descending between two flights ascending to the raised presbytery, and a "crypta," which seems to have consisted of two passages entered from the transepts on either side, but running outside the walls; a third, connecting the former two, and running in front of the apse, and another short passage running from the last mentioned to a spot beneath the high altar. There is a close resemblance between this arrangement and that in the Roman churches of the same period (as Sta. Cecilia) where the crypt follows the line of the wall of the apse. Altars were placed in both crypt and confession.

In the church of Brixworth, in Northampton-

shire, which there is evidence for believing to date from cir. A.D. 700, is a crypt running round the apse externally, originally covered with a vault; and, according to Mr. Poole (*Reports and Papers of Arch. Soc. of Northants, York, and Lincoln*, i. 122) there are also traces of a short passage running westwards from this to the probable position of a "confessio" below the high altar. Mr. Watkins, however (*The Basilica &c. of Brixworth*), asserts that there could have been no crypt under the apse, as the original floor was on a level with the rest of the church. [CHURCH.]

A remarkable crypt or "confessio" exists under the raised presbytery of the church of St. Cecilia at Rome, and apparently dates from the construction of the building by Pope Paschal I. (817-824). It consists of a vaulted space south of the altar (the church stands nearly north and south), a passage running round the interior of the apse, and another passage running south from the north end of the former, but stopped by a mass of masonry supporting the high altar. Within this mass is a sarcophagus, containing the body of the saint. The passages are lined with slabs of marble set on end: many of these have early inscriptions, and were probably brought from an adjacent cemetery. The same arrangement exists at Sta. Prassede, and nearly the same at SS. Quattro Coronati and St. Pancrazio—all at Rome—and it seems to have been the normal arrangement about this period. It will be observed that it is very much the same as that at Brixworth and St. Gall. At Fulda, in Hesse Cassel, is a crypt which is usually attributed to the 9th century. It consists of a circular passage, within which is a circular space, the vault of which rests on a short clumsy column, with a rude imitation of an Ionic capital.

Buildings of the fourth class, i.e. sepulchral chapels, were constructed at a very early period. The practice of erecting large structures for such purposes being familiar to several nations of antiquity before the Christian era it is not surprising that when they became converts to Christianity they continued a practice which their new faith would rather encourage than reprehend.

The greater part of the chambers in the catacombs near Rome may be considered as belonging to the class of sepulchral chapels. [See CATACOMBS.]

At what time the practice of placing an altar and of celebrating the eucharistic service in a sepulchral chapel was first introduced cannot be stated with precision. We are indeed told in the *Liber Pontificalis* of Pope Felix I. (250-274), that he "constituit super sepulcra martyrum missas celebrari," but altars not placed over tombs may have already been used. As, however, the practice of praying for the dead existed in the 4th and even in the 3rd century, it seems not unlikely that the practice of placing altars in sepulchral chapels may have come into use in the former of those periods. Perhaps the earliest undoubted instance of a chapel having been constructed to serve at once as a place of sepulture and of divine worship is that of the "Templum Probi," a small basilica attached to the exterior of the apse of St. Peter's at Rome, and built by Sixtus Anicius Petronius Probus, who died A.D. 395. He and his wife were undoubtedly buried in it, and its form makes it highly improbable



that the celebration of the eucharist within it was not contemplated by the builder.

Car. de Rossi, however, appears (*Bull. di Arch. Crist.* 1884, p. 25) to think that in the earlier centuries the chief use of such "cellae memoriae" was to afford a fit place for the banquets held in honour of the dead, and such buildings he believes to have been erected in *AREAE*, or enclosures set apart for sepulture outside the walls of cities, as early as the 2nd century, or probably even at an earlier period. That such buildings were also used as oratories there can be little doubt, since Sozomen (*Ecc. Hist.* ix. 2) states that the martyr St. Eusebia was placed in a *anastasis* near Constantinople, on the spot where the church of St. Thyrsus was afterwards built. [CELLAE MEMORIAE.]


An example has been recently discovered outside the gates of Rimini of very similar plan, which is described as that of a Greek cross, before which is an oblong apartment. Some remains of bas-reliefs, and a sepulchral inscription dated Maximo Consule (i.e. A.D. 523), give ground for the presumption that the building is not of later date than the 6th century. The remains of an altar were discovered; but as this contained a "sepulcrum" in which was a leaden box, doubtless containing relics, it could hardly have been coeval with the building.

Of about the same date were apparently the chapels at the cemetery of St. Alessandro, about six miles from Rome, discovered a few years ago: these had been formed from chambers in the first level of a catacomb, and are partly below the ground. There were two chapels with a space between them; one of these ends with an apse, on the chord of which is what appears to be the substructure of an altar; the other has a rectangular termination: at the end of this was found a marble cathedra raised upon a platform, and below this platform an altar, under which is a shallow grave lined with slabs of marble, from which the body of St. Alexander is believed to have been removed. Another chapel opened from this, and is of an irregular square form, with a small apse. The general character of the pavements and such ornamental portions as remained is of circa A.D. 500, and a monumental inscription bore the names of consuls of 443 and 527.

Of sepulchral chapels or mausoleums of undoubted date, perhaps the earliest is the tomb of the Empress Helena, outside Rome (cir. A.D. 328), a circular building standing on a square basement, in which is a vault. In the circular portion, which is about 66 feet in diameter internally, are on the floor, eight large niches, and above them as many windows; the whole is covered by a dome. It may be said that this is merely a tomb, but the large size of the windows points to an use other than that of a sepulchre. The *Liber Pontificalis* states that it was provided by the Emperor Constantine with an altar of silver and much church furniture and many vessels, but the trustworthiness of this part of the book is doubtful. Of nearly the same date is St. Costanza, the mausoleum of a daughter of the Emperor Constantine, also a circular building with a dome, but which has an internal peristyle and had also one externally. Further description of this building will be found under CHURCH.

Another circular mausoleum, which no longer exists, was that built by the Emperor Honorius in connexion with the Vatican Basilica; it was about 100 feet in diameter and very similar to that of the Empress Helena, in the ruins of this, in 1543, a marble sarcophagus containing the remains of one or both of his wives was discovered.


The building next to be mentioned is one of peculiar interest having come down to our time almost uninjured, and containing the sarcophagi, which it was constructed to receive, unviolated; this is the chapel at Ravenna now called the



38. Mausoleum of Galla Placidia, Ravenna.

church of SS. Nazaro e Celso, erected by the Empress Galla Placidia, as a mausoleum for herself and family before the year 450, it has, as will be seen by the plan, the form of a Latin cross. There was originally a portico by which it was connected with the atrium of the adjacent church of St. Croce. Three immense sarcophagi are placed in the three upper arms of the cross, and contain the remains of the Empress Galla Placidia, and of the Emperors Honorius II. and Constantius III. Between these stands the altar, but this is said to have been brought from the church of St. Vitale. The chapel is paved and lined with rich marbles up to the springing of the arches which carry the dome; this last, the lunettes below the dome and the arches and the soffits of the arches are all covered with mosaics of very beautiful character.

Of the highest interest, both architecturally and historically, is the tomb of Theodoric (ob. 526), outside the walls of Ravenna; this is



Mausoleum of Theodoric.

of two stories, the lower externally decagonal but enclosing a cruciform crypt. The upper story is circular and was surrounded by a range of small pillars carrying arches; opposite to the entrance is a niche, which no doubt once contained an altar; this story is covered by a low dome 30 feet in diameter internally, hollowed out from a single slab of Istrian marble. There are many peculiarities of detail in this building,

among them a small window in the form of a cross with limbs of equal length, all the bounding lines of which are convex. The sarcophagus containing the body of the king was probably placed in the centre of the upper chamber.

In one very remarkable instance, however, that of the Minster at Aix-la-Chapelle, the great Emperor founded neither an episcopal nor a conventual church, but constructed a building on a magnificent scale indeed, but essentially on the plan of a mausoleum of the earlier Empire; whether or not it was the intention of Charlemagne to construct at once a Minster and a splendid tomb, it is certain that it has ever been looked upon as the "memoria" of that great man. An account of this very remarkable building will be found under CHURCH.

Detached chapel-like buildings not attached to convents, and not sepulchral, are not often met



Plan of chapel.

with, though probably once common. In most instances they have perished either from time or neglect. In the Haouran, however, where since the 6th century the ruined cities have been uninhabited and the country a desert, many buildings which Count de Vogüé (*La Syrie Centrale*, Avant-

have, a square central portion, and three large semi-circular niches or apses, the so-called transverse triapsal arrangement. Such a plan was often adopted in order to afford place for three sarcophagi, and hence it may be thought that this chapel was really built as a "cella memoriae;" but it exists in the church of Bethlehem, where it certainly could not have been chosen with that intention.

**CHAPLET.** (1) It was anciently the practice of some churches to crown the newly baptized with a chaplet or garland of flowers. See BAPTISM, p. 164.

(2) For chaplet in the sense of a succession of prayers recited in a certain order, regulated by beads or some such device, see ROSARY. [C.]

**CHAPTER [CAPITULUM],** the body of the clergy of a cathedral, united under the bishop (for other senses of the Latin term see CAPITULUM).

1. The origin of chapters themselves, apart from the name, begins from a very early date. The presbyters, and subordinately the deacons of each diocese, constituted from the beginning the council of the bishop of that diocese [BISHOP], joined in his administration of it, and in the approval of candidates for ordination, &c., and in fact, though not in name, were his chapter. And these, at first, all lived in the cathedral city; and as country cures came gradually to exist, served them from that city. In time, however,



Kalybé at Omm-es-Zeitoun.

propos, p. 8) considers to have been oratories or chapels still exist, a good example of these Kalybé is that of Omm-es-Zeitoun, which an inscription engraved on its front shows to have been built in A. D. 282. It must, however, be observed that there seems to be in them no trace of any altar or of any place to receive it, and that, in that at Chagga, is a vault below the building, which latter circumstance gives rise to a doubt whether they may not have been sepulchral.

One example may be mentioned of a detached chapel of an early date, which was not certainly sepulchral, that, namely, built by Pope Damasus (367-385) near the baptistery of the Lateran at Rome, but not now in existence. It had a short

country presbyters became fixed in their several localities. And a distinction grew up accordingly, by the period of the great Nicene Council, between town and country presbyters, — *civitatenses*, and *diocesani* or *rurales presbyteri*, — the latter being reckoned as a somewhat lower grade than the former. In accordance with this distinction, and as a natural result of their distance from the bishop's residence, the country presbyters (and deacons) became in effect, although never formally, excluded from the Episcopal council or (so to call it by anticipation) chapter. At Rome this state of things became permanent, so that all the city clergy, and they only, became the chapter; and hence, after a lapse of centuries and

some other changes, the cardinal-bishops, priests, and deacons. In general, however, time brought about two further but equally gradual changes. 1. The bishop and his more immediate clergy took to living a life in common, although each still retaining his own special share of church goods and living upon it. And thus the town clergy in general became separated from those, who specially served the cathedral but had no cure in the city itself. And the chapter (so to call it) became gradually restricted to the latter, viz., the *cathedrales* proper, to the exclusion of the former, or general body of the town clergy; a right disused, as before, ceasing naturally in time to be recognised as a right at all. 2. The *cathedrales* themselves became increased in number by the addition of various diocesan officers: as e. g. the archdeacon, archpresbyter, *primicerius* or *custos*, *scholasticus*; or again, through the musical services of the cathedral, the *archicantor*; and through the engrafting upon the bishop's establishment of seminaries for youths and clergy, the *praepositus* or provost, &c. And thus a body of officers grew up, who, through their position and special attachment to the bishop and the cathedral, helped yet more to exclude outsiders. The time of St. Augustine and of Eusebius of Vercelli may be taken as the period whence the first of these changes began; the latter bishop endeavouring also to engraft the monastic life upon the common life of himself and his clergy, which St. Augustin did not; and the monastic bishoprics of the Anglo-Saxon church, established by St. Gregory and the Canterbury St. Augustine, and copied through Anglo-Saxon missions in Germany, helping on the practice. The British monastic bishops may be also referred to, who were anterior to the Canterbury mission; but the Celtic monasteries, with their dioceseless and often subordinate bishops, are anomalous, and irrelevant to the present question. The progress of the change may be marked, 1, by the Councils of Tours, ii. A.D. 567, and of Toledo, iv. A.D. 633, which require the presbyters, deacons, and all his *clerici*, manifestly the town clergy, to reside with the bishop, the latter making an exception for those only of whom health or old age rendered it desirable that they should live apart in their own houses; and by *Conc. Emerit.* A.D. 666, can. 12, which empowers a bishop to recal a country presbyter and make him a *cathedralis*;—2, by the gradual limitations of the word *Canonici*, which in the Councils of Clermont, A.D. 549, can. 15, and Tours ii. A.D. 567, still included *all* the clergy, even the minor orders, while the 3rd Council of Orleans, A.D. 538, uses it for all on the roll, and the 4th, A.D. 549, speaks still of "*matricula ecclesiae*;" but which Gregory of Tours (*H. F.* x. sub fin.), who wrote about the close of the 6th century, speaking of "*mensa canonicorum*" and a charter of Chilperic, A.D. 580 (quoted by Du Cange), restrict to the cathedral clergy (the distinction of regular and secular canons and the special sense of the term belonging to the later period after Chrodegang); so that in A.D. 813, *Conc. Mogunt.* and *Turon.* iii., there had grown accordingly to be two classes of "*Canonici*," chapters under a bishop, and colleges under an abbat (see also Council of Calchythe, A.D. 785, can. 4); and these two, under the name of *Capitula*, are mentioned in *Conc. Vern.*, A.D. 755, can.

11, the monks living "*secundum regulam*;" i. e., of St. Benedict, the clergy of the cathedral "*sub ordine canonico*." Yet even in the time of Charlemagne "*canonicus*" still had a double meaning, being either in general any clergyman on the roll (and "*canonical*" life meaning "*clerical*" life), or in particular the clergy who lived in common under the bishop [*CANONICI*]. The second change above noticed was also of gradual growth. The offices of archpresbyter and archdeacon were no doubt ancient [*ARCH-PRESBYTER*, *ARCHDEACON*], but did not become attached at once to the cathedral, probably not until the 6th or 7th centuries. The *Primicerius* and *Archicantor* were of later date still [*PRE-CENTOR*, *PRIMICERIUS*]; and so also the *Scholasticus* [*SCHOLASTICUS*]. Two further changes however were needed in order to complete the establishment of the modern chapter,—1, The appointment of a dean, which grew out of the office of *praepositus*. The latter came into existence under the bishop, in analogy with the *praepositus* under the abbat among Chrodegang's canons, but his office being gradually restricted to external administration, a *decanus* was appointed to conduct the internal discipline, after the analogy apparently of monastic *decani*; the 10th century being the period of the first institution of the office; and the dean gradually supplanted the provost [*DECANUS*]. 2. The conversion of the prebends (in fact though not in name) into benefices, i. e. of customary separate payments to individual cathedral members out of the church stock into a common treasury of the body, together with fixed rights of individual members to definite shares. The first "*commune aerarium*" in France is attributed to Rigobert, Archbishop of Rheims, after A.D. 700; so that *canonici quasi κοινωρικολ*, although a bad derivation, yet represented at first a real fact; as does also the more plausible derivation from *canon* = a fixed pension, called *sportula* by St. Cyprian, and "*consuetum clericorum stipendium*" by *Conc. Valentin.*, *Hispal.*, and *Agath.*, quoted by Du Cange. Prebends also began to be founded by bishops and other patrons about the same period.

2. For the history of the word chapter, see *CAPITULUM*. It was used as early as A.D. 755, *Conc. Vern.*, and so at Aix in 789, and Mayence in 813, &c., for the episcopal chapter, as well as that of Chrodegang's canons. And about that time it was that bishops began to make the cathedral clergy their special council. Its restriction to this only, followed in the course of another two centuries.

3. The functions of the cathedral chapter were simply derived, and (so to say) usurped, from those of the original council of the bishop, viz. the diocesan clergy. And the 8th century may be taken as the period when the "*chapter*" thus absorbed into itself the right of being the special council of the bishop. Administration of the diocese in the bishop's absence or during a vacancy, naturally fell to the bishop's "*senate*;" and accordingly, even in early times, it was found necessary to enact, "*ut presbyteri sine conscientia episcopi nihil faciant*" (*Conc. Arelat.* i. c. 19; and see *Can. Apost.* 38, &c.). Ordinations, however, were of course always excluded; but not so the patronage, under the like circumstances, of the bishop's livings. And this became the privilege of the chapter about the 8th century.

The right of electing the bishop was not so speedily usurped. It did not become customary for the chapter only to elect until the 11th century. And the final decree, absolutely restricting the right of election to that body (to the exclusion of the comprovincial bishops, as well as of the other diocesan clergy), only dates from Pope Innocent III. in the 13th. The change had run parallel with that which restricted the election of the pope to the cardinals. The charge of the cathedral services of course belonged to the chapter. Other privileges enumerated by Mayer (i. 73) for the most part are merely such as belong to any corporate body as such; as, e.g. the possession of a common seal (the earliest, however, known to Mabillon, dating only A.D. 1289), the right of making bye-laws, the power of punishing the excesses or misconduct of individual members. For the schools attached to cathedrals, see SCHOOLS.

4. The constituent members of a chapter varied in almost every cathedral. The dean, as has been said, was a comparatively late addition, of at earliest the 10th century; while in most cathedrals there was no such office until late in the 11th. The archpresbyter appears to have been at first the principal, under the bishop; until he was supplanted by the archdeacon. And these two, with the *custos*, or *primicerius* (so called at Rome, i.e. as the first entered on the wax tablet or list), were styled the "tria culmina ecclesiae." (*corepiscopi*, in name but in nothing else, lingered on in a very few, mostly French, cathedrals. A *scholasticus*, a SACRISTA or *cimeliarcha*, an *archicantor*, &c., also occur: for whom see under the several titles. And there were, besides, a staff of clergy for the general service of the cathedral church, together with *lectores*, *ostiarii*, *exorcistae*, *acolythi*, &c. A *praepositus*, or provost, also occurs in the 8th and 9th centuries. But the complete organization of a modern or a medieval chapter—the bishop, the *quatuor personae*, sc. dean, precentor, chancellor, and treasurer, the archdeacons, canons, &c.—belongs to Norman times and the 12th century. And minor canons, and vicars choral, &c., are an abuse of like date.

5. In the Eastern Church, the body of clergy serving a cathedral church was often exceedingly numerous: e.g. under Justinian, the "Great Church," out of the four at Constantinople, is said to have been served by 60 presbyters, 100 deacons, 40 deaconesses, 90 subdeacons, 100 readers, 25 cantores = in all 415; besides 100 *ostiarii*, who served all four churches. There were also special officers in Eastern cathedrals, as e.g. *πρωτοπapas*, *πρωτοψάλτης*, *χαρτοφύλαξ*, *σκευοφύλαξ*, &c.; for whom see under the several titles. But no such development of the chapter took place as in the West, so as to restrict to it the offices of electing the bishop, acting as his council or representative, &c. &c.

[Thomassin; Du Cange; Mayer, *Thes. Nov. Stat.*, &c.; *Eccles. Cathedr. et Coll. in Germania*; Walcott, *Cathedralia*, and *Sacr. Archaeology*.] [A. W. H.]

#### CHAPTER OF BIBLE. [LECTIONARY.]

CHAPTER-HOUSE, a place of assembly for monks or canons, forming part of the conventual buildings; called *capitulum*, says Papias, because there the *capitula*, or chapters of the monastic rule, were read and expounded.

For the ancient custom was that after prime, before the monks went forth to their labour, a chapter of the rule was read aloud to them. The meeting of the monks for the purpose of hearing such a reading was itself called *CAPITULUM* (Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v. *Capitulum*). The ancient plan of St. Gall contains apparently no chapter-house; and perhaps the first instance of a house built especially for the general meetings of a brotherhood or college for other than devotional purposes is that mentioned in the life of Abbot Ansegis of Fontanelle (c. 9, in *Acta SS. Ben. saec. iv. pt. 1*, p. 635), who is said to have built, about A.D. 807, near the apse of the church of St. Peter, and on the northern side of it, a house which he called *conventus* or *curia*, in Greek *buleuterion*, because in it the brethren were wont to assemble for the purpose of taking counsel on any matter (Martene, *De Riti. Monach.* lib. i. c. v. § 3). [C.]

#### CHAPTER, THE LITTLE. [CAPITULUM.]

CHARALAMPES, martyr, A.D. 198, commemorated Feb. 10 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

CHARAUNUS, martyr at Chartres, is commemorated May 28 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

CHARIOTEERS. Among the callings which were regarded by the Church of the first three centuries, that of the charioteer held a prominent place. It had its chief, if not its sole, sphere of action in games which were inseparably connected with the old religion of the empire. The men who followed it were commonly more or less disreputable, and had been excluded, even by Roman law, from most of the privileges of citizenship (Tertull. *de Spectac.* c. 22). It was, through the eager excitement which attended it, incompatible with meditation and prayer (Tertull. *l. c.*). We find accordingly that such persons were not admitted to baptism, unless they renounced their occupation (*Const. Apost.* viii. 32). If they returned to it after their admission to Christian fellowship they were to be excommunicated (*C. Elis.* c. 62,\* 1 *C. Arelat.* c. 5). When the games of the circus were reproduced under Christian emperors, the rigour of the Church's discipline was probably relaxed.

[E. H. P.]

CHARITAS, virgin, martyr under Hadrian, commemorated Aug. 1 (*Mart. Usuardi*). As AGAPE, Sept. 17 (*Cal. Byzant.*). Compare SAPIENTIA, SOPHIA. [C.]

CHARITINA, martyr, is commemorated Oct. 5 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

CHARITON, holy father and confessor, A.D. 276, is commemorated Sept. 28 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

CHARISMATA: literally "graces" which are the effect of grace; that is, of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, consequent on the Ascension of our Lord into heaven,—all, properly speaking, subjective: yet St. Paul calls the pardon of sin in one place (Rom. v. 15), and eternal life in another (*ib.* vi. 23), a "charisma"; that is, a gracious or free gift on the part of God through Christ. Again, subjective graces have been dis-

\* A various reading gives, however, "angur," instead of "auriga." It is possible that this may be a sign of a diminished horror of the charioteer's calling.



tinguished into two classes: 1. those conferring mere power (*gratiae gratis datae*); and 2. those which affect the character (*gratiae gratum facientes*). The *locus classicus* for both is 1 Cor. xii. to the end of ch. xiv. (on which see Bloomfield, Alford, Cornelius à Lapide, and others), where they are thrown together without much system or classification. Of the former class, some were neither permanent nor universal, as the gift of healing: others, as for instance, that which he affirms elsewhere to be in Timothy by the laying on of his hands (2 Tim. i. 6; comp. 1 Pet. iv. 10); in other words, the gift conferred upon all ministers of the Gospel at their ordination, fitting them for their respective posts, were permanent, but not universal. Both were bestowed primarily for the edification of the whole body; not but that it would fare better or worse with each individual possessed of them according to the way in which they were used. "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man, to profit withal." Of the latter class all were permanent and universal, being designed primarily for individual sanctification: all had them therefore without exception; and any body might double or quadruple his share of them by his own exertions. Where they lay dormant in any, the fault was his own. Wherever they were cultivated, they would bring forth, some thirty, some sixty, and some a hundredfold. "Follow after charity," says the Apostle: this is a gift of the same character with faith and hope, permanent (*μὲναι*) and bestowed on all. Therefore the degree to which you may become possessed of it rests with yourselves. As you follow after it, so you will obtain it. For those gifts which are not given to all you can only pray: still I enjoin you to pray; and of these "pray rather that ye may prophecy;" in other words, that ye may "understand the Scriptures" (comp. Luke xxiv. 45), and be able to interpret them for the benefit of others, as well as your own;—a gift which is permanent, and for the good of all, like charity. Of ordinary gifts, I have devoted a whole chapter to shew that charity should occupy the first place: of extraordinary gifts, I proceed to shew in the ensuing chapter my reasons for considering prophecy, taken in its widest sense, to be first also; one is for practice, the other for information: to understand the Scriptures, and to act upon them aright, for general as well as for private profit and edification, is to fulfil every purpose for which grace is vouchsafed. Prophecy, therefore, will mean here the gift of expounding, rather than of foretelling (Corn. à Lap. *ad l.*), and to the nine extraordinary "charismata" set down here, correspond the nine ordinary, described as "the fruit of the Spirit," in the Epistle to the Galatians (v. 22). To these last three more have been added, making twelve in all; while faith, hope, and charity have been contrariwise classified by themselves as the three theological virtues. [E. S. F.]

#### CHARITY SCHOOLS. [SCHOOLS.]

#### CHARMS. [AMULETS.]

**CHARTOPHYLAX.** One, says Beveridge (*Synod.* ii. 167), who kept the archives and documents or charters of the church. This in the Church of Constantinople was a high office; so much so, that under Andronicus Junior he was called "Magnus Chartophylax" who discharged it.

His duties were by no means those of a mere librarian or registrar, but included with them those of a chancellor. He wore suspended round his neck the ring or seal of the patriarch; received and examined all letters intended for him, with the exception of those coming from other patriarchs; furnished the list of those who should be promoted to vacant benefices of all sorts; and was entrusted with the authorisation of the nuptial benediction. When the 6th Council opened, it was the chartophylax, or keeper of the archives of the great church, whom the emperor ordered to fetch the books of the previous oecumenical councils from the patriarch's library, then the depository for all authentic ecclesiastical records. As both volumes of the 5th Council were subsequently proved to have been tampered with [CONCIL. CONSTANT. 34], there must have been one dishonest chartophylax at least in the 130 years intervening between the 5th and 6th councils. For the rest, see Gretser and Goar, c. 4 of their Commentaries on *Codinus*; c. 1, Du Fresne's *Gloss. Graec. et Lat.*; Suicer's *Thesaur.* s. v. [E. S. F.]

**CHARTULARIUS.** An officer entrusted with the keeping of charters or registers; and in the Eastern Church subordinate to the chartophylax. Such was his position, at all events, in the Church of Constantinople, according to the ecclesiastical list of *Codinus* (c. 1, with Gretser and Goar's *Commentaries*, c. 13); but from his next chapter we see there was a superior officer called "the great chartularius" attached to the imperial household (c. 2, and Gretser and Goar, c. 3). Elsewhere we read of "chartularii" belonging to the army, navy, and several other departments of state, whose records were voluminous; while the number of ecclesiastical "chartularii" for the different dioceses of the East is regulated by Justinian in the first book of his Code (tit. ii. c. 25). St. Gregory the Great calls a monk named Hilary, whom he employed in Africa to transact business for him, indifferently his "chartularius" or "notary"; shewing both offices to have been synonymous in the Church of Rome then (*Ep.* i. 77, ed. Migne, and the note). And Photius, two centuries and a half later, addresses one Gregory several times, in corresponding with him, as "deacon" and "chartularius" (*Ep.* iii. ed. Valetta). Later, a very different sense sometimes attached to this word: "Qui per epistolam liber fiebat," says Sirmondus (ad tom. ii. *Concil. Gall.* p. 679), "*chartularius* dicebatur." Again, "*chartularium*," in the neuter gender, stands for the place where charters and such like documents were kept literally; but in the West it has long served to denote those volumes, often called Red or Black Books from the colour of their binding or their rubrica, and written on parchment, in which the charters and customs and properties belonging to each monastery were transcribed (Du Fresne, *Gloss. Lat. et Graec.* s. v.). [E. S. F.]

#### CHASUBLE. [CASULA.]

#### CHEESE, IN EUCHARIST. [ELEMENTS.]

**CHERSONESUS**, the martyrs of, A.D. 296, are commemorated March 7 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**CHERUBIC HYMN.** [HYMN, THE CHERUBIC.]

CHEST. [ARCA : CAPSA.]

CHILDBIRTH. [CHURCHING OF WOMEN.]

CHILDEBERT, king, deposition at Paris, Dec. 23 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

CHILDREN. It is the object of this article to bring together the materials for a picture of the home life of Christians of the first eight centuries, so far as it affected the treatment of their children and their thoughts about them. It is obvious that every such picture must be more or less idealised, that in practice its completeness was marred by variations at different periods and in different churches, by the more or less perfect triumph of Christianity over heathenism. Making allowance for this, however, it is hoped that the representation here given will enable the reader to estimate the influence of the religion of Christ in this phase of human life with some distinctness. It is obvious also that in the course of the inquiry we must come in contact with many questions which, separately, demand a more dogmatic and more exhaustive discussion. These it will be enough to notice briefly.

(1.) We may start with the fact that the new faith taught men to set a higher value upon the sacredness of human life. The corrupt morals of the empire had all but crushed out the natural *σφοδρῆ* which binds the hearts of the fathers to the children. Infants were looked upon as incumbrances to be got rid of. The mothers of illegitimate children, sometimes even mothers who were married, killed or deserted their children without scruple, or called in the aid of women who made a business of the art of abortion. Against all such practices Christian purity raised its voice. Barnabas enumerates the sins in question among the things incompatible with the "way of light" (c. 19). The author of the *Epistle to Diognetus* speaks of the freedom of the Christian society from these practices as one of the marks of difference between them and the heathens among whom they lived (c. 5). Athenagoras condemns those who expose children, or procure abortion, as alike guilty of murder (*Legat.* c. 35). Justin speaks against the exposure as a common offence, and dwells on the enormities that followed, children so deserted, male and female, being the chief supply of the market for prostitution (*Apol.* i. 29). The practice lingered, however, even among Christians, and the Council of Elvira had to treat them as excluding a female catechumen from all but death-bed baptism, one who was already baptized even from death-bed communion (*C. Elib.* c. 63, 68). The Council of Ancyra, about the same time, acknowledging that the severer penalty had been the rule of the Church, reduced it to ten years' penance (c. 20), that of Lerida (c. 2) to seven, subject however to the condition of continuance in a penitential life; and if the offenders were in orders, to exclusion from liturgical functions.

(2.) We start, then, with the Christian conviction that children were a "heritage and gift that cometh from the Lord," to be received as a trust for which parents would have to render an account. It might have seemed that that feeling would have found universal expression in the dedication of infants, as soon as might be after their birth, by the sacred rite of baptism.

Our Lord's command, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not," might seem to sanction, if not to command, the practice. It must be admitted, however, that the traces of infant baptism in the first 150 years are but scanty, that the evidence of the New Testament is far from decisive. The statement of Suicer (*Thesaur.* ii. 1136) that for the first two centuries no one was baptized who could not make a conscious profession of his faith is, perhaps, overstrained, but it is true that the evidence on the other side is meagre. Justin's statement that "many had been made disciples of Christ. ἐκ παιδῶν" (*Apol.* ii. p. 62) is somewhat strained when these words are translated, as Bingham does, "from their infancy." The witness of Irenaeus, who says that "*infantes*" (as well as "*parvuli*") "*renascuntur in Deum*" (ii. 22), and identifies regeneration with baptism is, however, more distinct. That of Origen, however, that the Church's practice was "*etiam parvulis baptismum dari*" (*Hom. viii. in Levit.*) is rendered less so, by the distinction drawn by Irenaeus between the "*parvuli*" and the "*infantes*." The treatise in which Tertullian urges "*cunctatio baptismi*" as the safer and better course is rather in the tone of one who is contending against a growing practice than of one who rejects a tradition of the universal Church (*de Bapt.* c. 18). Wall on *Infant Baptism* is, of course, the great storehouse of arguments in favour of the primitive and universal use of the rite for infant children. It may be noted, however, (1.) that the command in Matt. xxviii. 19, seems to imply capacity for discipleship as a condition of baptism; (2.) that the "holiness" of Christian children is made to depend, in 1 Cor. vii. 14, not on baptism, but on the faith of one, at least, of the parents; (3.) that the mention of "households" as baptized is, at best, a precarious foundation for a wide generalisation. If baptism were thought of as limited to those who could make a confession of faith, it would not be deemed necessary to mention infants as not included in the "household" that was baptized, any more than it would be necessary to except them if one were speaking of a whole household going forth to fight against the enemy. It may fairly be conceded, however, that at least from the time of Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, the practice was common. The further question remained, at what stage in their infancy; and here the answers varied. Some pressed the analogy of circumcision and argued for the eighth day, but this was rejected by Cyprian (*Epist. ad Fidum*, lix. al. lxiv.) and by a Council of Carthage under his guidance. Gregory of Nazianzum, on the other hand, urged a delay of three years, more or less, that the child might be able to utter its profession of faith with its own lips (*Orat. xl. de Bapt.*). The Council of Elvira (c. 22) sanctioned the earlier age; but this was done not as resting on an immemorial practice, but on a special dogmatic ground, "*quia non suo vitio peccarunt*," as though it needed a justification. Generally, except in cases of necessity, their baptism, like that of adult converts, was

\* We have in both these passages to content ourselves with a Latin translation of a Greek original. A passage in the Latin version of Origen's *Hom. in Luc.* xiv. seems to bring even children who are just born within the range of the "*parvuli*."

postponed till the Easter following their birth (Socrates, *H. E.* v. 22; *C. Antissiod.* c. 18; August. *Serm. de Temp.* 110; Ambros. *de Myster. Pasch.* c. 5.).<sup>b</sup> The case of Augustine shows, however, that even a mother like Monica, acting, it may be, under the influence of the feeling of which Tertullian had been the spokesman, could postpone her child's baptism indefinitely, only eager to hasten it if there were any imminent fear of death (August. *Conf.* i. 11).<sup>c</sup> Even where baptism was postponed, however, the child was claimed for Christ, was signed with the sign of the cross, and made to taste of the salt which was known as the "mysterium" or "sacrament" of catechumens (*Ibid.*). [CATECHUMENS.] After an interval, varying according to the different views just stated, the child was brought to the font, stripped of its clothes, and baptized, making its acts of renunciation and adherence, if old enough, with its own lips; if still in infancy, through its sponsors. [SPONSORS.] Where children were left orphans, or were deserted by their parents, they were brought by benevolent Christians, who in the sight of the Church took charge of them. The priest announced the fact from the altar, and the child became the "alumnus" or foster-child of the person so adopting him<sup>d</sup> (1 C. Vasens. c. 9).

Baptism in such cases was followed, after an interval of uncertain duration, by confirmation. If a bishop were present at the baptism, the rule was that both rites were administered in immediate succession. As soon as the child was taken from the water he received the sacred unction and the imposition of hands. (Tertull. *de Bapt.* c. 7, *de Resurr. Carn.* c. 8.) In the absence of the bishop there was, of course, a delay; but the modern practice of Protestant churches of treating confirmation as the personal acceptance by the adult of what had been promised by the infant, was altogether foreign to the life of the ancient Church, as it is now from that of the East. In both cases, indeed, in order to guard against any inconvenience which might follow from the prolonged absence of the bishop, the priest was allowed to administer confirmation as well as baptism.

The admission of the infant to the privileges of Christian fellowship did not, however, stop here. There is almost, if not altogether, as weighty evidence for infant communion as there is for infant baptism. It was the recognised practice of the African Church in the time of Cyprian (*De laps.* c. 25). The Apostolical Constitutions (viii. 12, 13) show that it was also the custom of the East. It was vehemently urged by Augustine as essential to the complete salvation even of the baptized (*Epist.* 23 *ad Bonifac.* *De Peccat. Merit.* i. 20) and was defended against the scorn of unbelievers by the mystic pseudo-Dionysius (*de Hierarch. Eccles.* vii. 11). The Sacramentary of Gregory and the Council of Mâcon (c. 6), A.D. 588, are witnesses to its prevalence in the churches of Rome and Gaul. The first intimation of any wish to stop

<sup>b</sup> The Sunday before Easter was known in consequence as the "Octavae Infantum."

<sup>c</sup> Augustine blames the delay, it is true, but it is with reference to a baptism in boyhood, not in infancy.

<sup>d</sup> The word occurs in this sense in Christian epitaphs. (De Rossi, i. 46.)

it is found in the third Council of Tours (c. 19), in A.D. 813, and that continued inoperative for nearly three centuries. In this respect the Churches of the East, as in the case of confirmation, follow in the footsteps of antiquity.

So far, then, the child of Christian parents was met at its birth with these symbols, and, as it was believed, assurances of salvation. The work of moral training began with the first dawn of consciousness. He would be taught to make the sign of the cross upon his brow, or lips, or chest, on rising or lying down to sleep, or when he bathed or put on his clothes (Tertull. *de Civ. Mil.* c. 2). Soon a pious parent would tell him the story of the Gospels, as Monica did to Augustine, even though unbaptized (*Conf.* i. 17), or give him daily some texts of Scripture to be learnt by heart, as Leonidas did to Origen (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 2). He would learn the Lord's Prayer and the Creed as things for daily use, would be taught to pray at midnight, at sunrise, and at every meal (Tertull. *de Orat.* c. 20). The stories of martyrs who had suffered, sometimes the actual spectacle of those sufferings, would kindle his emotions. The range of instruction would become wider as he would be led first to the didactic, or sapiential, books of Scripture, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes; then the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles: last of all the Pentateuch, the historical books, and the Prophets (Hieron. *Epist.* 57, *ad Laetam*). For his general education, however, he would have to go to any school that might be opened, and these were, for four centuries or more, in the hands of heathens. For those who went to such schools Homei was still the groundwork of intellectual culture (August. *Conf.* i. 23). Grammar, dialectics, rhetoric, geometry, completed the course of teaching (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 2). It would be naturally a time of anxious watchfulness for Christian parents. When this was over the child would pass to the responsibilities of adolescence. Negatively we may be sure that no true Christian would allow his child to be a spectator of the games of the circus or the mimes of the theatre; that wherever this was tolerated it would be looked on as a sign of spiritual decay. [ACTORS.]

[E. H. P.]

#### CHILDREN, COMMUNION OF [INFANT COMMUNION.]

CHIONIA, martyr at Thessalonica, under Diocletian, April 1 (*Mart.* Hieron., Bedae); April 3 (*Mart.* Usuardi); April 5 (*Mart.* Hieron.); April 16 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

#### CHIROTHECAE. [GLOVES.]

CHLODOALD, presbyter and confessor, is commemorated Sept. 7 (*Mart.* Bedae, Usuardi). [C.]

CHOIR, ARCHITECTURAL (*Chorus, Suggestus*; Ἀμβων). Every complete church consists of at least three parts; bema (or presbytery), choir, and nave. The bema, entered in ancient times by none but the clergy, was devoted to the celebration of the holy mysteries; the choir was for the "clerks," in the widest sense of the word; the nave for the general body of the faithful. The bema corresponds to the space east of the altar-rails (called the sanctuary or presbytery) in an ordinary English church, and the choir to the remaining portion of the chancel. In monastic churches the choir is the place where the

brethren assemble to say the ordinary daily offices.

It is extremely difficult to determine the antiquity of the division between sanctuary and choir. Most of the passages of ancient authors bearing upon the matter give the impression that the rail or screen [CANCELLI] separated the whole space devoted to the clergy from that devoted to the people, and that there was no 'chorus' distinct from the sanctuary. It is, in fact, probable that Honorius of Autun (*Gemma Animæ*, i. 140) is right in saying "olim in modum coronæ circa aras cantantes stabant," though his etymology is wrong. The canon of the fourth council of Toledo, in the 7th century, quoted below, is perhaps the earliest instance in which the threefold division, sanctuary, choir, and nave, is clearly recognised. The remains of ancient churches give us but little information on this point, as screens are the most destructible and changeable portions. When we do meet with authentic testimony as to the arrangements of churches, we find generally that the whole of the eastern apse was occupied by the sanctuary, which was screened off from the rest of the church, while the choir was a raised space immediately west of the screen of the sanctuary [CHURCH, p. 375]. Whether the Greek SOLEAS was identical with this raised space or *suggestus* is doubtful.

The description of a church in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (ii. 57) implies that bishop, presbyters, and deacons occupied the space at the east end of the church, which was set apart for them, but does not mention any barrier between clerks and people. We find however such a barrier existing in the 4th century, when the laity were forbidden to enter the enclosure set apart for the altar and the clergy. This appears from the fact that St. Ambrose deprived the emperors of the exceptional right which they had enjoyed of passing within the screen [CANCELLI]. See Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 25; Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 18. To this the emperors submitted; and the edict of Theodosius the younger and Valentinian lays down that the emperors are to approach the altar only for the purpose of making their offering, and to withdraw immediately. In accordance with this the Trullan council (canon 69), while forbidding the laity generally to enter the sanctuary (*ἱερὸν θυσιαστήριον*), expressly permits the emperors to enter for the purpose of offering their gifts, "according to very ancient custom." This privilege Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople († 806), threatened to withdraw from Constantine VI. if he contracted the marriage which he was meditating (*Life* by Ignatius, in *Acta SS.* Feb. iii. p. 584).

The same privilege which was granted to emperors seems in ancient times to have been conceded to unordained monks (Jerome, *Ad Heliodorum*).

The 4th canon of the second council of Tours (A.D. 567) forbids the lay people to stand among the clergy, whether at vigils or at mass, and reserves all that portion of the church which is on the altar-side of the screen for the clerks engaged in the service (*choris psallentium clericorum*); yet the sanctuary (*sancta sanctorum*) was to be open for the purpose of praying and communicating both to laymen and to women [COMMUNION]. The same canon was repeated in effect by the council of Autun in the year 672.

CHRIST. ANT.

So too a Capitulary of the year 744 (art. 9, ed. Baluz.) forbids the laity to be within the screen in time of divine service, whether mass or vigil. So the council of Rome under Eugenius II., canon 33.

The liberty which in Gaul was given to lay people, of entering the choir to communicate, does not seem to have been given in Africa. St. Augustine (*Serm.* 392) speaks of the screen (*cancelli*) as the place where laymen ordinarily communicated; neophytes, however, seem to have drawn near the altar for their first communion (*Serm.* 224). In Spain the fourth council of Toledo (can. 18) of the year 633 enjoins the [ministering] priest and deacon to communicate before the altar, the rest of clerks in the choir, the people outside the choir.

Women were generally not permitted to enter the choir (*Conc. Laodic.* c. 44), unless for the purpose of communicating. And although nuns were probably excepted in ancient times (Augustine, *Epist.* iii.), their exclusion seems in the 9th century to have been general, at least in Gaul (Theodulf of Orleans, *Capitulare*, c. 6). Ahito, bishop of Basle in the early part of the 9th century (*Capitulare*, c. 16), ordains that no woman should approach the altar; and that when the altar-cloths required washing, they should be taken off by the clerks, and handed to the women at the door of the screen. The presbyters were also to receive the women's offerings outside the screen. (Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v. *Chorus*; Martene, *De Ritibus Antiquis*, i. 123 ff.) [C.]

**CHOIR OF SINGERS.** (*Chorus Cantorum*.) St. Augustine (*on Ps.* 149) says, "Chorus quid significet, multi norunt . . . chorus est consessio cantantium." Isidore of Seville gives the definition, "chorus est multitudo in sacris collecta, et dictus chorus quod initio in modum coronæ circum aras starent et ita psallerent." This etymology is undoubtedly false, but the statement upon which it is founded is by no means improbable. Whether it be true or not, that in the earliest ages the choir was grouped round the altar, we know that at a comparatively early period the choir had a space assigned to it in a church, [CHOIR, ARCHITECTURAL,] distinct from the SANCTUARY, which contained the altar.

"The choirs of our time," says Amalarius (*de Div. Off.* iii. 4), early in the 9th century, "are clothed in linen (*linum*)," and he distinguishes between this and the finer vestment of byssus which the singers wore under the Old Dispensation (2 Chron. v. 12). Compare SCHOLA CANTORUM. [C.]

**CHOREPISCOPUS** (*Χορεπίσκοπος*) = country bishop, *vicarius episcopi* (*Conc. Ancyran.*, *Neo-Cæsar.*, *Antioch.*, &c., Isid. Hispal. *De Offic. Eccl.* ii. 6, &c.), *villanus episcopus* (*Capit. Car. M.* vii. 187), *vicarius episcopus* (Hincmar), as opposed to the *cathedralis episcopus* (Du Cange);—to be distinguished, as being stationary, from the *περιόδευτής* or *visitator*, who itinerated, although the two became often confounded together:—a class of ministers between bishops proper and presbyters, defined in the Arabic version of the Nicene Canons to be "*loco episcopi super villas et monasteria et sacerdotes villarum*;" called into existence in the latter part of the 3rd century, and first in Asia Minor, in order to meet the want of episcopal supervision in the country



parts of the now enlarged dioceses without subdivision:—first mentioned in the Councils of Ancyra and Neo-Caesarea, A.D. 314, and again in the Council of Nice (which is subscribed by fifteen, all from Asia Minor or Syria); sufficiently important to require restriction by the time of the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341; and continuing to exist in the East until at least the 9th century, when they were supplanted by ἑξαρχοί [EXARCHI]:—first mentioned in the West in the Council of Riez, A.D. 439 (the Epistles of Pope Damasus I. and of Leo M. respecting them being forgeries), and continuing there (but not in Africa, principally in France) until about the 10th century, after which the name occurs (in a decree of Pope Damasus II. ap. Sigeb. in an. 1048) as equivalent to archdeacon, an office from which the Arabic Nicene canons expressly distinguish it. The functions of *chorepiscopi*, as well as their name, were of an episcopal, not of a presbyterial kind, although limited to minor offices. They overlooked the country district committed to them, “*loco episcopi*,” ordaining readers, exorcists, subdeacons, but, as a rule, not deacons or presbyters (and of course not bishops), unless by express permission of their diocesan bishop. They confirmed in their own districts, and (in Gaul) are mentioned as consecrating churches (Du Cange). They granted *επιφυλακ*, or letters dimissory, which country presbyters were forbidden to do. They had also the honorary privilege (*τιμωμενοι*) of assisting at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in the mother city church, which country presbyters had not. (*Conc. Ancyra. can. xiii.*; \* *Neo-Caesar. can. xiv.*; *Antioch. can. x.*; *St. Basil, M. Epist. 181*; *Rab. Maur. De Instit. Cler. i. 5*; &c. &c.) They were held therefore to have the power of ordination, but to lack jurisdiction, save subordinately. And the actual ordination of a presbyter by Timotheus, a *chorepiscopus*, is recorded (*Pallad. Hist. Lausiac. 106*). The office also offered an opportunity for a compromise in cases of schism, of which the Nicene Council availed itself, by authorising a Catholic bishop (among other alternatives) to find a place as *chorepiscopus* for any reconciled Novatian bishop (*Conc. Nic. can. viii.*). And the same council (*Epist. Syn. in Socrat. i. 9*) places reconciled Meletian bishops also in a somewhat similar position, although not calling it by the name itself. It was found also a convenient mode of disposing of “vacant” bishops, when such occurred. The office continued to exist among the later Eastern sects also: sc. among the Jacobite Syrians, where the *chorepiscopus* proper, who presided over a rural district, is distinguished, both from a titular *chorepiscopus*, more properly *archipresbyter* or *proto-pope*, who was a kind of leading presbyter in the episcopal city, and from the *περιοδευτής* or *visitator*, who went circuit; and among the Nestorians, where also both *chorepiscopus* and *περιοδευτής* existed, as distinct classes (*Denzinger, Ritz. Orient. Proleg. 116, sq.*; and see also the Arabic version of the Nicene canons, cans. 58 to 70). In both these bodies the *chorepiscopi* were presbyters. And in one ritual they are appointed without imposition of hands (*Denzinger. ib.*). In the West, i.e. chiefly in Gaul, the order appears to have prevailed

more widely, to have usurped episcopal functions without due subordination to the diocesans, and to have been also taken advantage of by idle or worldly diocesans. In consequence it seems to have aroused a strong feeling of hostility, which shewed itself, first in a series of papal bulls, condemning them; headed, it is true, by two forged letters respectively of Damasus I. and Leo M. (of which the latter is merely an interpolated version of *Conc. Hispal. II. A.D. 619, can. 7*, adding *chorepiscopi* to *presbyteri*, of which latter the council really treats), but continuing in a more genuine form, from Leo III. down to Pope Nicholas I. (to Rodolph, Archbishop of Bourges, A.D. 864);—the last of whom, however, takes the more moderate line of affirming *chorepiscopi* to be really bishops, and consequently refusing to annul their ordinations of presbyters and deacons (as previous popes had done), but orders them to keep within canonical limits;—and secondly, in a series of conciliar decrees,—*Conc. Ratispon. A.D. 800, in Capit. tit. iv. c. 1, Paris. A.D. 829, lib. i. c. 27, Meld. A.D. 845, can. 44, Metens. A.D. 888, can. 8, and Capitul. v. 168, vi. 119, vii. 187, 310, 323, 324*,—annulling all episcopal acts of *chorepiscopi*, and ordering them to be repeated by “true” bishops; and finally forbidding all further appointments of *chorepiscopi* at all. The title however lingered on for some centuries, in France and Germany, as applied to various cathedral dignitaries in particular cathedrals, but in senses wholly irrelevant to its original and proper meaning (see instances in Du Cange).

That *chorepiscopi* as such—i.e. omitting the cases of reconciled or vacant bishops above mentioned, of whose episcopate of course no question is made—were at first truly bishops, both in East and West, appears almost certain, both from their name and functions, and even from the arguments of their strong opponents just spoken of. If nothing more could be urged against them, than that the Council of Neo-Caesarea compared them to the 70 disciples,—that the Council of Antioch authorises their consecration by a single bishop, and that they actually were so consecrated (the Antiochene decree *might* mean merely nomination by the word *γίνεσθαι*, but the actual history seems to rule the term to intend consecration, and the [one] exceptional case of a *chorepiscopus* recorded [*Actt. Episc. Cenoman. ap. Du Cange*] in late times to have been ordained by three bishops [in order that he *might* be a full bishop], merely proves the general rule to the contrary),—and that they were consecrated for “villages,” contrary to canon,—then they certainly were bishops. And Pope Nicholas expressly says that they were so. Undoubtedly they ceased to be so in the East, and were practically merged in archdeacons in the West. And the non-episcopal nature of the functions to which they came to be limited would naturally lead to such a result. The language of the canons and of the Fathers (e.g. St. Basil. M. above quoted, or again St. Athanasius [*Apol. ii. Opp. i. 200*], who distinguishes them both from bishops proper and from presbyters, and again both from city and from country presbyters), naturally implies that at first they were bishops in the common sense of the word. The special rites in the East for their appointment probably belong to a time when they had undoubtedly

\* For the meaning of this canon and its various readings, see Routh, *Reliq. Sac. III. 430–439*.

there sunk down into presbyters. It ought to be said, however, that authorities are divided upon the question: English writers mainly (Beveridge, Hammond, Cave, Bingham, Routh, to whom may be added the weighty authority of Van Espen) asserting their episcopal character, while others (see a list in Bing. II. xiv. 2, 3, to which may be added Morinus and Du Cange) allege them to have been presbyters. It need hardly be said that they are not identical with either *coadjutors* or *suffragans*, properly so called: although they do bear a close resemblance to such bishops as, e. g. the Bishop of Dover in pre-Reformation times in England, and to the sundry Irish and foreign and other stray bishops, who are found so numerous doing the work of English bishops for them in the 12th to the 16th centuries, and to the suffragans as intended by Henry VIII., and now actually revived in England. (Bellarm. *De Clericis*, c. 17; Cellot. *De Hierarch.* iv. 14; Morinus, *De Sac. Ord. and Dissert.*; De Marca, *De Concord.*, &c. ii. 13; Du Cange; Suicer; Bingham; Van Espen.) [A. W. H.]

### CHORISTER. [CANTOR.]

**CHRESTIANI.** A heathen variation of the name Christiani. Instead of *Χριστιανός*, the more classical word, *Χρηστιανός*, *gracious* or *good*, was commonly supposed to have been the name or title by which Jesus of Nazareth was distinguished, and his followers therefore were called Chrestiani. The mistake is noticed by Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Lactantius, and others, but the name having a good signification, they do not wholly reject it. Tertullian however remonstrates with the enemies of the faith for prosecuting Christians merely for their name, a name which, according to either derivation, ought to command admiration rather than hatred. "Christianus, quantum interpretatio est, de unctione deducitur. Sed et cum perperam Chrestianus pronunciat a vobis (nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos) de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est. Oditur ergo in hominibus innocuis etiam nomen innocuum" (Tertul. *Apol.* c. 3; Bingham, I. i. 11). [D. B.]

**CHRISM.** (*Μύρον*, *Χρίσμα*; *Chrisma*. The latter word is sometimes *feminine*: "miscitat ipsam chrismam," *Ordo Rom. I.* c. 42.) The sacred oil or unguent used in the ceremony of baptism. The term is also used so as to include the oil blessed for the unction of catechumens and of the sick.

St. Basil (*De Spiritu S.* c. 66 [al. 27]) mentions the blessing of the oil of anointing for use in baptism as one of the observances derived from the earliest times by unwritten tradition. The earliest extant testimonies to its use, whether in baptism or in other ceremonies of the church, are the following.

Tertullian (*De Baptismo*, c. 7) says, "next, coming forth from the baptismal font, we are anointed with oil blessed according to the primitive ordinances, in accordance with which men were anointed with oil from the horn as a consecration for the priesthood." He seems to regard the anointing with oil as a symbol of the universal priesthood of Christians.

St. Cyprian (*Epist.* 70, c. 2, p. 768, ed. Härtel) speaks of the oil sanctified on the altar, with which the baptized are anointed [BAPTISM]; and

this oil, he says, the heretics who had no true altar could not have.

In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii. 43, § 3, and 44, § 1) the direction is given, immediately after baptism, "let the ministrant anoint the person baptized with unguent (*μύρον*), saying over it, 'Lord God . . . grant that this unguent may so effectually work upon him that is baptized that the sweet savour of Thy Christ may abide in him fixed and firm.'" In this case, the unguent was evidently perfumed. There is nothing in the passage to suggest that it had undergone any previous consecration.

Gregory of Nazianzus (*Orat.* 48, in *Julian*.) speaks of oil sanctified or consecrated on the spiritual and divine Table; Optatus of Milevis (*C. Donatist.* vii. p. 102) says that this ointment is compounded (*conditur*) in the name of Christ; and the Pseudo-Dionysius (*De Hierarch. Eccles.* c. 4) mentions the use of the sign of the cross in the consecration of it.

The privilege of consecrating chrism was in comparatively early times strictly confined to the episcopal order. The twentieth canon of the first council of Toledo (A.D. 398) censures those presbyters who ventured to prepare chrism for themselves, and desires them to send a deacon or subdeacon to fetch the chrism from the bishop, so as to be in time for the festivities of Easter Day. To the same effect writes Bishop Montanus to the clergy of Palencia and to Theoribius (Hardouin's *Concilia*, ii. 1143).

The greater quantity of chrism was probably at this time consecrated immediately before Easter, but it does not appear that the consecration was as yet limited to a particular day; on the contrary, the canon above cited expressly lays it down that the bishop might consecrate chrism at any time. But in the 5th century it became an established custom to consecrate the chrism and oil for use throughout the year on Maundy Thursday. Pope Leo complains in a letter to his namesake, the Emperor of the East (*Epist.* 156, p. 1324), that in consequence of the murder of Proterius, bishop of Alexandria, the oblation was prevented and no chrism was consecrated. Eligius of Noyon († 658), preaching on Maundy Thursday (Hom. 10 in *Coena Dom.* p. 245, *Biblioth. Patr. Colon.*) speaks of chrism being consecrated on that day throughout the Christian world. In the empire the consecration on Maundy Thursday was enjoined by a capitulary of Charles the Great (*Concil. Germaniae*, i. 342); yet at a somewhat later date the custom had probably not become universal; for a synod of Meaux of the year 845 forbade (canon 46) the preparation of chrism on any other day, as if such preparation was even then not quite unknown.

The Gelasian Sacramentary has a *Missa Chrialis* on Maundy Thursday, referring to the consecration both of chrism and of oil for the unction of the sick (Migne's *Patrol.* lxxiv. p. 1099). The Gregorian Sacramentary has also on the same day full directions for the consecration of oil and chrism in the mass (pp. 66-69); the ceremony consists of benediction, and breathing on the prepared unguent [AMPULLA]. With this may be compared the directions of the *Ordo Rom. I.* (App. c. 7, p. 34), which are probably of about the same age. Some of the later *Ordines* (see *O. R. X.* fr. 97, ff.; *XV.* pp. 480 f.) also give directions for the benediction of chrism

by the pope on Maundy Thursday. It appears from the *Ordo* last referred to that it was at one time customary for the pope to bless chrism only in the year of his coronation, and every seventh year afterwards.

It appears from the *Euchologion* that in the Greek Church also the blessing of chrism is one of the ceremonies of Maundy Thursday.

The chrism is not simple oil, but oil mixed with balsam. Eligius of Noyon (*Hom.* 8, *In Coena Dom.*) tells us that the mingling of balsam with the oil typifies the union of regal and sacerdotal glory. Compare Tertullian (*De Bapt.* 7), cited above. And Gregory the Great (*In Cantic.* i. 13) refers the balsam of Engaddi to that balsam which, mixed with oil and blessed by the bishop, makes chrism, typifying the gifts of the Holy Spirit. For the Eastern Church, the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite testifies (*Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 4) that the sacred unguent (μύρον) or chrism is composed of fragrant substances. The modern receipt for its composition (as given in the *Euchologion*) prescribes, in fact, besides oil and wine, thirty-six different kinds of aromatics.

For the principal uses of chrism, see BAPTISM, CONFIRMATION, ORDINATION. [C.]

**CHRISMAL** (*Chrismale*). (1) The vessel or flask in which the consecrated oil or CHRISM was contained [AMPULLA].

(2) A vessel for the reservation of the consecrated Host. In the Rheims MS. of the Gregorian *Sacramentary* (p. 432, ed. Ménard) is given a "Praefatio Chrismalis," while the *Ordo Romanus* in the corresponding place has the rubric, "Praefatio vasculi in quo Eucharistia reconditur." It is of this kind of chrismal that Egbert (*Penit.* xii. 6; in Haddan and Stubbs' *Councils*, iii. 428) and Halitgar (*Penit.* c. 10, p. 701, Migne) speak, as of a vessel which the priest carried with him and might lose. Some, however, take this chrismal for the CORPORAL.

(3) A cloth used to cover relics. In the *Life of Eligius*, attributed to St. Ouen (ii. 71), we read of a miracle wrought upon one who rubbed his face with the fringe of a chrismal which covered the relics of the saint.

(4) Old-English *Chrisom*. The white cloth laid over the head of one newly baptized, after the unction with chrism [BAPTISM, p. 163]. This cloth is called in Theodore's *Poenitential* (ii. iv. 7; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 193) "pannus crismatis;" in later authors, "vestis chrismalis," "chrismalis pannus," "mitra baptizatorium," "chrismale capitum." (Ducange, s. v.) [C.]

**CHRISMARIUM**. The vessel in which chrism is kept (Council of Auxerre, c. 6). It is sometimes however taken for a reliquary (Gregory of Tours, *De Mirac. S. Martini*, iv. 32; Fortunatus, *Vita Germani Paris.* c. 47). [C.]

**CHRISOM**. [CHRISMAL.]

**CHRIST, PICTURES OF**. [JESUS CHRIST IN ART.]

**CHRISTEMPOREIA**, Χριστεμπορεία—the selling of Christ—a name sometimes employed in the 5th century to signify simony. During the ages of persecution there was no place for simoniacal transactions: but when the higher offices of the Church brought wealth and dignity

to their possessors, there were not wanting ambitious and worldly men who sought to obtain such offices by bribery or other unworthy means. To check and prevent such discreditable practices, severe laws were enacted both in church and state as early as the 5th century. The Council of Chalcedon (c. 2) decreed that if any bishop gave ordination or an ecclesiastical office or preferment of any kind for money, he himself should lose his office and the party so preferred be deposed. Other like decrees occur in the so-called Apostolical Canons (c. 29), the Council of Constantinople under Gennadius, A.D. 459; the 2nd Council of Orleans, Bracara, and many others. The imperial laws also were no less stringent in regard to this abuse. *E.g.* it was enacted by one of Justinian's Novels (123, c. 1), that whenever a bishop was to be chosen, the electors should take an oath and insert it in the election paper that they did not choose him for any gift or promise or friendship, or any other cause, but only because they knew him to be a man of the true Catholic faith and of unblamable life and good learning. And in another law (Novel 137, c. 2) it is further provided that the party elected shall also at the time of his ordination, take an oath upon the holy Gospels that he neither gave nor promised by himself or other, nor hereafter will give to his ordainer or to his electors, or any other person, anything to procure him an ordination. And for any bishop to ordain another without observing the rule prescribed, is deposition, by the same law, both for himself and the person so ordained.

These were some of the securities required by the ancient Church against the practice which they stigmatized by the designation of Christemporeia (Bingham, iv. 3, 4). [D. B.]

**CHRISTENING**. [BAPTISM.]

**CHRISTIACUM CONCILIUM**. [CRESSY.]

**CHRISTIANA**, or **CHRISTINA**, virgin, μεγαλομάρτυς, martyr at Tyrus in Italy (?) A.D. 200, is commemorated July 24 (*Mart. Bedae, Rom. Vet., Usuardi, Cal. Byzant.*).

**CHRISTMAS** (FESTIVAL OF) (ἡμέρα γενέθλιος, τὰ γενέθλια, *Natalis, Natalitia, Nativitas, Domini*, &c. From the latter is derived the name of the day among peoples of the Latin race [*e.g.* the French *Noël*], and also among the Celtic nations, which were Christianized by Latin-speaking missionaries. In Germany the day is called the *Weihnachtsfest* from the solemn vigils which preceded the festival itself. The English *Christmas* [so the Dutch *Kerstmis*, whence *Kerst-maend*, a name for December], analogous to such forms as *Candlemas, Lammas, Michaelmas, Childermas*, superseded the older name *Yule* [Anglo-Saxon, *Geol*], by which the day is still known among the Scandinavian nations).

#### I. *Origin of Festival.*

It is not hard to understand why the Christian Church should have commemorated by an annual festival the Saviour's Incarnation. How far, however, the church was led by the possession of actual historical evidence to assign, as it has done, December 25 as the date of the Nativity, is a matter on which it is impossible to speak

otherwise than most doubtfully.\* On the one hand, due weight must be given to the unanimous agreement of the Western Church as far as the tradition can be traced back, and to the almost universal acceptance of this view by the Eastern Church at an early date. It is certainly not altogether impossible that there may have been some trustworthy tradition, some foundation for Tertullian's remark as to the archives of the Jews stored up at Rome, some slight substratum of truth underlying the legend as to the investigation of the day by Julius I. (*vide infra*). Further, sundry independent considerations, astronomical and otherwise, tend to make it probable that our Lord's birth took place near the end of the year. On this point reference may be made to Seyffarth's *Chronologia sacra*, which refers the Nativity to December 22 (p. 239), see also Ideler, *Chronologie*, vol. ii. pp. 385 sqq. On the other hand, some have argued on various grounds in favour of the greater probability of the Nativity having been in the autumn. Thus Lightfoot (*Horae Hebraeae et Talmudicae*, vol. ii. p. 32, ed. Girdell) would make it coincide with the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles, and associate it with that Festival in the same way in which the Passover and Easter, Pentecost and Whitsuntide correspond. His arguments mainly turn on the interpretation of Old Testament prophecies; e.g. our Lord died in Nisan, and if His ministry lasted three years and a half, as Lightfoot infers from Daniel ix. 27, then since our Lord at the beginning of His ministry was *trīs septuaginta sexagenos* (Luke iii. 23), we have, reckoning back from His death, Tishri or September for the season of His birth. Again, he infers from a comparison of Zechariah xiv. 16, 17, that it would be most improbable that the Feast of Tabernacles alone of the three great Jewish festivals should fail of the honour by which the Passover became exalted into Easter, and Pentecost into Whitsuntide. To decide the matter thus, however, in the absence of any more tangible historical evidence, is obviously unsafe. To the same end but on different grounds argues Jablonsky (*Dissertationes u. de origine Festi Nativitatis Christi in Ecclesia Christiana quodammodo statim celebrari coepta*, in his *Opera*, vol. iii. pp. 317 sqq. Amsterdam 1809. See also Munter, *Der Stern der Weism.* p. 110, Copenhagen 1827), maintaining for example that St. Luke's statement (ii. 8), of the shepherds keeping watch over their flocks by night would hardly have been possible on the assumption of the December date, seeing that it would then have been the rainy season, and the flocks would therefore have been under shelter. A further discussion, however, on this point rather belongs to the province of Biblical Chronology.

Many learned men have seen in the particular period at which we celebrate Christmas, evidence in favour of our viewing the Christian Festival as an adaptation of previously existing Jewish or heathen festivals; to the more striking views of this kind we shall now briefly refer.

\* Even in very early times the great uncertainty of the native was clearly felt. Thus Jacob, bishop of Verona (ab. 570 A.D.), is quoted by Irenaeus Bar-Sabbai as saying: "No one knows exactly the day of the nativity of the Lord: this only is certain, from what Luke writes, that He was born in the night" (*Ancient, Edif.* Or vol. ii. p. 164).

(a) Some, as Oldermann (*De fidei Ecclesiarum Judicae, origine festi Nativitatis Christi*, 1715) have viewed Christmas as a continuation and development of the Jewish Feast of the Dedication, a festival of eight days' duration beginning on Chelen 25 (= December 17), which was the anniversary of the purification of the temple by Judas Maccabaeus after the outrages of Antiochus Epiphanes (see 1 Mac. iv. 52-59; 2 Mac. x. 1-8; Josephus, *Antiq.* xii. 7, 6). Still while there seem to be several coincidences between the two feasts, such a transference from Judaism to Christianity of which no hint whatever is given in early times is exceedingly unlikely.

(b) Others have derived it from some one or other of the Roman festivals held in the latter part of December, as the *Saturalia*, or the *Sylvestria* which followed them, or the *Juvenalia* established by Nero. A more striking parallel, however, than any of these is to be found in the *Brahma*, or the *Natalis Invicti* [*Soter*], when the Sun, then at the winter solstice, was, as it were, born anew, even as Christ the Sun of Righteousness then dawned upon the world. This is the view of Wernsdorff, *De origine Solimanum Natalis Christi ac festivitatis Natalis Invicti*, Wittenberg 1757; of Jablonsky partly (*supra*); also of Mr. King (*Onesius and their Romans*, p. 49), who derives the Roman festival from the Mithras-worship of the Sun. Then as Mithraism gradually blended with Christianity, changing its name but not altogether its substance, many of its ancient notions and rites passed over too, and the Birthday of the Sun, the visible manifestation of Mithras himself, was transferred to the commemoration of the Birth of Christ. Numerous illustrations of the above remarks may be found in ancient inscriptions, e.g. SOLI INVICTO ET LUNAE AETERNAE C. VETTI GERMANI LIB. DUO PARATUS ET HERMES DEDERUNT, or HAIQ NIOPA ANIKHTO (Orator, *Inscriptum Antiquum*, p. xxviii.)

In the legend on the reverse of the copper coins of Constantine, SOLI INVICTO COMITI, retained long after his conversion, there is at once an idea of the ancient Sun-God, and of the new Sun of Righteousness. The supporters of this theory cite various passages from early Christian writers indicating a recognition of this view. The sermon of Ambrose, quoted by Jablonsky, is certainly spurious, and is so marked in the best editions of his works; it furnishes, however, an interesting illustration of an early date. The passage runs thus, "Bene quodammodo sanctum hunc diem Natalis Domini Solem novum vulgus appellat, et tanta sui auctoritate id confirmat, ut Judaei etiam atque Gentiles in hunc vocem conveniant. Quod libenter amplectendum vobis est, quia orientis Salvatoris, non solum humani generis salus, sed etiam colis ipsius claritas invenitur" (Sermon 6, in *Appendix* p. 397, ed. Bened.). In the Latin editions of Chrysostom is a homily, wrongly ascribed to him, but probably written not long after his time, in which we read, "Sed et Invicti Natalem appellant. Quis atque tam invictus nisi Dominus noster, qui mortem subactam deridet? Vel quod dicunt Soter esse Natalem, ipse est Soter Invictus, de quo Malachias propheta dixit, Orietur vobis timentibus nomen ipsius Sol Justitiae et mittet ut in pennis ejus" (*Sermo de Nativitate S. Joannis Baptistae*: vol. ii. 1113, ed. Paris, 1570). Leo the Great



finds fault with the baneful persuasion of some "quibus haec dies solemnitatis nostrae, non tam de Nativitate Christi, quam de novi ut dicunt solis ortu, honorabilis videtur" (*Serm.* 22, § 6, vol. i. p. 72, ed. Ballerini). Again, the same father observes, "Sed hanc adorandam in caelo et in terra Nativitatem nullus nobis dies magis quam hodiernus insinuat, et nova etiam in elementis luce radiante, coram (al. totam) sensibus nostris mirabilis sacramenti ingerit claritatem" (*Serm.* 26, § 1, p. 87).

We may further cite one or two instances from ancient Christian poets: Prudentius, in his hymn *Ad Natalem Domini*, thus speaks (*Cathemerinon* xi. init., p. 364, ed. Arevalus):—

"Quid est, quod arctum circulum  
Sol jam recurrens deserit?  
Christusne terris nascitur  
Qui lucis auget tramitem?"

Paulinus of Nola also (*Poema* xiv. 15–19, p. 382, ed. Muratori):—

"Nam post solstitium, quo Christus corpore natus  
Sole novo gelidae mutavit tempora brumae,  
Atque salutiferum praestans mortalibus ortum,  
Præcedente die, secum decrescere noctes  
Jussit."

Reference may also be made to an extract in Assemani (*Bibl. Or.* ii. 163) from Dionysius Barsalibi, bishop of Amida, which shows traces of a similar feeling in the East; also to a passage from an anonymous Syrian writer, who distinctly refers the fixing of the day to the above cause; we are not disposed, however, to attach much weight to this last passage. More important for our purpose is the injunction of a council of Rome (743 A.D.) "Ut nullus Kalendas Januarias et bromas (=brumalia) colere praesumpserit" (can. 9, Labbé vi. 1548), which shows at any rate that for a long time after the fall of heathenism, many traces of heathen rites still remained. A similar mention is found also in the proceedings of the Quinisext Council (692 A.D.), τὰς οὕτως λεγομένας Καλάνδας καὶ τὰ καλούμενα Βρουμάλια (can. 66, Labbé vi. 1170).

(γ) Others have even derived Christmas from the Northern festival (*Yule*) in December, in honour of Freya (cf. Loccenius, *Antiq. Sueco-Goth.* lib. i. c. 5, Holmiae, 1645; Scheffer, *Upsalia Antiqua*, p. 296, Upsal, 1666).

(δ) Jablonsky, while considering, as we have said, that in the festival of the *Natalis Invicti* is to be found the origin of the celebration of our Lord's Nativity by the Roman Church, maintains (*op. cit.* pp. 361 sqq.) that the Christians derived this festival primarily from the Basilidians. These, as we learn from a passage of Clement of Alexandria cited at length below, celebrated Christ's baptism as being His manifestation to the world on Tubi 11 (=January 6), and Jablonsky argues that this particular day was suggested to them by the Egyptian festival of the *Inventio Osiridis* or *Festum Osiridis nati* or *renati* (cf. Juvenal viii. 29; Athenagoras, *Legatio*, c. 22, p. 299, ed. Maranus), itself a commemoration of the renewed life of the sun from year to year, which he thinks was celebrated on that day. (On this last point, however, much doubt exists. Wyttenbach, *Animadversiones in Plutarchi Moralia; De Iside et Osiride*, p. 366 F, considers that if Plutarch's text is correct, the festival took place in Athyr or November, and

Kircher, *Oedipus Aegyptiacus*, vol. ii. part 2, p. 202, would fix it in Choeac or December.)

(ε) Some writers have argued that the Christian festival was not so much a transformation of a previously existing non-Christian one, as an independent festival set up as a counter-celebration at the same time with the heathen festival; this distinction, however, is rather apparent than real. Augusti, for example (*Denkwürdigkeiten*, vol. i. p. 226), sees in it a standing protest against those sects which denied or obscured the great truth of the Incarnation, such as the Manichaeans, Gnostics, Priscillianists, and the like.

## II. History of Festival.

We do not find in the earliest Christian times uniformity of observance as to the day on which our Lord's Nativity was commemorated. The earliest allusion to it is made by Clement of Alexandria, and is of so much importance that we shall give it at length. After speaking of the year of our Lord's birth, he proceeds: "And there are some who over curiously (περιεργότερον) assign not only the year but even the day of the birth of our Saviour, which they say was in the 28th year of Augustus, on the 25th day of Pachon.<sup>b</sup> And the followers of Basilides celebrate also the day of His baptism (οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Β. καὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος αὐτοῦ τὴν ἡμέραν ἑορτάζουσι), spending the night before in readings, and they say that it was in the 15th year of Tiberius Caesar, on the 15th of the month Tubi, but some say that it was on the 11th of the same month. . . . Further, some of them say that he was born on the 24th or 25th of Pharmuthi." (*Stromata*, lib. i. c. 21, vol. i. p. 407, ed. Potter). The two days here specified as those on which the Nativity was celebrated, Pachon 25, and Pharmuthi 24 or 25, are respectively May 20, April 21 or 22 (see Bede, *De temporum ratione*, c. 11; *Patrol.* xc. 345). Jablonsky (*op. cit.*), and Le Nourry (*In Clem. Alex. opp. Diss.* ii. art. 5) infer from the language of Clement that Tubi 11 or 15 (January 6 or 10) was observed by the followers of Basilides as the day of the baptism as well as of the Nativity. We should venture to doubt this idea, but it is perhaps supported by the passage cited below from Epiphanius. Gieseler also (*Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. p. 154, ed. 3) considers the inference incorrect.

We may probably assume the above-quoted passage to be decisive against any general celebration of the Nativity in Clement's time. Possibly indeed, though as we have already said the inference seems doubtful, he may refer to a celebration of the day by some of the sects of the time, since he speaks of the Basilidians "observing also the day of the baptism." Further, it would seem as if Clement rather censured the attempt to fix accurately the day of our Lord's birth, itself conclusive evidence against a general recognition of the festival in Clement's time.

It was the general custom in early times, in the East, to fix the Nativity on January 6, which thus served as the anniversary both for the Birth

<sup>b</sup> Ideler (*op. cit.* ii. 387 n.) suggests as a reason for this fixing of the day on the part of the Egyptians, that bearing Christ was born in the 9th month, they referred it to the 9th month of their own calendar.

and the Epiphany. An illustration of this, not however applying to an Oriental Church, may perhaps be derived from the accounts of the visit of Julian the Apostate, when at Vienne in Gaul, to a church with the view of seeming in accord with the religion of his soldiery. Ammianus Marcellinus (lib. xxi. c. 2) speaks of this visit as taking place on the Epiphany ("feriarum die quem celebrantes mense Januario Christiani Epiphania dictitant"), and Zonaras (*Annal.* lib. xiii. c. 11) on the Nativity (τῆς γενεθλίου σωτῆρος ἡμέρας ἐφεστηκυίας). It is just possible, however, that the references may be to different events.

To derive illustrations of the practice from distinctly Eastern sources, we may refer in the first place to a letter attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, which professes to be addressed by him to Julius, bishop of Rome, on this subject. This letter, though a palpable forgery, affords interesting evidence of the existence of the practice of combining the two feasts on January 6. We derive our knowledge of it from two sources: (1) a summary of it given in a letter, *De Nativitate Domini*, of John, bishop of Nicaea (end of the 9th or beginning of the 10th century) to Zacharias, Catholicos of Armenia Major (Combesis, *Haeresis Monothelit.* pp. 298 sqq.); and (2) an anonymous *Ἀναγκάλῃ διήγησις*, published by Cotelier from a MS. in the Library of Paris (*Patres Apostolici*, i. 316, ed. 1724). The general substance of these is to the effect that the bishop of Jerusalem complained of the inconvenience of celebrating the Nativity and the Epiphany on the same day, seeing that as he went in person to scenes commemorated by these events, Bethlehem and the Jordan, it was difficult to perform both journeys in one day, and the services were necessarily mutilated. He therefore requests information as to the proper day of the Nativity, adding that Titus carried away to Rome the archives of the Jews from which the fact might be cleared up. (For this point, cf. Tertullian *contra Marcionem*, lib. iv. c. 7.) The pope in answer declares that he has examined the records and finds that December 25 is the day on which the Nativity should be held. The latter of the two documents we have referred to adds that this decision caused much murmuring—"Now at that time Gregory Theologus [Nazianzen] was at Constantinople, and there arose no small murmuring among the citizens, as though he had been dividing the feast, and they said, Thou hast divided the feast, and art casting us into idolatry." According to this document the name of the bishop of Jerusalem in question was Juvenal, a successor of Cyril (see Cyril. Hierosol. p. 370, ed. Touttée).<sup>c</sup>

A possible allusion to this affair may be cited

<sup>c</sup> The unhistorical character of these documents is equally obvious whether we take Cyril or Juvenal: for Julius was dead nearly a century before the time of the latter. Again as for Cyril, the letter, according to Cotelier's obvious correction, claims to be written not by the well-known Cyril ("who wrote to Constantine" [*leg.* Constantius]) concerning the appearance of the luminous cross over Jerusalem), but a later one in the time of Valerius, mentioned by Epiphanius (*Haer.* lxvi. 20). This however is impossible, for the end of the pontificate of Julius only just overlaps that of Cyril. Even if, in spite of the letter, we referred it to Cyril I., we are no better off, for it is clear that the practice of celebrating the Nativity and the Epiphany together continued in Jerusalem after his time.

from the *Laudatio S. Stephani* by Basil of Se-leucia, who flourished at the time of the Council of Ephesus (*Patrol. Gr.* lxxxv. 469), who says of Juvenal that he "began to celebrate the glorious and adorable salvation-bringing Nativity of the Lord," which not improbably means celebrated as a distinct festival. Possibly the explanation of the whole thing is that Juvenal initiated some change in accordance with the Western practice, which was then explained as a direct action of the Roman See, and was finally associated with the more famous name of Cyril.

To show that the change was not at once made in Palestine, we may further appeal to the Latin homily *De Nativitate Domini*, found in Latin editions of Chrysostom, which though not received as a genuine writing of that Father, is assigned by Touttée (*op. cit.* p. 369) to the 4th century or the beginning of the 5th. The writer is contending that the Western plan of dividing the festivals is correct, and finds fault with Orientals who clung to their old method on the ground that they must know best in whose land our Lord's earthly life was past (Chrysostom, vol. i. p. 1116, ed. Paris, 1570).

Important testimony on this point may be derived from Cosmas Indicopleustes (*Topographia Christiana*, lib. v.; *Patrol. Gr.* lxxxviii. 197), who after referring to the message of the angel to Zacharias and the visit of the Virgin to Elizabeth, says that Christians concur in celebrating the Nativity in the ninth month, on Choeac 28 (=December 24), "but the people of Jerusalem, as though from what the blessed Luke says that Christ was baptized when 'beginning to be about thirty years old,' celebrate the Nativity on the Epiphany." He then appears to say that the people of Jerusalem were right in supposing that our Lord's baptism fell on the anniversary of His birth, but that the Church had wisely postponed the celebration of one of these events for twelve days lest either festival should meet with insufficient attention. Thus Jerusalem was incorrect in taking the later day for the anniversary of the Nativity. "But the people of Jerusalem alone by a reasonable conjecture, yet not accurately, celebrate [the Nativity] on the Epiphany, and on the Nativity they celebrate the memory of David and of James the Apostle." We further gather from the letter of John of Nicaea already referred to (*op. cit.* 1141) that the Church of Jerusalem appealed to the authority of James, the Lord's brother, for their practice of celebrating the Nativity on January 6. He adds that in the time of Honorius the patriarchs of Constantinople (Chrysostom), Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch formally acquiesced in the Western plan.

We shall now adduce evidence to show that the practice of the Alexandrian Church agreed in this matter with that of the Church of Jerusalem. In his notes to his Latin translation of the Arabic Preface, Canons and Constitutions of the Nicene Council, Abraham Ecchelenensis cites from the Constitutions of the Alexandrian Church, "*In die autem Nativitatis et Epiphaniae eo tempore quo concilium Nicaenum coactum fuit, praeceperunt ejus patres ut noctu missa celebretur*" (Labbe ii. 402).

Cassian<sup>d</sup> again (*Collutio* x. c. 2; *Patrol.* xlix.

<sup>d</sup> It would almost seem as though there were grounds for believing the change to have taken place in Egypt by

820) speaks of it as the custom in Egypt in his day: "Intra Aegypti regionem mos iste antiqua traditione servatur, ut peracto Epiphaniarum die quem provinciae illius sacerdotes vel Domini Baptismi, vel secundum carnem Nativitatis esse definiunt, et idcirco utriusque sacramenti solemnitatem non bifarie ut in occiduus provinciis, sed una diei hujus festivitatem concelebrant . . ." (cf. Isidore, *De Eccl. Off.* i. 27); Gennadius (*De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, c. 58; *Patrol.* lviii. 1092) speaks of a certain Bishop Timotheus who composed a book, not now extant, on the Nativity of our Lord "quam credit in Epiphania factam." Taken in conjunction with what we have already said of the Egyptian practice this may refer to Timotheus, bishop of Alexandria.

We next pass on to notice the evidence for the practice of the Armenians in this matter. Euthymius (*Panoplia Dogmatica*, tit. 23; *Patrol. Gr.* cxxx. 1175) says of them: "These deny the birth of Christ according to the flesh and the mystery of the true Incarnation, saying that they took place only in appearance; nor do they celebrate the Annunciation of the Mother of God on the day that we celebrate it, that is on March 25, as the inspired Fathers, the great Athanasius\* and John Chrysostom and those of their time and after their time have handed it down to us, but on January 5; in a very short time they fancifully and obscurely pretend that they celebrate the Annunciation and the Nativity and the Baptism of Christ, to the deceiving of the uncorrupt and not according to truth." Similar evidence is forthcoming from Nicephorus (*Hist. Eccles.* xviii. 53; *Patrol. Gr.* cxlvii. 440): "They deny also the Nativity of Christ according to the flesh, and say that He was born only in appearance; and differing from us who observe them separately, they extend the fast to the 15th [doubtless for ε' here we should read ε'] day of the month January, and celebrate together the Annunciation and Nativity and Baptism." The inquiry of the Armenian Catholicos Zacharias from John of Nicaea, which called forth the letter of the latter, is also evidence throwing a light upon the matter in question.

We shall next cite from the answers of John, bishop of Citrum, to Constantine Cabasilas, archbishop of Dyrrachium (quoted by Cotelier, *Patres Apostolici*, i. 316, ed. 1724, from MSS. in the Library of Paris, though not given in the printed editions, as Leunclavius, *Jus Graeco-Romanum*, p. 323): "We abolish the twelve days' [fast] for the overthrowing of the fast of the Armenians. For they fast for these twelve days before Epiphany, and so celebrate together on the fifth of January the three feasts: I mean the Annunciation and the Nativity and Baptism of Christ." He proceeds to attribute this to the heresiarch Ichanus, who held Docetic views.

Cotelier further quotes from a MS. in the same

Library a form of renunciation to be gone through by Armenian heretics on joining the Roman Church. Among other things is, "If any one does not celebrate on March 25 the Annunciation, and on December 25 the Nativity of Christ, let him be Anathema." He had previously (*op. cit.* p. 238) printed from the same MS. an attack on the *δυσσεβής θρησκεία τῶν κακίστων Ἀρμενίων*, where we find: "And on January 5 in the evening, they celebrate the feast of the Annunciation. . . . And in the morning they celebrate the Nativity of Christ, and in the Liturgy the Holy Epiphany."

Finally, for the Armenian practice reference may be made to two invectives (λόγοι στήλι-τευτικοί) of Isaac, Catholicos of Armenia, in the 11th or 12th century (i. 3, ii. 10, Combefis, *Haeresis Monothelit.* pp. 333, 405). The modern Armenian Church still retains this practice (Neale, *Holy Eastern Church*, Introd. p. 741).

The Western Church, so far as we can trace the matter back, seems to have kept the two festivals of the Nativity and Epiphany always distinct.<sup>1</sup> Jerome says unhesitatingly (*Comm. in Ezech.* i. 1, vol. v. 6, ed. Bened.): "Et dies Epiphaniarum hucusque venerabilis est, *nam ut quidam putant Natalis in carne*, tunc enim absconditus est, et non apparuit."

We may cite the very ancient Calendarium Carthaginense (*Patrol.* xiii. 1227), which marks December 25 thus: "viii. Kal. Jan. Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Filii Dei," with a note of the Epiphany on Jan. 6. We shall only cite here from two other ancient calendars, that of Bucherius and the Leonine, which Muratori (*De Rebus Liturgicis*, c. 4) refers approximately to the dates 355, 488 A.D. respectively. These severally mark the day, "Natus Christus in Bethlehem Judae," "Natale Domini" (*l. c.*). Other Liturgical monuments will be treated of separately.

Evidence, however, is forthcoming to show that in the Roman Church the Epiphany was probably the older of the two festivals, and therefore in some respects the more important, for the ancient *Ordo Romanus* (In vigilia Theophaniae, p. 21, ed. Hittorp, Cologne, 1568) remarks: "Nec hoc praetereundum est, quod secunda Nativitas Christi (*i.e.* the Epiphany), tot illustrata mysteriis, honoratior sit quam prima (*i.e.* Christmas)." Still this is after all only a matter of relative importance, and the Nativity is evidently accounted a festival of the highest order in the Leonine Sacramentary, which is certainly older than the Ordo which Hittorp refers to the time of Pepin and Charlemagne.

We shall now endeavour to show that the change of the day to December 25, in accordance with the Western plan, began to take place in the East towards the end of the 4th century. The old way was that believed in by Ephrem Syrus (ob. 378 A.D.), who is cited as saying, "On the 10th day [of March] was His Conception, and on the 6th day [of January] was His Nativity" (Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* ii. 163). The change, however, must have been gradual. For,

Cassian's time; for in the heading of a homily by Paul, bishop of Emesa, delivered at Alexandria before Cyril, we find *λεχθεῖσα καὶ Χοιὰκ* (= December 25) . . . *εἰς τὴν γεννησιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. (*Conc. Ephes.* Pars iii. c. 31; Labbé, iii. 1095.)

\* The writer here doubtless appeals to the *Quaestiones ad Antiochum Ducem*, 55 (*Patrol. Gr.* xxviii. 632), once attributed to Athanasius, but universally acknowledged now to be spurious.

<sup>1</sup> It will be noticed that the Western Church marks the Epiphany by a Greek name, and the Nativity by a Latin name. It is a reasonable inference that the former took its rise in the East, and was thence introduced into the West; while the latter as a separate festival was of distinctly Western growth.

to say nothing of Armenians, we find Epiphanius saying (*Haer.* li. 24, vol. i. p. 446, ed. Petavius): "For since He was born in the month of January, that is, viii. Id. Jan. which is according to the Romans January 5, according to the Egyptians Tubi 11, according to the Syrians or the Greeks Audyneus 6, according to the Cyprians or Salaminians the 5th of the 5th month, according to the Paphians Julius 14, according to the Arabians Aleom 21, according to the Cappadocians Atarta 13, according to the Hebrews Tibieth (Tebeth) 13, according to the Athenians Maemacterion 6 . . . ." It does not appear whether Epiphanius means that all these nations celebrated the Nativity on the day thus indicated: it is more probable that he is merely giving the various equivalents for the day in different systems of reckoning. Indeed his mention of the Romans is perhaps conclusive.

The most important piece of evidence, however, towards fixing the date of the change in the East by which December 25 became recognized as the day of the Nativity is to be found in a Homily of Chrysostom to the people of Antioch, *εἰς τὴν γενέθλιον ἡμέραν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (vol. ii. p. 354, ed. Montfaucon), which Montfaucon (p. 352)<sup>s</sup> gives strong reasons for believing to have been delivered on December 25, 386. After saying how earnestly he had wished to see on the day of the Nativity a congregation like that which was then met together, Chrysostom proceeds: "Nevertheless it is not yet the tenth year since this day has been made manifest and plain to us, still as though it had been handed down to us from the beginning (*ἀνωθεν*) and many years ago, it has flourished thus through your zeal. And so a man would not err who should call it at once new and ancient,—new, in that it has recently been made known to us; but old and ancient, in that it has speedily won an equality with older festivals. . . ." And as plants of good stock speedily grow up and produce fruit, "so this day too, known from the beginning to those who inhabit the West, but brought to us not many years ago. . . ." The change, however, at first meets with opposition. "I know well," he adds, "that many even yet dispute with one another about it, some finding fault with it and others defending it, . . . since it is old and ancient, for the prophets already foretold His birth, and from the beginning it has been manifest and notable to the dwellers from Thrace even to Gades." Again (§ 2) he refers his hearers to the archives at Rome as a source whence certain evidence on the point could be obtained, and adds "from those who have an accurate knowledge of these things and inhabit that city, have we received this day. For they who dwell there, observing it *from the beginning* and by old tradition, themselves sent to us now the knowledge of it." Again (§ 5) after fixing April as the time of the Annunciation, he arrives for the Nativity at the month Apellaeus (December),

"this present month, in which we celebrate the day."

From the above-quoted language of Chrysostom, we may notice; (1) that about the year 386 A.D. the festival of the Nativity, as distinct from and independent of the Epiphany, was a novelty of a few years' standing in the East; (2) that Chrysostom believed that the Western Church had celebrated an independent festival "from the beginning and by old tradition;" (3) that the change was met with opposition, and therefore would be gradual.

Combining, then, Chrysostom's definite testimony with the fact that Epiphanius had, perhaps a little before this time, concurred with the old Eastern view, and that at the time of the Council of Ephesus the change was tacitly recognized at Alexandria, we may fairly argue that except in those parts of the Eastern Church where the old plan was still continued (Jerusalem possibly and Armenia certainly), the Western plan was being gradually adopted in the period which we may roughly define as the last quarter of the 4th and the first quarter of the 5th century.

Whether before the time of Chrysostom any part of the Eastern Church observed the Nativity on December 25, it is difficult to say. The date of the various parts of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (see the Article) being so doubtful, we shall merely cite from them a passage bearing on this point: "Observe the days of the festivals, brethren, and first the Nativity, and let this be celebrated by you on the 25th day of the ninth month. After this let the Epiphany be very greatly honoured in your eyes, on which the Lord revealed to you His Own Godhead; and let this be held on the 6th day of the tenth month" (v. 13; cf. also viii. 33, where the two festivals are again distinguished). Cotelier in his introduction (*op. cit.* p. 197) also cites a passage found in some MSS. of Anastasius which professes to be quoted from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, in the present text of which, however, it is not found: "For our Lord Jesus Christ was born of the Holy Virgin Mary in Bethlehem, *ἐν μηνὶ κατὰ Αἰγυπτίους Χοϊὰκ κε'* [probably a mistake for *κθ'*, which = December 25] *ἑρὰ ἐβδόμη τῆς ἡμέρας ἣ ἐστὶν πρὸ ὀκτὼ καλανδῶν Ἰανουαρίων.*"

The result of all this investigation then is roughly this. In the case of the Eastern Church there is no *certain* evidence pointing to a general celebration of the Nativity on December 25 before the time of Chrysostom. Till then it had been held on January 6 in conjunction with the Epiphany, and even after this date some churches of the East retained for some time their old plan.

In the West we are told that the festival had been recognized, and celebrated on December 25 "from the beginning." We are not able to produce any very ancient witnesses from Western Fathers, but may fairly assume that it had existed sufficiently long for Chrysostom to be able to use reasonably and without fear of contradiction such a word as *ἀνωθεν*. We have also called attention to the recognition of it in ancient calendars.

Since the time of Chrysostom, the Nativity has been received by all Churches of Christendom as one of their most important festivals. Thus, in a sermon attributed to Gregory of Nyssa, but

<sup>s</sup> Montfaucon here cites Athanasius (*Frag. Comm. in Matth.* vol. i. p. 1025, ed. Bened. 1787) as speaking of December 25 as the Nativity. But in the first place the Benedictine editors had considerable doubt of the genuineness of the fragment ("si non aperte spurium admodum suspectum videtur, in quo sunt pleraque *μωδὸν*"); and in the next, it seems rather the death of Herod which is indicated than the birth of our Lord.



of doubtful authenticity, it is said: "Now is heard accordant throughout the whole inhabited world the sound of them that celebrate the feast" (*Patrol. Gr.* xvi. 1148). Chrysostom (*In B. Philogonium* 4, vol. i. 497) speaks of it as second in importance to no festival, "which a man would not be wrong in calling the chief (*μητρόπολις*) of all festivals."

Several sermons are extant of Pope Leo I. on the subject of the Nativity, further exemplifying this statement (*Serm.* 21-30, vol. i. pp. 64 sqq. ed. Ballerini).

It is curious that in one of his epistles Augustine does not seem to recognize the Nativity as a festival of the first order, where after referring to the Divine institution of the Sacraments, he proceeds to those things "quae non scripta sed tradita custodimus" on the authority of the Apostles and the Church, "sicut quod Domini Passio et Resurrectio et Ascensio in caelum et Adventus de caelo Spiritus Sancti anniversaria solemnitate celebrantur" (*Epist.* 54 § 1 [olim 118]; *Patrol.* xxxiii. 200). Yet he deemed the festival of such importance that he has written not a few sermons for the day, showing the celebration of this festival in Africa (see *Serm.* 184-196, 369-372; *Patrol.* xxxviii. 995 sqq., xxxix. 1655 sqq.; the authenticity of the latter group, however, is doubtful).

### III. Liturgical Notices.

The Roman Church evidently accounted the Nativity one of the most important feasts from very early times. Their earliest Sacramentary, that of Pope Leo, contains nine Masses for the day (vol. ii. 148 sqq.). There is, however, no notice of a Vigil. In the Preface in the first Mass it is said: "Quoniam quidquid Christianae professionis devotione celebratur, de hac sumit solemnitate principium, et in hujus muneris mysterio continetur." See again the Preface in the seventh Mass: "Atque ideo sicut primis fidelibus extitit in sui credulitate pretiosum, ita nunc excusabilem conscientiam non relinquit, quae salutaris mysterii veritatem, toto etiam mundo testificante non sequitur."

In the Gelasian Sacramentary four Masses altogether are given: (1) For the Vigil at Nones; (2) For the Vigil in nocte; (3) For the Vigil *Mane prima*; (4) For the Nativity in die: that is to say, there are practically three Masses on the Nativity itself. After this again are several prayers for the Nativity, whether at Vespers or Matins.

The Gelasian Sacramentary borrowed a good deal from the Leonine here. The Collect and *Secreta* for the services of the Vigil at Nones and *Mane prima*, and a Collect and the Preface for the Nativity itself as well as two (the 2nd and 4th) of the added prayers all come from the large number of Masses for the day in the older Sacramentary (*Patrol.* lxxiv. 1055 sqq.). We now pass on to the Gregorian Sacramentary. Here, as in the previous case, there are altogether four services with a large number of alternative forms. The second mass is connected in some MSS. with the church of S. Maria Major; thus, *Natalis Domini ad S. Mariam Majorem* (MS. Rodradi), *Nocte ad S. Mariam* (MS. Ratoldi); and the third contains also the commemoration of S. Anastasia, and one MS. mentioned by Ménard (*in loc.*) gives two prefaces for the day, one for the Saint and

the other for the Nativity (cf. *Greg. Sacr.* col. 5 sqq. ed. Ménard). See also the *Antiphonary*, where, as before, four Masses in all are recognized (*ib.* col. 657 sqq.), and a still more elaborate set of forms is given in the *Liber Responsalis* attributed to Gregory (*ib.* col. 741 sqq.).

The *Ordo Romanus* (ed. cit. p. 19) prescribes three Lections from Isaiah for the Vigil of the Nativity: (1) ix. 1-x. 4; (2) xl. 1-xli. 20; (3) lii. 1-15. The Ambrosian Liturgy of the Church of Milan (Pamelius, *Liturgg. Lat.* vol. i. pp. 293 sqq.) gives one Mass for the day.

We may now briefly examine the Liturgical monuments of the Gallican Church. In the ancient Lectionary of that Church, there were originally twelve Lections for the Vigil of the Nativity. Those which are yet extant, five in number, are: Isaiah xlv. 23-xlvi. 13; an extract from a sermon of Augustine<sup>a</sup> *De Nativitate Domini*: Isaiah liv. 1-lxi. 7; Malachi ii. 7-iv. 6; St. John i. 1-15.

The Lections for the Nativity itself are Isaiah vii. 10-ix. 8 (with some omissions); *Daniel* [Benedicite] cum benedictione; Hebrews i. 1-13; St. Luke ii. 1-19 (Mabillon, *de Liturgia Gallicana*, lib. ii. pp. 106 sqq.). In illustration of this plan of having twelve Lections for the Vigil of the Nativity, here doubtless equivalent to the Matins of the Nativity, Mabillon (*l. c.*) cites from the *Regula* of Aurelian, bishop of Arles: "In Natale Domini et in Epiphania tertia hora surgite: dicite unum nocturnum et facite sex missas [= lectiones] de Isaia propheta; iterum dicite nocturnum, et legantur aliae sex de Evangelio" (*Patrol.* lxxviii. 396).

It will be seen that in the Gallican Lectionary one Mass only is presupposed for the day of the Nativity, and in accordance with this the Gothico-Gallic Missal (*op. cit.* pp. 188 sqq.) gives us one Mass for the Vigil and one for the day. In the ancient Gallican Missal are found forms of the Preface "ad vesperum Natalis Domini" and prayers "ad initium noctis Natalis Domini," "in media nocte Natalis Domini."

The Mozarabic Missal gives us but one Mass for the day and ignores the Vigil. The Prophetical Lection, the Epistle, and the Gospel are respectively Isaiah ix. 1-7; Hebrews i. 1-12; St. Luke ii. 6-20 (ed. Leslie, pp. 37 sqq.). The Breviary gives Matins for the Vigil; and for the day of the Nativity, (1) Vespers—that is on the evening preceding December 25; (2) Matins and Lauds. Into the Vesper service enters the noble hymn, "Veni Redemptor Gentium."

It will have been noticed that the Roman Liturgies, the Gelasian and Gregorian, give three Masses for the Nativity, while those for the Churches of Milan, Gaul, and Spain give but one. In the case of the Gallican Church this may be illustrated from Gregory of Tours, who in the life of Nicetius of Lyons (*Vitae Patrum*, viii. 11, p. 1196, ed. Bened.), says: "Facta quoque hora tertia, cum populus ad missarum solemniam conveniret, hic mortuus in ecclesiam est delatus." On the other hand, we must mention that in a writing of Eldefonsus, a Spanish bishop, who wrote 845 A.D., is an allusion to a triple Mass on the Nativity, Easter, Whitsunday, and the Transfiguration (*Patrol.* cvi. 888). This

<sup>a</sup> This passage, attributed to Augustine, does not seem to be his, nor is it included in his works.

as probably a leaning to the Roman plan, or it may be a custom of independent origin.

The cause of the triple Mass in the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries is thus explained by Mabillon (*l. c.*), that in consequence of three being the number of "stations" discharged in ancient times in Rome by a Pope on that day, three Masses were instituted.<sup>1</sup> We shall again quote the ancient *Ordo Romanus* on this point (p. 19): "Prima die Vigiliis Natalis Domini hora sexta cantant Missam ad S. Marcum. Qua expleta cunctis vesperalium orationibus, dehinc vadunt ad cibum. In crepusculo noctis intrat Apostolicus ad vigilias in praefatam Ecclesiam, tamen non cantant ibi invitatorium ad introitum, sed expleta vigiliis et matutinis, sicut in Antiphonario continetur, ibidem cantant primam Missam in nocte. Qua expleta, vadunt ad S. Ananiam causare aliam Missam de nocte. Dehinc pergunt ad S. Petrum, ut ibi vigilias celebrent, ab eo loco ubi invenerit eos psallere qui ibidem erant. Ipsi enim intrant ad vigilias debito tempore in processu noctis et cunctis invitatoriis et prosequuntur ordinem Antiphonarum. Unde etiam dupli officia in Romanorum Antiphonario hac nocte describuntur." The above will account for the commemoration of S. Ananias at the Mass *Missa prima*. The *Ordo* then adds the obviously groundless statement that the institution of these nocturnal Masses is to be referred to Pope Telephorus (ob. 158 A.D.).

Attention has already been called to the fact of the early recognition of the Vigil of the Nativity. In addition to the examples cited, we may further appeal to a still older witness, Augustine, who speaks of it in one of his letters (*Epist. 65 ad Anastasium* [olim 236]; *Patrol. xxxiii.* 234). It differed in this respect from the ordinary type of Vigil in that it continued through the night, making with the Nativity itself one great solemnity. Thus we read in the letter of the Bishops Lupus and Ephraimus to Bishop Talasius: "Vigilia Natalis Domini longe alio more quam Paschae Vigilia celebranda, quia hic lectioes Nativitatis legendae sunt, illae autem Paschae. Epiphaniae quoque sollemnitates habet eum specialem cultum. Quae Vigiliae vel maxime aut per totam noctem aut certe in matutinis vergente curandae sunt. Paschatis autem Vigiliae a Vespere raro in Matutinis usque perducitur" (*Patrol. lviil.* 66). In the *Capitula* of Theodoric of Tarras, archbishop of Canterbury (ob. 690 A.D.), the difference of the practice of the Latin and Greek Church in this matter is pointed out, in that the former began the Vigil at Noon, the latter late in the evening (*Capit. 66; Patrol. xcix.* 357). The Gelasian, Grego-

rian, and Pamelius' Ambrosian Sacramentaries give also Masses for the Octave of the Nativity, January 1, which would also of necessity be the anniversary of the day of the Circumcision, by which express name it is denoted in some other Liturgies. [Circumcision.]

The existence of the group of important festivals between Christmas and the Epiphany seems to point to a wish on the part of the early Church to render the whole season one great festival, by reckoning as much as possible of the time from ordinary worldly business, in commemoration of persons more or less indirectly connected with our Lord's Nativity. Thus a Council of Tours declares: "Inter Natale Domini et Epiphania omni die festivitas sunt itemque praebebant" (*Concil. Turonensis ii.* can. 17; *Labbe, vol. v.* 856). From the great importance of the festival, the Nativity, if happening to coincide with a fast, claimed the right of overriding the fast. Indeed there was a fast preceding the Nativity which just stopped short of it. Thus Aurelian, already quoted, says (*l. c.*): "A Calendae Novembri usque ad Domini Natalis quotidie jejunandum abique Sabbato et Dominico." Cf. also the canon we have just cited of the Second Council of Tours, "De Decembri usque ad Natale Domini omni die jejunant." We may further cite in illustration Epiphanius (*Adversus Haereticos: Expositio Fidei* 22, vol. I. p. 1105), who, after saying that there is no fast throughout the fifty days of Pentecost, adds, "Nec on the day of the Epiphany, when the Lord was born in the flesh, is it lawful to fast, although it happen to fall on the fourth or the sixth day of the week." It will be remembered from a previously cited passage of this writer that he follows the Eastern plan in this matter, so that his day of the Epiphany is at once Epiphany and Nativity.

As a festival of so great importance, Christmas was one of the seasons, on which it was especially enjoined on all, clergy and laity alike, to communicate. Thus the Council of Agde (506 A.D.) orders: "Ut cives qui superiorum sollemnitatem, id est Paschae ac Natalis Domini vel Pentecostes festivitatibus cum episcopis intermissis neglexerint, cum in civitatibus communionis vel benedictionis accipiendae causa se nosse debeant, triennio a communione priventer ecclesiam." Again: "Si quis in clero constitutus ab ecclesia sua diebus sollemnibus defuerit, id est Nativitate, Epiphania, Pascha vel Pentecoste, dum potius mularibus laceris studet quam cervitio Dei parat, conventus et triennio a communione suspendatur. . . ." (*Concil. Agathensis*, can. 63, 64; *Labbe, iv.* 1593). Springing from the same tendency is the injunction of the First Council of Orleans (511 A.D.): "Ut nulli civium Paschae, Natalis Domini vel quinquagesimae sollemnitatem in villa licet celebrare, nisi quem infirmitas prohibeat revocare" (*Concil. Aurelianense i.* can. 25; *ibid.* 1406). It was allowed by the Council of Epone (517 A.D.) for people of rank (cives superiorum natalium) to invite their bishop to themselves at Christmas or Easter to receive his blessing (*Concil. Eponeense*, can. 35; *ibid.* 1500).

IV. Christmas Present. As coming at the beginning of the ecclesiastical year, and as being in itself a time when from the Great Gift then given by God to man, all memories call to peace and friendship, the season of Christmas has from

<sup>1</sup> This seems more probable than the view adopted by Quenstedt in his notes on the works of Leo I. (*Epist. 9* "11 ad Symonem"), vol. II. (1809), that the custom arose from a distant authorization in the Roman Church to hold several masses, as might be found necessary, on festivals of great importance, such as Christmas and Easter, where there would be a great multitude of people, more than a church could contain at once. He quotes as illustration of this from our own church, when the Council of Oxford (1215 A.D.), under archbishop Langton, archbishop of Canterbury carried "ad hoc duobus claustris districtis inhibitione ne monachi qui-plam munerum ecclesiam crederet die in die, ex quo die Nativitatis et Romanorum Nativitatis vel in caeteris defunctis." (*Can. 6; Labbe, vol. xi.* p. 364.)



**CHURCH** (1), in respect to the reverence and the privileges attached to the building.

(1) It was customary to wash the hands and feet before entering the church, for which purpose a fountain was commonly provided in the middle of the *atrium* or court before the church, called *cuntharus* or *phiale*; so Euseb. *H. E.* x. 4; Tertull. *De Orat.* c. xi.; Paulinus of Nola, *Epist.* xii. *ad Severum*; Socrates, ii. 38; St. Chrys., repeatedly; Synes. *Epist.* cxxi.: quoted by Bingham. Kings and emperors also left their arms, and even their diadems, and their guards, outside when entering a church (Theodos. *Orat.* in *Act.* i. *Conc. Ephes.*; Bingham, VIII. x. 8). And the Egyptian monks, after Eastern custom, put off their sandals (Cassian. *Instit.* i. 2). It was customary, also, to show reverence to the church by embracing, saluting, and kissing, its doors, threshold, and pillars. So St. Athanasius (*Opp.* ii. 304, ed. 1627), St. Chrysostom (*Hom.* xxix. in 2 Cor.), Paulinus (*Natal.* vi. *Felicitis*), Prudentius (*Hymn II.* in *S. Laurent.* 519, 520), &c., quoted by Bingham, *ib.* 9.—(2) Upon entering the church, “the Christians in the Greek and Oriental churches have, time out of mind, used to bow . . . towards the altar or holy table;” a practice for which no known ancient canon exists, and which looks therefore like a primitive practice, and one probably borrowed from the Jews (Mede, *Disc. on Ps.* 132, quoted by Bingham). A profound silence was also to be observed within the building (Cassian, *Instit.* ii. 2; S. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xix.). And coughing, spitting, &c., were forbidden,—“A gemitu, screatu, tussi, risu, abstinentes” (St. Ambros. *De Virg.* iii. 9). And Nonna is eulogized by her son, St. Greg. Naz. (*Orat.* xix.), as, among other things, never spitting, and never turning her back upon the altar.—(3) Election of bishops and of clergy, synods, catechetical schools, and the like, were allowed to be held within churches. But eating meals there was strictly forbidden, even in time the ἀγάπαι:—Οὐ δεῖ ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τὰς λεγόμενας ἀγάπας ποιεῖν καὶ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐσθίειν καὶ ἀκούβιτα στρωννύειν (*Conc. Laodicea.* c. 28):—“Ut nulli episcopi vel clerici in ecclesia conviventur, nisi forte transeuntes hospitiorum necessitate illic reficiantur; et populi, quantum fieri potest, ab hujusmodi convivii prohibeantur” (*Conc. Carth.* III. can. 30; *Cod. Con. Afric.* 42). St. Augustin, however, is compelled to tolerate, whilst he severely condemns, the custom of feasting in the church in memory of the martyrs—“Qui se in memoriis martyrum inebriant, quomodo a nobis approbari possunt, quum eos, etiam si in domibus suis faciant, sana doctrina condemnet” (*Cont. Faust.* xx. 21). The Emperor Leo also (*Novel.* lxxiii.), and *Conc. Trull.* can. 97, forbid people from lodging in certain galleries in the church, called *catechumenia*. And the *Conc. Eliberit.* can. 35, prohibits private vigils of women in the church precincts—“ne foeminae in coemiterio pervigilent;” although the practice of spending whole nights there in prayer was permitted to men (see *e.g.* Theodoret, v. 24; S. Athanas. *Epist. ad Serapion.*; Socrat. i. 37; &c.); and *cubiculi*, or cells, were sometimes provided for the purpose (Paulin. *Epist.* xii. *ad Sever.*).—(4) Holding assemblies privately out of the church was strictly forbidden: Εἴ τις παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησιάσῃ, καὶ καταφροῖων τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἶθελαι

πράττειν, μὴ συνόντος τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω (*Conc. Gangr.* can. 6); and can. 5 of the same council condemns those who despise the church and its assemblies.—(5) The church was a place of safety, both for valuables and for life and person. Besides the archives and treasure of the church itself, the church treasury served as a safe receptacle for other precious things, public or private: as, *e.g.* the cubit wherewith the increase of the Nile was measured, which had been kept in the temple of Serapis, was transferred by order of Constantine to the Christian church, and retransferred to the idol temple by Julian the Apostate (Ruffin. ii. 30; Sozom. i. 8; Socrat. i. 18).—(6) Immunity of life and person attached also to such as took refuge in a church: for the details of which see SANCTUARY. (Bingham.) [A. W. H.]

(2) The building set apart for the performance of Christian worship.

This article is arranged as follows:—

- I. Names, p. 365.
- II. Early History, p. 366.
- III. The Period from Constantine to Justinian, p. 368.
- IV. The Period from the death of Justinian to the death of Charles the Great.
  1. The western part of the territory of the Eastern Empire, p. 378.
  2. Armenia and the adjacent provinces, p. 379.
  3. Italy, p. 379.
  4. France, Germany, and Switzerland, p. 380.
  5. Spain, p. 382.
  6. Ireland, p. 384.
  7. Scotland, p. 385.
  8. England, p. 385.

I. Names.—Greek, *ἐκκλησία*, *Κυριακή*, or *τὸ Κυριακὸν*; Latin, *Ecclesia*, *Dominica* (*i.e.* domus dominica), or *Basilica*; French, *Église*; Italian, *Chiesa*; Spanish, *Igreja*; Roumanic, *Biserica*; Anglo-Saxon, *Circ*, *Cyric*; Old German, *Chirichu*; Modern German, *Kirche*; Dutch, *Kerk*; Icelandic, *Kyrkia*; Swedish, *Kyrka*; Russian, *Tserkoff*; Polish, *Kosciol*, if Greco-Russian, *Cerkiew*; Irish, *Domhliag* (*i.e.* stone house), *Tempull*, *Eclais*, *Regles*; Welsh, *Eglwys*; Hungarian, *Egyház*, *Templom*.

The names for a church in the languages of the Latin family are evidently derived from the Greek *ἐκκλησία*; those in the languages of the Teutonic and Scandinavian families apparently from *Κυριακή*.

Several other terms have been used by Greek and Latin writers of the earlier centuries when speaking either of churches, or of oratories or places of assembly. Such are *νὰς*, *templum*, by Lactantius, St. Ambrose, Eusebius, St. John Chrysostom. Arnobius and Lactantius use the word *conventiculum*, while *concilium* and *synodus* are also found in use not only for the assembly but for the edifice (v. Bingham ii. 84). Isidore of Pelusium (lib. ii. *Ep.* 245) in the like case distinguishes between *ἐκκλησία* the assembly, and *ἐκκλησιαστήριον* the building.

Descriptive phrases were also employed, as *Προσευκτήρια*, *Οἶκοι Εὐκτήριοι* (by Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and others) *Oratoria*, *Domus Dei*, *Domus Ecclesiae*, *Domus Divina*, by various writers from the third century downwards. Bingham, however, has shewn that in the 6th century *Domus Ecclesiae* was sometimes used, not to signify the church, but the Bishop's house, and that in the 5th century (and probably even somewhat later), *Domus Divina* was the official style for the Imperial palace.



'Ἀνάκτορον [see ANACTORON] as equivalent to basilica is used by Eusebius (*De Laude Constant.* c. 9), but is only rarely employed.

Churches erected specially in honour of martyrs were called *Μαρτύρια*, Martyria, Memoriae, *Τρόπαια*, Tropaea, *Τίτλοι*, Tituli.

Those who wrote in Latin, in the dark ages, appear to employ the word basilica for the most part, when they wrote of a large church, oratorium when of a chapel or oratory. Those who wrote in Gaul, in the 6th and 7th centuries, are said by De Valois (v. Du Cange, *Gloss. art.* 'Basilica') to have used basilica for the church of a convent, and ecclesia for a cathedral or parish church. Gildas in the 6th century employs ecclesia and basilica, adding to the latter word 'martyrum.'

II. *Early History.*—At what time the Christians began to erect buildings for the purpose of celebrating divine worship is unknown, but it is obvious that inasmuch as they held frequent assemblies for religious purposes, suitable places for such assemblies would be required, and that when the congregations became large rooms in private houses would cease to afford the requisite space.

The assertions of some of the earlier Christian writers, as Arnobius (*Disputat. adv. Gent.* lib. vi. c. 1), Origen (c. *Cels.* lib. 7, c. 8), Minucius Felix (*Octav.* c. 8, 10, 32) that the Christians had neither temples, altars nor images, that God could be worshipped in every place, and that his best temple on earth is the heart of man, should, it would appear, be understood, not literally—for there is positive evidence of the existence of churches in the 3rd century—but that they had no temples or altars in the Pagan sense of those words, and that their religion was spiritual, and not dependent upon places or rituals.

The passage from Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* vii. 5, p. 846) and those from other writers, quoted by Bingham (*Antiq.* bk. viii. c. 1, § 13), prove that a certain place was called *ἐκκλησία*, but, in strictness, not that it was a separate building, constructed and set apart for that purpose. The documentary evidence of the next century, the 3rd, is, however, much more decisive. The chronicle of Edessa (in Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* xi. 397) mentions the destruction of temples of Christian assemblies in A.D. 292.


Aelius Lampridius in his *Life of the Emperor Alexander Severus* (A.D. 222-235), narrates that the Christians having occupied a certain place, it was confirmed to them on the ground that it was better that God should be worshipped there after any manner, than that it should be given up to the adverse claimants, the 'popinarii,' or tavern-keepers. Gregory of Nyssa, in his life of Gregory Thaumaturgus, bishop of Neo-Caesarea, states that he built several churches there and in the adjacent parts of Pontus. In addition to which, many other testimonies of a like nature might be adduced.

The edict of Diocletian, usually attributed to the year 302, ordering the destruction of the churches and the confiscation of the lands belonging to them, confirms these statements, and Lactantius' account (*De Mort. Persecutorum*, c. 12) of the destruction of the church at Nicomedia in A.D. 303, shows that some of them at least were considerable edifices.

There is some ground for believing that in the

3rd century those plans and arrangements of churches which we find to prevail in the 4th and following centuries were, at least in part, already in use; St. Cyprian (*Ep.* 59, p. 688, Hartel) imagines Pagan altars and images usurping the place of the altar of the Lord, and entering into the "sacrum venerandum consessum" of the clergy. In this there seems to be an evident allusion to the arrangement usual in later times, in which the altar was placed in the apse, and the clergy sat on a bench around it.

So also in the passage in Tertullian (*De Pudicit.* c. 4), when that writer speaks of certain sinners being removed not only from the 'limen' but also 'omni ecclesiae tecto,' not only from the threshold of the church itself, but even from every dependent building, such as the narthex, the atrium, or the baptistery. It is doubtful whether any now existing church can be attributed, upon good evidence, to this century. One which had been believed so to date, is the basilica of Reparatus, near Orleansville, in Algeria, the ancient Castellum Tingitanum. It is about 80 feet long by 52 wide, and is on the "dromical" or as we now say basilican plan, that is, in the form of a parallelogram, longer than wide. It was divided into a nave and four aisles by four ranges of columns. It has now an apse at each end, both internal to the line of walls. According to an inscription, still remaining, the earlier part of the building dates from 252, but the era is most probably not that of Christ, but of Mauritania, and the date corresponds with A.D. 325; the other apse was added about A.D. 403, to contain the grave of the saint.



Basilica of Reparatus.


The earlier apse, with the ground in front of it, is raised about three feet; and below it was a vault, in which were two sarcophagi. It is not, however, clear whether this arrangement was original. Another African church, that of D'jemila, which is believed to date from the latter part of this century, presents the remarkable peculiarity of being without an apse. It measures 92 feet by 52. Near the end furthest from the entrance door is an enclosure entered by a doorway in front and one on each side. This, no doubt, surrounded the altar and the seats of the priests.

Some other churches which have been supposed to belong to this century, as the cathedral of Trèves (v. Hübsch, *Die altchristl. Kirchen*, pl. vi.), and the small church at Annona, in Algeria, though on the basilican plan, are much wider in proportion to their length than is usual in the later examples. In the case of Trèves the building is, in fact, a square (or very nearly so), measuring about 120 feet internally with an apse. The roof was supported by two monolithic columns of granite, about 40 feet high, on each side. If the church were not square, but oblong, about which there is some doubt, there were probably three, and perhaps even

five of these columns on each side. By some, however, as by Kugler, *Gesch. der Baukunst* i. 404, this building is attributed to about the year 550, but it seems very improbable that so bold a plan, involving arches of great span, supported on monolithic columns nearly 50 feet high (including bases and capitals) was conceived and executed at that time. The church at Taffkha, in central Syria, exhibits the same square form, with a semi-ovoid apse projecting from the side opposite to the entrance. This building, in style and construction, most closely resembles a basilica at Chagga, which M. de Vogüé ascribes to the third century, and it must be presumed that he considers the church to be of the same date. It

depth by a little less in width, and being about 20 feet high internally.

Some of the churches in Egypt and Nubia, as at Erment in Egypt and Ibrim in Nubia (v. Kugler, *Gesch. der Baukunst*, i. 376), are, no doubt, of a very early date, perhaps of the end of the 3rd or the beginning of the following century, but no certain date can be affixed to them. In both those named the apse is enclosed within the walls, the angles of which are occupied by chambers. This arrangement, indeed, seems to have been very early adopted and very generally adhered to in the East. Some early examples of the same plan may be found also in the West, as in the Church of St. Croce



St. Simeon Stylites, Kalat Soma, etc.

is constructed like many other buildings in the same part of Syria, in a very peculiar manner, being entirely roofed with large slabs of stone, which rest on arches spanning the nave at intervals of about 7 ft. 8 in. The flat roofs of the aisles formed galleries.

One very remarkable feature in this building is the tower which ranges with the façade and rises to a height of about 43 feet. If this church be of the date to which it would seem to belong, this must be considered as the first appearance of a tower in ecclesiastical architecture.

The church is not large, measuring externally (exclusive of apse and tower) about 57 feet in

in Jerusalem at Rome: but it does not seem to have been frequently used.

When, in the year A.D. 313, the Emperor Constantine had published the edict tolerating the Christian religion, and still more when, in A.D. 324, he took it under his patronage, a great increase in the erection of churches, and in the size and splendour of the edifices, naturally ensued—the emperor himself setting the example by erecting at Jerusalem and elsewhere churches of great magnificence.

It has been shewn that churches of the basilican type were erected before the period of Constantine, and it is probable that sepulchral or memorial churches of circular or polygonal

plan, and oratories or chapels of many various forms, may have been also built, but it is not until the 4th century that we have examples of all three of these classes, the date and character of which are well ascertained. Typical forms for the two first classes were established in the great buildings erected during the reign of Constantine, and have influenced the construction of churches down to the present day.

The basilican, or, as the Greeks called it, the dromical plan, continued, in the great majority of instances, to be in use in the West (though with certain modifications) until after the period embraced by this work, and in Rome until after the year 1000.

It was almost equally prevalent in the East until the genius of the architect of St. Sophia at Constantinople had evolved from the other typical form, viz. that of the memorial church, a new combination so striking and impressive as to have permanently influenced the church architecture of Asia and of the east of Europe in favour of a modification of the memorial type; while in the West, churches the plans of which are thence derived, continue to be, as they had been before, exceptional; such are S. Vitale at Ravenna and S. Lorenzo at Milan.

In the earlier period the choice of form would seem to have been guided by the intention most strongly present to the founder. Where special intention of doing honour to the memory of a martyr existed, the circular form was chosen, but where this was not the leading thought, the basilican; the latter lending itself better to the celebration of divine services with a large attendance of worshippers. In several instances a basilican and a memorial church were placed in close proximity, as at Jerusalem by Constantine, Kalat Sema'an in Central Syria, at Nola by Paulinus, at Constantinople in the churches of St. Sergius and of St. Peter and Paul, and several others, the circular or polygonal church being in almost all these cases dedicated in honour of a martyr.

It will be most convenient when describing the churches erected from the time of Constantine to that of Justinian to divide them according to the threefold division mentioned above, viz., into: 1st, basilican; 2nd, memorial or sepulchral churches; and 3rd, oratories (which are treated of under the head CHAPEL), without paying much regard to the country in which the examples are found. During this period, in fact, so much unity, as well of ritual and practice in religious matters as of style and feeling in art, prevailed throughout the Roman Empire, that the differences between the ecclesiastical architecture of its various provinces are chiefly differences of detail.

At the beginning of the period which follows, viz., that from Justinian to Charles the Great, the great development of the Byzantine style took place, and the architecture of the East is thenceforward widely different from that of the West. Soon afterwards the fragments into which the empire had divided were formed into new nations, most of whom developed something of new plan or new style in their ecclesiastical buildings, and it will therefore be necessary to treat of the architectural history of most of these nations separately. This part of the subject may be divided into the following sec-

tions:—1, The western part of the territory of the Eastern Empire; 2, Armenia and the adjacent provinces; 3, Italy; 4, France, Germany, and Switzerland; 5, Spain; 6, Ireland; 7, Scotland; 8, England.

III. *The Period from Constantine to Justinian.*—It has been thought by some writers (v. Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chret.* art. Basilique), that the crypts or chapels of the catacombs near Rome have served as models for the primitive Christian churches, by which it would appear that churches of the basilican type are meant. This opinion would, however, appear to rest on no sufficient foundation, for the so-called chapels are in general either a series of two, three, or even five, chambers, usually not more than 6 or 7 feet square, connected by doorways, as in the instance of the "chiesa principale" of the cemetery of St. Agnes (v. Marchi, tav. xxxv. xxxvi. xxxvii.), or hexagonal, polygonal, or oblong excavations, without apse or any of the usual features of a church, such as the crypt discovered by Bosio in the cemetery of the Via Salaria Nuova, but not now accessible, which has been held to have been a church (v. Marchi, tav. xxxii.). In this an octagon of about 23 feet in diameter is connected by a doorway about 4 feet wide, with an oblong chamber about 12 feet wide by 32 long. [CATACOMBS.]

The so-called basilica of St. Hermes, in a cemetery near the Via Salaria Vecchia, of an oblong form, terminating in an apse, was, no doubt, reduced into its present form by Pope Hadrian I., as the *Lib. Pontif.* tells us of that pope that he "basilicam coemeterii sanctorum martyrum Hermetis, etc., mirae magnitudinis innovavit."

No church of the period of Constantine has come down to modern times in a complete state, but fortunately a contemporary writer (Eusebius) has left us such detailed accounts, that, with the assistance which we can obtain from existing remains, we can form a very complete picture of a church of that period.

The earliest church of the building of which we have a distinct account is that which Paulinus built in Tyre between A.D. 313 and A.D. 322. Eusebius (*Eccl. Hist.* bk. x. iv. s. 37) states that the bishop surrounded the site of the church with a wall of enclosure; this wall, according to Dr. Thomson (*The Land and the Book*, p. 189, c. xiii.) can still be traced, and measures 222 feet in length, by 129 in breadth. In the east side of this wall of inclosure he made a large and lofty portico (πρόπυλον), through which a quadrangular atrium (αἶθριον) was entered; this was surrounded by ranges of columns, the spaces between which were filled by net-like railings of wood. In the centre of the open space was a fountain, at which those about to enter the church purified themselves.

The church itself was entered through interior porticoes (τοῖς ἐνδοτάτω προπύλοις), perhaps a narthex, but whether or not distinct from the portico which bounded the atrium on that side does not appear. Three doorways led into the nave; the central of these was by far the largest, and had doors covered with bronze reliefs; other doorways gave entrance to the side aisles. Above these aisles were galleries well lighted (doubtless by external windows), and looking upon the nave; these were adorned with beautiful work in wood. The passage is rather obscure, and has been

variously translated: the above is the sense of Bunsen's paraphrase (*Basiliken des Christ. Roms*, s. 31). Hübsch (*Alt. Christ. Kirchen*, s. 75) thinks that the word εἰσβολαῖς (entrances) stands for windows, and that the woodwork was in them. It seems, however, more probable that the εἰσβολαῖ were the openings from the galleries into the nave, and the woodwork the railings or balustrades which protected their fronts.

The nave or central portion (βασιλῆος οἶκος) was constructed of still richer material than the rest, and the roof of cedar of Lebanon. Dr. Thomson states that the remains of five granite columns may still be seen, and that "the height to the dome was 80 feet, as appears by the remains of an arch." Nothing which Eusebius says leads to the supposition that it was covered by a dome, and the arch was probably the so-called triumphal arch through which, as at St. Paolo f. l. m. at Rome, and many other basilican churches, a space in front of the apse somewhat like a transept was entered. Hübsch has made a conjectural restoration of the church thus arranged.

The building, having been in such manner completed, Paulinus, we are told, provided it with thrones (θρόνους) in the highest places for the honour of the presidents (πρυέδρων), and with benches, or seats (βάθροις), according to fitness, and, placing the most holy altar (ἅγιον ἁγίων θυσιαστήριον) in the midst, surrounded the whole with wooden net-like railings of most skilful work, so that the enclosed space might be inaccessible to the crowd. The pavement, he adds, was adorned with marble decoration of every kind.

Then on the outside he constructed very large external buildings (ἐξεδραι) and halls (οἶκοι), which were attached to the sides of the church (τὸ βασιλῆιον), and connected with it by entrances in the hall lying between (ταῖς ἐπὶ τὸν μέσον οἶκον εἰσβολαῖς). These halls, we are told, were destined for those who still required the purification and sprinkling of water and of the Holy Ghost.

In A.D. 333 Constantine caused a basilica to be erected at Jerusalem near the site of the sepulchre of our Lord, which was either included in this building or in a circular or octagonal adjacent structure, the basilica being called ἐκκλησία Σωτήρος—church of the Saviour. What the plan and situation of these buildings were, and whether anything now existing be the remains of these buildings, are questions full of difficulty and have been the subject of much controversy (v. Fergusson, De Vogüé, *Eglises de la Terre-Sainte*).

To discuss the various theories and the arguments on which they are founded would occupy far too much space. Eusebius unfortunately has written of the subject in a somewhat rhetorical manner, so that the plan of the structure cannot be clearly made out, but some interesting particulars may be gathered from his account of the basilica.

It had (*Life of Constantine the Great*, lib. iii.) double porticoes or, as we should say, aisles (δίττων στοῶν), or rows of piers with colonades (παράσταδες) in two stories above and below or on the ground, which stretched throughout the whole extent (μήκει) of the temple.

CHRIST. ANT.

By καταγείων we should perhaps understand not subterranean but on a level with the ground, the "ἀνάγειαι" corresponding with the triforium of a mediæval church. Recent investigations have shewn that extensive subterranean galleries exist on a part of the site (according to Mr. Fergusson's views) of this church, but their character and date has as yet not been satisfactorily ascertained. The inner rows were of highly decorated piers, the exterior of enormous columns (iii. c. 37). If we understand as Bunsen (*Die Basiliken Roms*, s. 33) does, that the rows stretched across the front as well as along the sides, we may perhaps understand by interior (αἱ δὲ εἰς τῶν ἐμπροσθεν) those which ran lengthwise, and by the exterior (αἱ ἐπὶ προσώπου τοῦ οἴκου) those which ran across the front.

The three doors by which it was entered looked to the east. Opposite to these doors was the hemispherical head region (κεφάλαιον τοῦ παντὸς ἡμισφαίριον) of the whole; i. e. the apse. This was decorated with twelve columns, on which were as many large silver vessels. The walls were built of hewn stone in regular courses, and covered internally with slabs of variegated marble. The roofs were of wood richly carved and gilt, and covered externally with lead (c. 36).

Before the entrances was an atrium. There was a first court with porticoes, before which were the entrances of the court; then on the middle of the market-place the propylæa or outer gateways, whose magnificence astonished all who saw them. Mr. Fergusson thinks that the so-called golden gateway on the east side of the Haram enclosure, is one of these propylæa.

Another building in the Holy Land, the church at Bethlehem, has strong claims to be considered as the work of this period (v. De Vogüé, *Eglises de la Terre-Sainte*, p. 46). It has an oblong atrium, a vestibule divided into three portions, the central of which alone opens into the church, double aisles with columns of the Corinthian order, and at the end opposite to the atrium the transverse-triapsal arrangement—i. e. one apse at the end of the building, and two others, one at each end of a transept-like space; beneath the centre of this space is the crypt of the Nativity.

As to the churches built in Rome during the reign of Constantine much uncertainty exists; the *Liber Pontificalis* attributes to him the erection (in several cases at the request of Sylvester, then bishop of Rome) of seven churches in that city, and describes at much length the ornaments and vessels of precious metals with which they were decorated. As, however, these accounts are for the most part not confirmed by other authorities, and contain many matters of an improbable character, they are not generally accepted as trustworthy. That the churches of St. John Lateran, of St. Peter, Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme, and Sta. Costanza, were erected or converted into churches at this time is however universally admitted. Of the first nothing of the period of Constantine is now visible and no distinct account of its size or plan has come down to us. Of St. Peter's, though it no longer exists, we have a full account and careful drawings and plans. It will be seen by the accompanying woodcut that it was of the same type as the churches which Eusebius describes, a five-aisled basilica ending in an apse, before the front




of which was an atrium. It was a church of very large size, being 380 feet long by 212 wide, and covering above 80,000 English square feet; as much, as Mr. Fergusson remarks, as any mediæval cathedral except those of Milan and Seville. The transept, it will be seen, extends beyond the width of the nave. The interior range of columns would seem to have been of uniform dimensions and to have supported a horizontal entablature, the exterior range carried arches. Over the entablature was a lofty space of wall in later times divided into two layers of panels, each containing a picture, and above these were clerestory windows of great size, one over each intercolumniation. It is not certain that the prolongations of the transept beyond the walls of the nave are part of the original plans for Pope Symmachus (A.D. 498-514) is said in the *Liv. Pontif.* to have built two cubicula, or oratoria, in honour of St. John the Baptist and

five arched openings, of which that in the centre is the largest. These have been supposed by Kugler (*Gesch. der Baukunst*, i. 376) to have been originally windows; they are now built up, but it may be seen that the masses of wall which separate them were covered with thin plates of marble of two or more colours arranged in patterns. Above these openings are a like number of immense windows measuring, according to Ciampini (*Vet. Mon.* i. 75), about 28 feet high by 14 feet 6 inches wide.

The church of Sta. Pudenziana at Rome has also been assigned, with much apparent probability, to the earlier half of this century; it has been greatly modernized, but retains in the apse the finest early Christian mosaic in Rome (engraved in Gally Knight's *Italian Churches*, vol. i. pl. 23). This mosaic is assigned by most competent judges to the 4th century.

The other church at Rome which has been



St. Peter, Rome.

St. John the Evangelist. The "Confession" was a very small vault under the altar, and it is not quite clear that any vault at all was part of the original construction.

The basilica of Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme deserves notice as an instance of the alteration of a hall or civil basilica into a church. It formed part of the palace known as the Sessorium. When converted into a church a very large apse was added at the east end; this apse is enclosed by chapels, of which that on the south-east is covered by a cupola and is believed to be original, that on the north-east is of a later date. It can hardly be doubted that a chapel similar to that on the other side originally occupied the site. This is the only instance in Rome of this system of enclosing the apse, one which, as has been said, was common in Africa and in parts of the East.

The lateral walls of Sta. Croce are pierced by

mentioned as of the Constantinian period, Sta. Costanza, will be described when circular and polygonal churches are spoken of.

Other churches of the basilican type were constructed by order of Constantine, as the original church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, that of the Apostles and others at the same place, but all these have been destroyed or rebuilt.


Towards the end of this century (A.D. 386) the great church of St. Paul, beyond the walls (*fuor le mura*) at Rome, was commenced and, until the fire of 1822, remained far less altered than any other building of the period in or near that city. It resembled St. Peter's in size and in design, with the exceptions that the transept was of the same width as the nave, and that the columns of the nave supported arches instead of architraves. It was lighted by (according to Ciampini) 120 windows, each 29 feet high by 14 feet 6 inches wide.

The church of S. Stefano in Via Latina, built by Pope Leo I. (A.D. 440-461), had fallen into ruin and the remains become covered with earth. They were discovered in the year 1858, and present some points of interest. There is a double vestibule at the east end of the church, and a remarkable arrangement in front of the altar apparently arising from a wish to preserve a small oratory already existing on the spot, but what is still more interesting is that the plan of the "chorus cantorum" and enclosure of the altar can be traced, portions of the walls forming these enclosures existing; they were worked in stucco and painted. As this work has quite the character of the 5th century these are probably the earliest remains of the kind which have been noticed, if we except those on the basilica at D'Jemilah in Algeria, mentioned above. The pavement of large slabs of marble is also no doubt original.

The church of St. John Studios at Constanti-

Several churches in Central Syria are described by Count de Vogüé as belonging to this period.

The other principal type of church is, as has been said, the sepulchral or memorial, in the earlier examples usually circular in plan, in later not unfrequently polygonal. The models from which such buildings were originally developed were doubtless the sepulchres of a circular form, many of which were erected at Rome at the close of the Republican period and under the emperors. These structures were originally nearly solid, containing only small chambers; such are the tomb of Cecilia Metella and the tomb of Hadrian now enclosed in the castle of St. Angelo. In later examples, as in that of the Tossian family, and that of the Empress Helena (now commonly called Torre Pignatarra), the upper story is occupied by a chamber, taking up as much of the diameter as the necessity of making the wall strong enough to sustain a dome permitted. This chamber in some cases,




St. Paul, Rome.

nople, built A.D. 463, now a mosque known as Imrâchor-Dichamini, shows that as regards plan and design there was in the 5th century little difference between a basilican church in Rome and in Constantinople. This building has been well illustrated by Salzenberg (*Alt-Christliche Bruderkirche von Constantinopel*), and it will be seen from his plates that it consists of a portico or narthex, a nave and aisles divided by columns, carrying a horizontal architrave, and on this another colonnade supporting arches, so as to furnish spacious galleries over the aisles, and an apse semi-circular within, semi-hexagonal without. The proportion of width to length is greater than is usual in the basilican churches of Rome, perhaps an early indication of that preference for plans approaching to a square which Byzantine architecture afterwards so strongly manifests. The most characteristic feature is, however, the great size of the galleries, no doubt intended to be used as a gynæceum.

as in that of the Torre Pignatarra, was well lighted by large windows. From such a building to the church of Sta. Costanza the progress is easy, the external peristyle, as in Hadrian's tomb, was retained, and another was introduced into the interior on which the dome was supported. Some approach to a cruciform plan it will be seen was produced by grouping the twenty-four coupled columns which carry the dome in groups of six, and leaving a wider space between each group than between each pair of columns. A niche in the aisle wall corresponds to each inter-columniation, those corresponding to the wider intervals being of larger size than the others. In these larger niches sarcophagi were placed; one of porphyry now in the Museum at the Vatican, was removed from the niche opposite to the door. The external peristyle has been entirely destroyed. This building has been called a baptistery, but there is no trace nor record of the existence of

a piscina or font. The probability would appear to be that it was erected as a mausoleum for the Constantinian family. This building is about 100 feet in diameter, the dome being about 40.

If we admit Mr. Fergusson's theory that the 'Kubbet-es-Sakhra,' or 'Dome of the Rock,' is the building erected by order of Constantine over the sepulchre of our Saviour, it must be classed among memorial churches. This appropriation of the building has been the subject of much controversy, but in the present state of our knowledge the question can scarcely be satisfactorily decided. Whoever compares the engravings of the capitals in the church at Bethlehem, given by Count de Vogüé (*Eglises de la Terre Sainte*, p. 52) with that of the capitals in the 'Dome of the Rock' (*The Holy Sepulchre*, by James Fergusson, p. 68), must see that both are of one closely similar design and probably of the same date, which there can be little doubt is the earlier part of the 4th century. The 'Dome of the Rock' is an octagon 155 feet in diameter, with two aisles and a central dome, this is supported by four great piers, between each of which are three pillars supporting arches springing direct from their capitals; the space between these and the external wall is divided into two aisles by a screen of eight piers and



Sta. Costanza, Rome.

sixteen pillars—two pillars intervening between each pier. On the capitals of these pillars rest blocks which carry a frieze and cornice; these last carry arches above which was a second cornice. The whole building has undergone much alteration, and these capitals and friezes appear to be the best preserved portions of the original design.

It seems clear that one of two hypotheses must be held; either that the existing remains are those of a building of the period of Constantine, erected on the spot and still retaining their original architectural arrangement, or that portions of such a building have been removed from another site, and re-erected where we now find them.

Eusebius (*De Vita Constant.* iii. 50) tells us of another octagonal church erected by order of Constantine, of which no trace now remains. This was at Antioch; Eusebius describes it as of wonderful height, and surrounded by many chambers (*οἴκοις*) and exedrae (*ἐξέδραις*), which it would appear were entered from the galleries (*χωρημάτων*) which both above and below ground encircled the church.

A church was also built by Constantine at Constantinople (Eusebius, *Vita Constant.* iv. 58, 59) as a memorial church of the Apostles (*μαρτύριον ἐπὶ μνήμῃ τῶν ἀποστόλων*), and at the


same time as a place for his own burial. This building was destroyed by Justinian, and its precise form is unknown; but that it was in some manner cruciform appears from the distich of Gregory of Nazianzus, in the poem of the dream of Anastasius:—

Σὺν τοῖς καὶ μεγάλαιον ἔδος Χριστοῦ μαθητῶν  
Πλευραῖς σταυροτύποις τέτραχα τεμνόμενον.

It would seem that it stood in the centre of a large atrium, surrounded by porticoes. Bunsen (*Die Basiliken des Christl. Roms*, s. 36) thinks that in this edifice we may discern the germ of the Byzantine type of church.

It is a matter of some difficulty to distinguish between a sepulchral chapel or tomb and a memorial church; the one class in fact runs into the other, the distinction between them depending upon the object which the builder had in view; when he constructed a large edifice in which services were to be frequently held, still more if this building was intended to be the cathedral church of a bishop or the church of a district, the structure must be considered as a church, although it was also constructed in order to honour a martyr and to protect his tomb; when on the other hand it was of small size, and its primary object was to contain the tomb or tombs either of the builder or of some saint, it must be considered as only a sepulchral chapel although containing an altar, and although services were occasionally celebrated within it.

Several remarkable buildings of the 5th century belong to the first class. One of these is the church of St. George at Thessalonica, which consists of a circular nave 79 feet in diameter, covered by a dome, a chancel, and an apse; the walls of the nave are 20 feet thick, and in them are eight great recesses, two of which serve as entrances and one as a sort of vestibule to the chancel, the roof is covered with a magnificent series of mosaics. The cathedral at Bosrah, in the Haouran, the date of which is ascertained to be A.D. 512, has a plan with several points of similarity to that of St. George, particularly as regards the chancel.



Cathedral at Bosrah.


In Italy some circular churches were constructed to carry, not domes, but wooden roofs; of these the most remarkable example is St. Stefano Rotondo, at Rome, built between A.D. 467 and A.D. 483. This church had originally two aisles and is of very large size, having a diameter of about 210 feet.

The church of St. Lorenzo at Milan, once the cathedral of the city, is very remarkable, as shewing an attempt to combine the circular with the square plan. Its real date has not been ascertained, but it is probably of the earlier part of the 5th century. The main building has lost all original character through repairs, but according to Hübsch the original walls exist to a height of nearly 40 feet, and the ground plan may therefore be accepted as original.

It will be observed that chapels are annexed to the church on the north, south, and east; that on the north is supposed by Hubsch to have been a vestibule, that now called St. Aquilino on the south is thought to have been constructed as a baptistery, that on the east in all probability was constructed to serve as a sepulchral chapel, a purpose to which, whether it was originally destined or not, the chapel of St. Aquilino was also applied as early as the beginning of the 5th century, if the sarcophagus said to have contained the body of Ataulphus (ob. A.D. 415) really did so, and if this was its original place of deposit.

Hübsch, however, gives it as his opinion, founded chiefly on the character of the brickwork, that the chapels are later in date than the main church.

In this instance we have the two classes, the memorial church and the sepulchral chapel, in juxtaposition. A few instances of the latter class remain to be mentioned, and firstly the two large circular edifices which stood on the north side of St. Peter's at Rome, one of which was afterwards called the church of St. Andrew,



St. Stefano Rotondo, Rome.

and the other having been the sepulchre of Honorius, or at least of his two wives (*Besch. der Stadt Rom.*, II. i. 95), was afterwards dedicated to St. Petronilla.

The building of the church of St. Andrew is attributed to Pope Symmachus (A.D. 498–514) on the authority of the *Lib. Pontif.*, but the position and connexion of the buildings was such that it seems probable that both were built at the same time, which was apparently that of the Emperor Honorius. According to the plans which have come down to us they had no apses, but seven square-ended recesses in the thickness of the walls. They were of large size, about 100 feet in diameter.

A still existing building of the same class is the chapel at Ravenna, built by the Empress Galla Placidia (ob. 450), which, though more properly a sepulchral chapel than a church, cannot be wholly passed over here. It is in plan a Latin cross without an apse: from the intersection of the arms rises a tower enclosing a small dome. This example is of peculiar interest, as the earliest known instance of this plan which after-

wards came to be so extensively used in Western Europe. Recent excavations have shown that the chapel was originally entered by a portico, which was in connexion with the atrium or narthex of the adjacent church of Sta. Croce. (De Rossi, *Bull. di Archeol. Crist.* 1866, p. 73.)

A further account of sepulchral chapels will be found under CHAPEL.

Although heathen temples were in consequence of their plans little suited for adaptation to Christian worship, they were occasionally during the earlier centuries of the Christian era, as well as in later times, converted to this purpose. One of the most remarkable early examples of this transformation is that of the temple of Venus at Aphrodisias, in Caria, where the original building was enclosed by a wall and an apse added at one end, the cella demolished, the columns of the posticum removed and placed in a line with the lateral columns, and a wall pierced with windows was raised on the lateral colonnades so as to form a clerestory. A church was thus formed of large size, about 200 feet long by 100 feet wide. Messrs. Texier and Pullan (*Byz. Arch.* p. 89) believe this transformation to have taken place between the periods of Constantine and of Theodosius.

The period of Justinian is one of special importance in the history of ecclesiastical architecture. From this time the basilican plan went, in the East, almost or entirely out of use, and a modification of the plan of St. Sophia was almost exclusively adopted, the modified plan being a quadrangular figure approaching a square with a dome covering the centre, and a large internal porch or narthex at the entrance. This plan, however, did not originate with the architect of St. Sophia, the germ of it is perhaps to be found in the domed oratories or Kalybés of Syria; from such a simple dome—a building like the cathedral of Ezra, in which the dome is surrounded by an aisle, and an apse added—is readily derived, this example dates from A.D. 510; and if to such a plan a narthex be added, we have the typical Byzantine plan, as in the church of SS. Sergius and Bacchus at Constantinople, built under Justinian, but somewhat earlier than St. Sophia. The peculiar feature of the latter church is the placing of the dome not upon piers and arches on every side, but upon semi-domes east and west, by which means a vast space, more than 200 feet long by 100 feet wide, totally unencumbered by piers or columns, was obtained. This construction has, however, never been copied in Christian churches, but it has served as a model for the mosques of Constantinople.

All the minuter peculiarities of construction and of detail, however, henceforward prevail in the East, to the exclusion of the Roman style, which previously was in use. In the West, examples of Byzantine character continue to be very rare. St. Vitale at Ravenna is perhaps the only prominent example, until a much later period. The church of St. Sophia is, however, in itself a monument of such importance as to require to be noticed in some detail.

It is a building of very considerable dimensions, covering about 70,000 square feet, exclusive of the portions of the atrium (or exo-narthex), the baptistery, and other annexed buildings.

From the exo-narthex, the principal or exo-




narthex, 205 feet in length internally, by 26 feet in breadth, is entered. The principal mass of the building forms nearly a square 235 feet north and south, by 250 feet east and west, with an apse projecting on the east side. The central dome is 107 feet in diameter by 48 feet in height, and rises 180 feet from the floor. The semi-domes are of the same diameter. The aisles are spacious, but, in consequence of the exigencies of the constructional arrangement, are so divided as

with ornaments in relief; but those now existing do not seem to be of the period of Justinian.

All the columns, capitals, &c., are of porphyry or marble. The floors and all other flat spaces are covered with marble slabs of the richest colours, the domes and curved surfaces with gold ground mosaic.

Little is known as regards the precise position of the various fixed appliances by which the church was fitted for divine worship. The altar



St. Sophia, Constantinople.

to form rather a series of chambers than continuous galleries. There is, it will be seen, but one apse, in front of which is a shallow chancel space, covered by a barrel-vault. On the upper floor are chambers corresponding with those below, which furnished places for women.

The windows are filled with slabs of marble, pierced with square openings filled with thick pieces of cast glass. When the windows are large they are divided into three or six parts by columns and architraves. The doors are of bronze,

is supposed to have stood in the chancel space or bema, in front of the apse; the iconostasis appears, according to Salzenberg, to have been placed at the western end of the bema, and to have been about 14 feet high. From the poem of Paul the Silentary, we learn that it was of silver, had three doors, the central the largest, and 12 columns raised on a stylobate, and was adorned with figures (probably bust figures) of our Lord, the Virgin Mary, Prophets and Apostles, in discs or medallions. Whether these figures were in the

free, as Salzenberg supposes, or between the columns, is not certain; but, as the Silentiary says of the altar, that it was not fit that the eyes of the multitude should look on it, it would seem probable that they filled the spaces between the columns, making a solid iconostasis, as in modern Greek churches.


The altar was of table form, supported by columns, and of gold, decorated with precious stones; over it was a splendid ciborium of silver, from the arches of which hung curtains with

where they were situated. It would seem probable that the compartment north of the apse was the prothesis and that south, the diaconicon.

The seat for the emperor was on the south side, and near the diaconicon; that for the empress, also on the south side, but in one of the central divisions of the triforium.

The circular building was the sacristy, the rectangular, the baptistery.

The same emperor, also, built a church at Constantinople—that of St. Sergius, now called



St. Sophia, Constantinople.

figures of our Lord, St. John the Baptist, St. Paul, and others, woven in silk and gold.

The circumference of the apse was occupied by the synthronon or seats for the patriarch and bishops. These were of silver-gilt, separated by shafts, probably carrying canopies.


Paul the Silentiary says nothing as to the chorus or place for the readers and singers, except that the iconostasis divided the portion set apart for the celebration of the mysteries from that of the "many-tongued multitude" (*πολυγλώσσου πλήθος*). This seems to show that the chorus extended from the iconostasis to the ambo, which the same authority states to have stood nearly in the middle of the church, but rather towards the east. This space may, however, have been divided into two parts; one, the soleas, to the east, set apart for the priests, deacons, and sub-deacons; the other for the readers and singers. The soleas is said by Codinus to have been originally of onyx, but made by Justinian of gold (*χρυσῶς*). In the same passage it is said that the ambo was made of gold. We should no doubt understand in both cases that the true meaning of the passage is that much gilding was employed as a decoration. In the case of the soleas the gilding may probably have been applied to the seats or stalls for the priests.

It would appear from the measurement given by Evagrius (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. cap. xxxi.) that the holy couch (*θυσία κλίνη*) commenced at the western end of the eastern semi-dome, possibly therefore the line of division between the enclosures for the superior and inferior clerics ran at this point, the chorus for the readers and singers, extending thence to the ambo.

Two compartments, known as the prothesis and diaconicon, are mentioned by Byzantine writers, but it has been a matter of dispute

where they were situated. It would seem probable that the compartment north of the apse was the prothesis and that south, the diaconicon. In this the peculiar form of capitals and treatment of foliage, which are characteristic of Byzantine art, are fully shown.

The church of S. Vitale at Ravenna, built between 526 and 547, is, as Mr. Fergusson has




St. Vitale, Ravenna.

remarked, so far as the arrangement of the dome, of the galleries, and of the pillars which support them, almost identical with St. Sergius. But S. Vitale has a sort of clerestory below the dome, which is raised about 20 feet higher. The arrangement of the aisles, choir, and exterior walls differ, it will be seen, very much; and it would seem that the architect had studied the building at Rome known as the Temple of Minerva Medica. S. Vitale is thoroughly By-

santine in detail, and, in spite of most tasteless repairs and additions, still retains much that is characteristic and interesting, especially in the choir, the lower part of which is lined with slabs of precious marbles, and the upper with the well-known mosaics.

interior apse are innovations upon the original plan.

Another basilican church of the period of Justinian is that of Dana, between Antioch and Btr. This, likewise, has a single apse, but the end of the church is a straight line, oblong



*S. Vitale, Ravenna.*

While, however, churches with domes were constructed, basilican churches were also built. In connection with that of St. Sergius at Constantinople, was a basilican church dedicated to SS. Peter and Paul, which has been destroyed. The church of the monastery of St. Catharine, on Mount Sinai, which still exists, is basilican. It has never as yet been well illustrated; but the

apartments—no doubt to serve for the prothesis and diaconicon—being placed one on each side. It is remarkable that the arch of the apse is of the horseshoe form, and those of the nave are very much stilted. The capitals are Roman in character.

The finest example of a basilican church of this period is, however, that of S. Apollinare in



*S. Apollinare in Classe, Ravenna.*

detail of the capitals appears to be more Roman than Byzantine. It is a basilica with one apse; but in order to form a chapel for the supposed site of the burning bush, an interior apse has been formed. At the sides are four chapels, but it would seem probable that the chapels and the

Classe, at Ravenna, dedicated in 549. Here the eastern ends of the aisles are parted off, and terminate in apses, of which arrangement this is, perhaps, the earliest instance of which the date is well ascertained. It is a church of very noble proportions, and retains the decorations of

the apse in marble and mosaic, is a very complete state. The capitals are, as seems to be usual in the basilican churches of this period, more Roman than Byzantine in character. Upon the capital rests a block or dormer, ornamented with a cross, as in many other churches of the time.


Attached to the west front is a tall circular tower of seven stages, which is probably of the same age, and perhaps the earliest extant example of a church tower. Though, according to Hübner (*Alt. Christl. Kirchen*, p. 34), the lower part of the tower standing near the cathedral of Ravenna may probably date from the previous century, and parts of some other towers, both at Rome and at Ravenna, may belong to the beginning of the 6th. Attached to the church of S. Vitale at Ravenna are two small round towers, which have perhaps never been carried to their full intended height.

The cathedral of Parenzo in Istria, built circ. A.D. 542, is too interesting to be passed over, particularly as it has undergone extremely little alteration, and retains the atrium before the front, and the baptistery opening from the atrium on the side opposite to the church—the baptistery, unfortunately, in a semi-ruinous state. Here, it will be seen, the aisles have apsidal ends internally, but the wall is flat externally. The apse is of peculiar interest, retaining the cathedra for the bishop and the bench for the clergy, in apparently an unaltered state, while the wall behind, to about one half of its height, is covered with an extremely rich and tasteful decoration in "opus sectile," the patterns being composed of pieces of the richest marbles, lapis lazuli, and mother-of-pearl. Above the cathedra is a cross standing on a globe, and figures of dolphins, tridents, cornucopias, and burning candles are sparingly introduced among the patterns of architectural character. On the west front, and on the east and above the apse, are remains of fresco paintings of an early date. In this church, although basilican in plan, the capitals are Byzantine in character.

To this account of individual churches it may perhaps be desirable to add, for the sake of giving a clearer idea of what a church of the period which has been under consideration was, an attempt to reconstruct in imagination such a building in a complete state with its fittings and decorations. Existing remains, with the assistance to be derived from the writers of the time, allow this to be done with sufficient assurance of accuracy. A basilican church of the first class in Rome,


Constantinople, or one of the larger cities of the Roman Empire, may be thus described.

A stately gateway gave admittance to a large court (atrium) surrounded by covered colonnades, in the centre of which was a fountain or a vase (cantharus) containing water, so that ablutions might be performed before the church was en-



S. Apostolorum in Classe, Ravenna.

tered. On one side of this atrium and entered from it was the baptistery. The basilica itself was usually, when the circumstances of the site permitted, placed on the western side of the atrium, so that the rising sun shone on its front. This



PLAN.

front was pierced by three or five doorways according to the number of the aisles, and in that part which rose above the colonnade of the atrium, windows of immense size admitted light to the interior; the wall between and above these windows was covered sometimes, in parts, with mosaic of glass in gold and colour, but usually with plates of richly coloured marbles and porphyries arranged so as to form patterns;



sometimes, however, stucco painted was the cheaper substitute. When the building was, as was always the case at Rome, of brick, the same decoration, by means of marble slabs or of stucco, was, if not actually carried out, in all probability almost always projected for the whole exterior of the building. In only one case at Rome—that of the transept of S. Pietro in Vincoli, built A.D. 442—is the finish of the brickwork such as to lead to the conclusion that it was intended to remain uncovered.

The doors were of bronze adorned with sculptures in relief, and frequently gilt, or of wood, often richly inlaid or carved. Curtains of the richest stuffs, often of purple or scarlet, embroidered with gold, hung at the doors, to exclude the heat of summer or the cold of winter while the doors stood open.

In the interior the whole floor was covered either with tessellated pavements or with slabs of many-coloured marbles arranged in beautiful patterns. The aisles were separated from the nave by ranges of marble columns whose capitals supported either arches or horizontal architraves. The great width of the nave, in a first-class basilica frequently more than 80 feet, and the forest of columns on either hand (one of the colonnades often containing 24 or more columns) when there were double aisles, produced an architectural effect of great magnificence. The clerestory wall was pierced by numerous immense windows with arched heads, one of which was over each intercolumniation. These windows were no doubt divided by columns or pilasters and architraves, and the divisions fitted with slabs of marble pierced in a variety of patterns—these perforations were in many or most cases fitted with talc, alabaster, or other transparent or semi-transparent stones, or with glass either plain or coloured.

The roof was flat and of wood, where magnificence was sought it was richly adorned with carving and gilt. The semi-dome which covered the apse was covered with mosaic pictures, the subject being usually Christ, either seated or standing, with his apostles ranged on each hand. The earliest existing example of this arrangement is in the church of Sta. Pudenziana at Rome, which although it has been much injured and largely repaired, still shows so much goodness of style that it can hardly be attributed to a later date than the 4th century. Where a transept existed it was usually divided from the nave by an arch, the face of which fronting the nave was often also covered with mosaics; a colossal bust of Christ was often the central object of the picture, being placed over the crown of the arch, while on either side and below are represented the seven candlesticks, the symbols of the evangelists, and the twenty-four elders.

Details as to the arrangement of the fittings of churches will be found under the respective heads; it may be sufficient here to say that the apse was furnished with a bench following its circumference for the higher clergy, in the centre of which was a raised seat (cathedra) for the bishop; that the altar was usually placed on the chord of the apse at the top of a flight of steps, and parted off from the nave by railings (cancelli); below it was often a platform or space (soleas), and beyond this a quadrangular, usually oblong, enclosure (chorus, presbyterium;

the last perhaps improperly), in which the singers and readers were stationed. This enclosure was formed by railings or dwarf walls, and connected with these was the ambo or reading desk. At Rome, and probably elsewhere, a space on either side of the chorus was also railed in, that on the right being called 'senatorium,' and appropriated to senators or other men of rank, that on the left, called 'matroneum,' to women of the same degrees. Where a gallery, or, as we now say, a triforium existed, it was set apart for women, but this arrangement was not very common in the West.

Benches or other seats were probably provided in the chorus, the senatorium, and the matroneum, but the rest of the church was left altogether open and free. These seats were either of marble or of carved wood, in many instances gilded, the railings of the same materials or of bronze. Over the altar was a lofty and richly decorated canopy (ciborium), from the arches of which hung curtains of stuffs of the richest colours interwoven with gold. Like curtains often depended from the arches of the nave, and hung at the doors. Vases, crowns, and lamps of silver or of gold hung from the arches, or were placed upon the dwarf walls or partitions which separated the various divisions of the edifice.

According to the proposed plan, the history of the ecclesiastical architecture of the period which follows, viz. from the death of Justinian to that of Charlemagne, will be treated of under separate sections.

IV. *The Period from the death of Justinian to the death of Charlemagne.*—1. *The western part of the territory of the Eastern Empire.*—During the reign of the Emperor Justinian, churches were built on the basilican plan, as well as on one derived probably in part from such churches as that at Ezra, in central Syria, in part from the circular or polygonal churches which had been constructed throughout Christendom. Soon after the time of Justinian the basilican type was no longer followed, but a peculiar plan was adopted, that in which the building assumes a form approaching to a square, the central part being covered by a dome placed on a drum pierced with windows. The period which followed the death of Justinian was one of political trouble, and hence examples of the progress of Byzantine architecture during the latter part of the 6th and the 7th centuries are somewhat deficient. The church of St. Clement at Ancyra, however, probably belongs to this period, as the dome is raised on a low drum pierced with windows; in plan the church approximates to that of the later Greek churches. The church of St. Irene at Constantinople, which may probably date from the earlier half of the 8th century, shows a further advance, as the dome is there raised on a lofty drum pierced with windows; some features of the earlier plan are, however, preserved, as there is only one apse, and as its form is oblong. The church of St. Nicholas at Myra is perhaps more modern than either; it has a double narthex, three apses, a lesser on each side of the larger, and a dome raised on a drum in which are windows. If the remains of the iconostasis and ciborium shewn in plate lviii. of Texier and Pullan's *Byzantine*

*Architecture* are those of the original construction, the whole space east of the dome was parted off from the bema. This church is of considerable dimensions, about 100 feet in extreme length by 60 wide in the eastern part, the narthexes extending in width to about 115 feet.

Another church of much interest, and probably of about the same date, is that which exists in ruins near the remains of the ancient Trabea in Lycia.


2. *Armenia and the adjacent provinces.*—The churches remaining in these countries have not as yet been studied with sufficient care and knowledge to allow very satisfactory conclusions to be formed as to the real dates of those now existing. The Persian invasions in the 5th and 6th centuries, and the Mahomedan conquest in the 7th, must have caused damage and destruction to a great portion of the older buildings; a high antiquity is nevertheless claimed for several churches, but how much of the existing building is really of early date, is very uncertain.

One of the earliest is apparently that at Dighour near Ani in Armenia, which Mr. Ferguson thinks may be referred to the 7th century. It bears an evident resemblance in style, though not much in plan, to some of the churches of the Sassanid dating from the previous century.

triforium carried over the aisles and along the wall of the front. At S. Lorenzo the aisle roofs have been destroyed, but no doubt once existed. In other respects they do not differ from the earlier churches.

The church of Ss. Vincenzo ed Anastasio alle tre Fontane, near Rome, founded 625-638 and rebuilt 772-785, is however very remarkable in an architectural point of view, as it is not constructed with columns taken from older buildings, but altogether of new material and with considerable originality.

In the early part of the 9th century three churches were built in Rome by Pope Paschal I. (817-824), Sta. Prassede, Sta. Cecilia, and Sta. Maria, in Domenica. All still exist, and though badly injured by repairs and alterations, still present very much that is interesting and original. The first has a nave and aisles, a transept, and a single apse. The columns dividing the nave from the aisles are antique and support an entablature, the ranges are broken by three oblong piers, which carry arches spanning the nave, but these, according to Hübsch, are not original, but inserted not very long after the construction of the building. The transept is entered from the nave by a triumphal arch, the front and soffit of which



Ss. Vincenzo ed Anastasio.

The church of St. Hripsime near Etchmiadzin is believed by Dr. Neale (*Holy Eastern Church*, i. 204) to date from the 6th century, and he considers its peculiar plan to have been the form followed in a large proportion of the Armenian and Georgian churches. The germ of the arrangement, however, exists in the cathedral of Bosrah in the Sassanid of A.D. 512.

The two recesses in these Armenian churches which flank the apse in which the altar stood, were doubtless used for the prothesis and diaconicon, but to what use the other two were applied must be matter of conjecture.

The primatial church of Armenia, that of Etchmiadzin, has something of the same arrangement, but wants the western chamber. It was probably founded in 524, but underwent many alterations and reparations, one very important one in 705.

The church of Usunlar is said to have been erected between 718 and 726; its plan is rather Byzantine than distinctively Armenian.

3. *Italy.*—In Rome but few important works were undertaken during the 6th, 7th, or 8th centuries, the rebuilding of S. Lorenzo fuori le Mura (578-590) (the present choir), and of S. Agnese (625-638) were among the most considerable undertakings. These buildings are alike in one respect, viz. that they have a gallery or

are covered with mosaics, as are also the apse and the wall on each side of it. All these were placed there by Pope Paschal, and are most valuable monuments of the state of art of his period.

Below the raised tribune is a "confessio"—a vault under the high altar. The west end of the transept (the church standing nearly north and south) was at an early time parted off by a wall, and on this a low tower has been raised. The part thus walled off is of peculiar interest, as perhaps no portion of a church of so early a date remains in so unaltered a state. The walls are covered with remains of frescoes which seem to be coeval with the mosaics, and the windows retain the pierced slabs of marble, the apertures of which still contain fragments of the laminae of talc through which light was admitted.


The chapel of S. Zeno, attached to the east side of the nave, has been noticed under CHAPEL. The doorway leading into it is of great interest to the architectural antiquary, as it shows that in the beginning of the 9th century the prevalent style of ornament was that formed by knots or plaited patterns of the same character as those in use in England and elsewhere between A.D. 700 and A.D. 1000. The execution is feeble, scratchy, and irregular.

Sta. Cecilia has been greatly altered, but

retains very interesting mosaics, also the work of Pope Paschal. The distribution and subjects are much the same as those at Sta. Prassede.

The Roman churches of this date, however inferior in style to those of the earlier period, must have presented an appearance of equal splendour; mosaic and precious marbles were not spared, nor doubtless gilded roofs. Doors were of bronze, or even of more costly materials, for Honorius I. is said in the *Lib. Pontif.* to have covered the doors of the Vatican basilica with silver weighing 975 lbs.

Examples of churches of the period under consideration, with well-ascertained dates, are not so readily to be found in other parts of Italy as in Rome; but a few buildings exist which can be assigned on historical data to this period, the character of which is quite in accordance with that of those of other countries whose date can be ascertained. Such are the Duomo Vecchio and Sta. Giulia at Brescia, and SS. Apostoli at Florence. The first of these is by some assigned to the latter part of the 7th century, by others, with greater probability, to about A.D. 774; it is a large circular church about 125 feet in diameter, covered by a dome of 65 feet internal diameter; it is extremely plain, having no shafts or columns, but piers carrying square-edged



Duomo Vecchio, Brescia.

arches springing from very simply moulded impost; the whole is roughly and irregularly built.

Sta. Giulia forms part of a convent founded by Desiderius, King of the Lombards (757-773) and is a basilican church.

SS. Apostoli at Florence is believed on respectable authority to have been dedicated in the presence of Charles the Great; it is a small basilican church with antique columns, probably brought from Fiesole.

The Duomo of Torcello, near Venice, is believed to have been originally built in the 7th century, but largely repaired or rebuilt in A.D. 1000. It is on the basilican plan, with ranges of columns dividing the nave from the aisles; it is particularly interesting, as preserving in a more perfect state than elsewhere the internal arrangement of the apse, the bishop's cathedra being placed against the central point of the curve at the top of a flight of steps, on either side of which are six concentric ranges of steps for the presbyters; the altar is placed on a platform in front, and a screen divides the presbytery or choris from the nave. Under the apse is a small crypt. In front of the church

are the traces of a baptistery, square externally, octagonal within. The apse is flanked by two minor apses, which may probably date from the rebuilding. This church has much resemblance to the cathedral of Parenzo in Istria. Close to its west front stands the small church of Sta. Fosca, which by some is believed to be of the same date as the Duomo, by others is referred to the 9th or 10th century. S. Giovanni in Fonte, the baptistery of the Cathedral of Verona, though much altered and repaired, probably dates from a period not later than the 9th century; it is a small building with nave, aisles, and apse.

4. *France, Germany, and Switzerland.*— Though many and large churches were constructed in the opulent cities of the Roman provinces of Gallia during the period of Roman occupation, nothing has come down to our time except a few fragments. The description given by Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* xii.) of the gilded roof, the glass mosaic of the walls, the variously coloured marbles, and the stony wood of columns seems to shew that in their pristine glory the churches of Lyons or of "opulent Vienna" were little inferior in splendour to those of the imperial city.

Churches continued to be constructed under the rule of the Teutonic conquerors, although doubtless of much diminished magnificence. Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 14) describes the basilica built by Perpetuus at Tours, in honour of Eustochius, in the following words: "Habet in longum pedes centum sexaginta, in latum sexaginta; habet in altum usque ad cameram pedes quadringenta quinque, fenestras in altario triginti duas, in capso viginti; ostia octo, tria in altario, quinque in capso."

Hübisch (*Alt-Christ. Kirchen*, pl. xlviii. figs. 6 and 7) has made a conjectural plan and section of this church, believing it to have been planned as parallel-triapsal.

The same historian (ii. 16) describes the church built by St. Namatius at Clermont, as 150 feet long, 60 feet broad, and 50 feet high, with a round apse, and aisles on each side. It had, he says, 42 windows, 70 columns, and 8 doors. The walls of the altarium were adorned with "Opus sarsurium," i.e. sectile work, of various marbles.

At Perigueux are said (J. H. Parker, *Archæologia*, xxxvii. 248) to be remains of a church of this period, remarkable as having barrel vaults carried on arches transversely across the aisles. At Beauvais, attached to the cathedral, is a portion, no doubt the nave and aisles, of a much earlier church known as the Basse Oeuvre; it closely resembles in character the buildings in Italy, such as SS. Vincenzo ed Anastasio near Rome, which are believed to date from the 7th or 8th centuries; but it may even be older, as it is simply a building Roman in style, and so plain as to give none of that assistance towards the formation of an opinion as to the date which mouldings or ornament afford. The great size of the windows is, however, perhaps, an indication of early date. Several other smaller examples of like character are said to exist within the diocese of Beauvais.

In the baptistery at Poitiers we have an example of a somewhat more ambitious attempt at classical architecture; but the manner is

which the ornamental pieces are put together denotes an utter barbarism and want of architectural knowledge or taste.

Somewhat akin to this building are some churches not far from the Loire, as St. Genèreux near Poitiers, Savenières in Anjou, &c.; both these shew a reminiscence of Roman methods of building, and the former has much decoration by triangular pediments and a sort of mosaic in brickwork, probably a variety of the opus sarcurum of Gregory of Tours. The buildings of this class are ascribed by the French antiquaries with much probability to the period from the 6th to the 8th century.

In the valley of the Rhone and the adjacent territories, where are abundance of remains of Roman architecture and plenty of excellent and durable freestone, the classical models were so well copied for several centuries that it is matter of great doubt to what date many buildings should be assigned. One very characteristic example is

work, but the imposts generally are of the rudest kind, though one or two shew mouldings of a somewhat complicated character and apparently properly cut, whether these are the work of a later time or not is not clear. Beneath the central tower is a sort of cupola resting on pendentives, and pierced in the centre with a large orifice.

When, however, the influence of Charler the Great, whose regard for architecture is well known, began to make itself felt, we find a marked improvement in architecture; besides the most remarkable monument of his reign, the minster of Aix-la-Chapelle, we have several other churches erected either under him or his immediate successors, which enable us to form a definite conception of the style of the period.

Before these are described one building of very anomalous character should however be mentioned, this is the gateway at Lorsch, not far from Worms. It is a two-storied parallelogram,



Avignon

the porch of the cathedral of Avignon, which has all the character of a building of the lower empire, but in Mr. Fergusson's opinion is not older than the Carolingian era. The same ornaments are found on this porch and in the interior of the church, and it would therefore seem that the whole building is of about the same date.

In the Jura, not far from Orbe, at the convent of Romain-motier, a church was dedicated in A.D. 753 by Pope Stephen II., and the nave, transepts, and tower now existing, are believed to be those of the original structure. The two-storied narthex Mr. Fergusson thinks may be a century or two, but Blavignac (*Hist. de l'Architecture Sacrée*, &c.) only a little later. The columns of the nave are circular masses, only three diameters in height, corbelled out square at the top, the bases quadrangular blocks. The arches have a sunk face, but no ornament or moulding. Some shafts in the eastern part of the church have capitals rudely imitating Roman

the lower storey pierced with three large archways, and was no doubt the gateway leading into the atrium of the church of the monastery, of which class of buildings this is perhaps the only existing example (at least in the west), of an early date.

The most remarkable and most authentic work of the period in Germany or France is the minster of Aix-la-Chapelle, the original character of which, though hidden by repairs and mistaken attempts at decoration, can still be satisfactorily ascertained: it was commenced in 786, and dedicated in 804; it is externally a polygon of sixteen sides, to the west is attached a tower-like building, flanked by two circular towers containing staircases. What the original arrangement of the east end was is unfortunately unknown, as in the 14th century it was replaced by a new choir. The building is about 105 feet, the dome 47 feet 6 inches in diameter, and the latter rises about 100 feet above the floor.

In the interior are eight compound piers,



made up of rectangular figures and without shafts, which support plain round arches; the triforium is very lofty, and the arches opening from this into the central space have screens of columns in two stories, the lower carrying arches while the upper run up to the arch which spans the openings. Above there are eight round-headed windows, and the whole is covered by an octagonal dome. The columns of the triforium are antique, and so it would appear were their capitals; the bases seem to have been made for the building, and according to Kugler (*Gesch. der Baukunst*, i. 409) are very shapeless. The best preserved part of the interior is the belfry over the porch; this is covered with a plain waggon vault, and shews plain rectangular piers with moulded bases, and imposts carrying equally plain arches. The severely simple character of the building is very well seen in this chamber, which is on a level with and originally opened into the triforium. The dome was once covered with mosaic, which has wholly disappeared; but Ciampini (*Vet. Mon.* ii. 41) has engraved a part of it, three of the eight segments of which it was composed. In the central of these is a colossal figure of Christ seated on a throne, surrounded by concentric rings of colour representing the rainbow, the ground on which this figure was placed was golden with red stars, below are seven of the twenty-four elders of the Apocalypse. The simple grandeur of this picture must have harmonized well with the whole character of the building. The triforium would seem to have been paved with mosaic and other pavements brought from Ravenna or Rome: two fragments still remain, one of black and white tesserae, the other of sectile work, in marble slabs of various colours. The fronts of the openings from the triforium to the central space are protected by cancelli of bronze, doubtless also brought from Ravenna or Rome; they are of several patterns, some of classical Roman character, others Byzantine.

A vault is said to exist beneath the centre of the church, and to have served as the burial-place of the great emperor; but it is not accessible, and nothing seems to be known as to its character. The western doors are of bronze.

The exterior is very plain, the only ornament being some pilasters at the angles of the drum of the dome; these have capitals of classical character, but in their wasted state it would be difficult to decide whether they are really antique or copies of antique work.

A document of the utmost value as affording information as to the arrangements of a large conventual church, is the plan preserved in the public library of St. Gall, and first published by Mabillon (*Ann. Ben. Ord.*). It appears to have been sent to Abbot Gozpertus, who began to rebuild the church and monastery in A.D. 829, and very probably was prepared by Eginhard, who was prefect of the royal buildings under Charles the Great. The annexed cut represents that part which contains the church and its appendages.

The plan is without scale, and little or no reliance can be placed on the proportional size of the parts, as Professor Willis has observed; the church is said, in legends written upon it, to be 200 feet long and 80 feet broad; but in the plan, if we assume the length to be 200 feet,


the breadth would be only 56 feet. The drawing must no doubt be considered rather as a scheme for a great monastery than as a plan to be carried out by an architect; its peculiarities will be readily seen; first among these are the apses at each end, an arrangement afterwards common in Germany, but of which we have no earlier instance. The circular towers are also remarkable. At the east end the drawing is confused by the attempt to shew both the crypt and the choir; the space marked by slanting lines bears in the original the legend "*involutio arcuum*," and no doubt is meant to represent an arched passage, from whence proceeds a short passage to the confession.

The church of Granson, near the lake of Neuchâtel, according to Mr. Fergusson, is of the Carolingian era, though others are disposed to place it in the 11th century.

In France the most important examples of the Carolingian period seem to be the nave of the church of Mortier en Der, near Vassy, which exhibits a style very nearly akin to that of the Minster of Aix-la-Chapelle, and the remains of the church of St. Martin at Angers. This last was founded some years before 819, as the Empress Hermengarde, who died in that year was the foundress, and was interred within it. It consisted of a nave and aisles, a central tower, and a rather long transept; the eastern part having been replaced by a choir of the 12th century. The piers separating the nave from the aisles are oblong, but chamfered at the angles, and carry plain unmoulded arches of rectangular section; there is no triforium, but a clerestory of windows of rather long proportion. The tower has a dome which originally sprang from the capitals of four massive circular pillars, which, as they are engaged in the piers which carry the tower, shew only the fourth of a circle. The capitals have some shallow carving, chiefly patterns of plaited work. In several parts of the church two or three courses of flat bricks are introduced between the courses of stonework.

The church of Germigny-sur-Loire is a building of very remarkable character, and in it, incised on the abaci of the two eastern capitals of the tower piers, is an inscription recording its dedication in 806. The plan, it will be seen, is peculiar, having a tower in the middle of a square, with an apse projecting from three of the faces, and two small apses flanking the eastern apse. The piers are square, and have imposts of blocks and some knotwork in shallow relief. Among the most peculiar features are the small shafts attached to the piers at the entrance of the eastern apse. These recall some of the details of Romain-motier, as the imposts do those of St. Martin at Angers.

5. *Spain*.—As in Gaul, little or nothing remains in Spain of the churches built before the invasion of the barbarians; and those which the latter constructed were destroyed by the Arabs. Some capitals and fragments, probably of enclosures of '*chori cantorum*,' exist at Cordova ('*Monumentos Arquitectónicos de España*'), and some other fragments and capitals have been found at Toledo on the sites of the basilicas of St. Leocadia, built A.D. 600, and of St. Gines, said to date from the 8th century ('*El arte Latino—Bizantino en España*,' by Don José Ama-



Plan of St. Gall.

- AA. The Church.  
 B. The Abbot's Lodging.  
 C. The Public School.  
 D. The Hospitium or Guest House.  
 E. The Refectory.  
 F. Residence of Doctor, with Garden of medical herbs.  
 G. Another small double-apsed Church, joined by wall across centre.  
 H. Greenhouse and Vestibule.

- I. Great Cloister.  
 J. Refectory.  
 K. Kitchen.  
 L. Wine Cellar.  
 M. Dormitory, with various dependent buildings.  
 N. Another Hospitium, apparently for inferior class of guests.  
 O. Paddock for horses, cattle, sheep, &c.  
 P. Pond.

- RR. Open space or paradise. (That to the west is surrounded by an open semicircular porch, by which the public were to gain access to the Church.)  
 S. Vestry.  
 T. Library.  
 U. Archbishop's House.  
 V. Porter's House.  
 X. Furnace.  
 Y. Detached chimney-shaft for kitchen.

dor de los Rios). At Venta de Baños, near Palencia, the church built by Reccesvinthus in A.D. 661, is stated to remain in a tolerably complete state.

The only other churches which can be supposed to date from a period even as early as the 9th century which have as yet been noticed, are a few in the Asturias, not far from Oviedo.

These, however, present many remarkable peculiarities of plan, having square ended chancels, and chapels or apartments attached to their sides. One of the group, Sta. Maria de Naranco is stated to have been built cir. 848, and as the others are somewhat plainer and ruder in style they are more probably earlier than later. The most remarkable is that of the Ermita de Sta. Christina, near la Pola de Lena, which retains the original partition separating the choir from the nave: the choir is raised above the nave, and the altar recess above the choir, these as well as the western part of the church are vaulted over, so that there are chambers above them. The central space is covered by a waggon vault. The circular panels in the upper part of the choir screen are pierced, the central panel below carved with ornament, having much affinity with that to be seen on the crowns of the 7th century found at Fuente de Guarrazeo, near Toledo.

S. Salvador de Valdedios, near Villaviciosa, has aisles, but the same system of vaulting over both ends of the church exists, and as in the others there are small chambers right and left on entering by the western door. One of these probably served as a baptistry, as is the case at Sta. Maria de Naranco. A porch and other chambers are attached to the south side, and may have served as dwellings for priests or attendants on the church. This has been attributed to A.D. 892.

Sta. Maria de Naranco is nearly on the same plan, and appears to have always been a parish church.

The upper chambers in all these churches are open to the church, not closed as in Ireland, and capable of being used as dwelling places.

These buildings are all small, Sta. Cristina being about 50 feet long, Sta. Maria de Naranco about 70, but have a good deal of ornament, and exhibit a peculiarity of style, the origin of which cannot be traced to any other country, and which was probably developed from the earlier imitations of Roman work. A clue to the reasons for the peculiarity of plan seems altogether wanting. The square end of the chancel may perhaps be thought to indicate some Irish influence as that country is the only one where this form is anything but the rarest exception.

Although, as has been said, the churches of the earlier period have disappeared, Spain has preserved in a remarkable manner some of the traditions of the arrangement of churches in the earlier periods; thus the 'coro,' instead of beginning to the east of the transepts, is, like the "chorus cantorum" of the early basilicas, extended into the nave, and the central lantern tower is called the 'cimborio,' in memory, doubtless, of a time when it served as the 'ciborium' of the high altar, now placed in the elongated choir, or, as it is called by the Spaniards, 'capilla mayor.' Probably these

traditions were handed down through a chain of numerous links, the earlier of which have perished.

6. *Ireland*.—We find here a great number of very small churches very roughly built, with very little attempt at any decoration, frequently lighted only by one very small window, but constructed usually with extremely large stones, and not unfrequently built with that material exclusively, the roof being formed by horizontal courses, each brought forward until they met at the top.

Such are the churches or chapels of Tempull Ceannanach, on the middle island of the bay of Galway (Petrie, *Eccle. Arch. of Ireland*, p. 189), of St. Mac Darn on the island of Cruach Mhic Dara, off the coast of Connemara (*id.* p. 190), of Ratass, Co. Kerry (*id.* p. 169), of Fore, Co. Westmeath (*id.* p. 174), and many others. The two first of these churches form single apartments without any division into nave and chancel, and measure, the first 16 feet 6 inches, by 12 feet 6 inches internally; the second 15 feet by 11 inches; both are roofed with stone in the manner described. The two other churches are in a less complete state, but their doorways are remarkable for their square heads, and the immense size of the stones of which they are constructed; in that of Ratass the lintel is 7 feet 6 inches long, 2 feet high, and extends through the whole thickness of the wall. There appears in this doorway an evident intention of imitating the architecture of a Greek or Roman building. In that of Fore the lintel is 6 feet long, 2 feet high, and 3 feet deep, and is sculptured with a cross within a circle, on a projecting tablet. Both these churches are attributed by Mr. Petrie to the 6th or 7th centuries. It is a question of much interest whence the builders of these churches derived their ideas of architecture, these buildings resembling in no respect any contemporaneous structures in England, France, or Italy. Improbable as the suggestion may at first sight appear, it would seem that it was Central Syria which furnished the models; that country abounds with churches and monasteries constructed between the 3rd and 7th centuries in a style founded upon the Roman architecture of the time, but with many peculiarities both of construction and of detail. Among the former of these is the use of very large stones, and the practice of roofing small buildings by advancing each course somewhat nearer the centre than that below; examples of both will be found in plenty in Count Melchior de Vogué's *Syrie Centrale*. Although in these buildings arched doorways are the most common, those formed precisely in the same manner as the Irish examples, with one large block for a lintel, are frequently found; and one of these (*Syrie Centrale*, p. 99, fig. 4), may almost pass for the original of which the lintel at Fore is the rough copy. The Irish buildings have far more the appearance of such copies of the products of a cultivated school of architecture as might be achieved by native workmen under the direction of immigrants, bringing with them recollections, rather than accurate knowledge of the edifices they had left behind, than that of the first rude essays of an uncivilised race.

The Persians plundered Syria in A.D. 573, the Saracens invaded it in 613, and Central Syria

seems to have been entirely depopulated about that period. It at that time contained many monasteries and many monks, and it is quite possible that among the numerous foreigners who sought an asylum in Ireland at that period may have been Syrian monks. In the litany of St. Aengus, written, it is believed, in the year 799 (Petrie, p. 137), among the scores, and even hundreds, of strangers of various nations, mention is made of seven Egyptian monks buried in Disert Ulidh. The greater part of these immigrants are in the litany simply called "peregrini," without indication of nationality. Dr. Petrie (p. 127), however, seems to think the peculiarities of construction of these early buildings are due to the colonisation of the country by "the Firbolg and Tuatha de Danann tribes, which our historians bring hither from Greece at a very remote period; which tribes," he says, "were accustomed to build, not only their fortresses, but even their dome-roofed houses and sepulchres, of stone without cement, and in the style now usually called Cyclopean and Pelasgic."

Besides the small churches which have been mentioned above, larger structures were also erected in Ireland at an early date. The cathedral church of Armagh, whether that erected in the time of St. Patrick or of a later date, would appear in the 9th century to have been 140 feet in length (Petrie, p. 157). The more usual length of a church of the first class would, however, appear to have been 60 feet; this dimension having, according to the tripartite life of St. Patrick, been prescribed by the saint for the Domnach Mor (Great Church), near Teltown, in Meath, appears to have been invested with a sort of sacred character; and it is worth notice that the church at Glastonbury, founded according to tradition by a St. Patrick, but undoubtedly by missionaries from Ireland, was 60 feet long, by 26 feet broad; it seems to have been of wood.

These larger churches had usually a chancel—in plan a parallelogram—attached to the larger oblong which formed the nave.

Two peculiarities mark the ecclesiastical architecture of Ireland, one, that the altar end is invariably rectangular, the other that the towers found near the early churches are always circular. Perhaps the most probable explanation of the former is that the form was originally used as that most suitable for a very small oratory, and perpetuated in consequence of the extraordinary veneration which the Irish have always entertained for anything connected with their early saints. [For the round tower see TOWER.]

7. *Scotland*.—Irish ecclesiastics founded the celebrated monastery of Iona, and spread Christianity through the isles and mainland of Scotland, but very few buildings which can be referred to the period under consideration have been observed. The most remarkable would seem to be the church at Eglisay in Orkney, which bears a close resemblance to one of the early Irish churches, and is specially remarkable as having a round tower attached to it. The nave is 30 ft. by 16 ft., the chancel 11 ft. by 9 ft. 7 in., the latter is covered by a plain semi-circular vault, over which was a chamber constructed between it and the external covering of stone. The nave

CHRIST. ANT.

also is stated to have had a stone roof. The tower is entered by a door in the west wall of the nave; the chancel arch is described as of a horse-shoe form, but this may probably be occasioned by a settlement of the work. The windows are few and small, the doorways plain, round-headed arches. As in the Irish islands there were numerous oratories scattered over Orkney and Shetland; the parish of Yell in the latter is said (Hibbert's *Scotland*, p. 530) to have contained twenty chapels. The churches constructed by the Christian Picts were probably either of wood or of earth, which is the reason of the entire absence of any buildings within their territory which can be assigned to a period before A.D. 800, it is the more remarkable as the numerous sculptured monuments show that the people who dwelt within the limits of the Pictish kingdom could carve stone with extraordinary skill for the period.

8. *England*.—Though the Christians of Britain must undoubtedly have possessed churches of considerable size before the occupation of the country by the Saxons, Jutes, and Angles, no certain remains of such buildings have as yet been met with.

The historians of Canterbury assert that Ethelbert gave to St. Augustine an existing church in that city (Willis' *Arch. Hist. of Christ Church, Canterbury*, pp. 20, 30) which became the cathedral. Bede mentions the church of St. Martin as an ancient church given in like manner, some portions of wall in the latter have been thought to have formed part of the ancient church. Of the Saxon cathedral nothing remains.

Three influences it will be seen contributed in unequal degrees according to circumstances and locality, to form or to modify ecclesiastical architecture in England; viz. 1, that of Roman architecture either as derived from buildings still existing in the country, or from designs imported by ecclesiastics and other church builders; 2, that of the Irish missionaries; 3, that of the native school of timber architecture. The first of these we may trace in the plans, in the style of some churches, and in the frequent assertion that a church was constructed "opere Romanorum;" the second, perhaps, in the preference of a rectangular east end over an apsidal, which last, as we find it all but universal in England in the 12th century and common in the 13th, was probably the prevalent plan in earlier centuries; the third, in construction evidently copied from wooden buildings, and in the fact that the baluster shafts, which more than any other feature characterize the ante-Norman style, were turned in a lathe as if they had been wood. It seems probable that the Roman and the native style were concurrent, for we find the two mixed together, as in the curious doorway at Monkwearmouth which there seems to be ground to believe is part of the church built by Benedict Biscop, A.D. 671. Here we have an arch and impost which are evident imitations of Roman work, supported by coupled balusters, and an excessively exaggerated base carved with interlacing ornaments or snakes by a hand which no doubt was accustomed to execute similar work in wood.


The existing remains of English churches, dating between 600 and 800, are unfortunately, with very rare exceptions, only fragments. These

2 C



scanty remains, assisted and illustrated by what contemporary or somewhat later writers have told us, will however enable us to form tolerably clear ideas as to the character of the churches which were built in the above-mentioned period.

Of the metropolitan cathedral of Canterbury we have a detailed account, written by Edmer the Chanter, in which he describes the edifice as it existed before the fire of 1067. The annexed plan is copied from that drawn up by Professor Willis (*Hist. of Ch. Ch. Canterbury*) from Edmer's




Canterbury Cathedral.

description. The church, Edmer says, was built "Romanorum opere et ex quadam parte ad imitationem ecclesiae beati apostolorum principis Petri," meaning of course the great Vatican basilica. The western apse was probably added by Archbishop Odo about A.D. 950.

Of another church of the larger class we have some important remains. This is that of Stow, in Lincolnshire, where a bishopric was founded in A.D. 678. The church there is cruciform, measuring 150 ft. from east to west, with a breadth of 27 ft. in the nave and 24 ft. in the chancel; the transept is 90 ft. from north to south by 23 ft. wide; the side walls are about 35 ft. high. It has been shown that the transept is evidently the work of two periods, the wall up to a certain height having all the appearance of having suffered from fire, while that above shows no trace of such damage. There is ground for believing that in 870 the church was burnt by the Danes, and that it was extensively repaired between 1034 and 1050 (v. Rev. G. Atkinson, *On the Restorations in Progress at Stow Church*, in *Reports and Papers of the Architectural Societies of Northants, York, and Lincoln*, i. 315; and the same writer in v. 23 of the same publication, *On Saxon Architecture*), the existing chancel being added in the early part of the next century.

Another church, that of Brixworth, in Northamptonshire, has strong claims to be considered




Basilica, Brixworth.

to date from the same period, for Leland tells us, on the authority of Hugo, a monk of Peterborough, that Lanulphus, abbot of Peterborough,

about 690, founded a monastery there, and the existing edifice may be reasonably supposed to be the original church. The repairs which were finished in 1865 enabled the ground plan of the church to be correctly ascertained, and it will be seen to be somewhat peculiar, consisting of a square tower, the lower part of which forms a porch at the west end, with a chamber on each side opening into the porch and also into the aisles, a nave and two aisles with chambers at their east ends, a short chancel without aisles, and an apse surrounded by a corridor or crypt entered by steps from the chancel. The piers are oblong masses; the arches, which spring from square imposts, are of Roman bricks in two courses and wholly without ornament; over each pier is a rather small clerestory window with arched head, also turned in Roman bricks. Attached to the west side of the tower is a circular stair turret of different and less careful work, and therefore probably a later addition. The bases of piers which have been found show that at the west end of the chancel were probably three arches, through which it was entered from the nave.

Another church still exists in a state so far complete that there can be no doubt as to its original plan, but there is no historical evidence as to its date, and its architectural character is such as scarcely to warrant a decisive opinion. This is the church in the castle of Dover, which, in consequence of recent repairs, can be studied more satisfactorily than was previously the case. A short account of it was published by the Rev. John Puckle in 1864, from which the ground



Church at Dover.

plan is taken; from this it will be seen that it is a cruciform church, with a tower between the nave and chancel.

The churches described are undoubtedly examples of "opus Romanum." Some others which have been destroyed were, doubtless, of like character, and as the contemporary or later descriptions contain points of interest, it will be well to cite them. The most remarkable is that of the church built by St. Wilfrid, at Hexham, about 673, written by his disciple Stephen Eddius (*Vita S. Wilfridi*, ap. Mabillon, *AA. SS. O. S. Ben. saec. iv.*, pt. i., p. 646), running as follows: "cujus profunditatem in terra cum domibus mirifice politis lapidibus fundatam, et super terram multiplicem domum columnis variis et porticibus multis suffultam, mirabilique longitudine et altitudine, murorum ornatam, et variis linearum anfractibus viarum, aliquando sursum, aliquando deorsum, per cochleas circumductam, non est meae parvitatibus hoc sermone explicare." Richard, the prior of Hexham, in the 12th century, describes it (*Twysden's Scriptores Decem*,

p. 290) as a noble building of hewn stone, with crypts beneath, and walls rising to a great height.

Unfortunately, however, the church was not in existence at the time the prior wrote, having been burnt by the Danes, in 875, but his testimony is not to be altogether disregarded, particularly as his mention of crypts and subterraneous oratories and winding passages is confirmed by the still existing crypt, a plan of which will be found under CHAPEL, p. 344.

If, however, the church had three stories and columns, some square, some of various forms, it must have been in advance of any building now existing of as early a date, and it seems probable that in his zeal for the glory of St. Wilfrid, the prior somewhat exaggerated the architectural splendour of the building.

Of the church built at Ripon by the same prelate, Eddius tells us "in Hrypis basilicam polito lapide a fundamentis in terra usque ad summum aedificatam, variis columnis et porticus suffultam, in altum crexit" (Mabillon, *A.A. SS. Ben. saec. iv. pt. 2, p. 563*).

About the same time Benedict Biscop built (A.D. 671) a monastery at Monkwearmouth, the doorway of the church of which has been already commented on, and Bede (*Hist. Abbatum Wearmouth. c. 5*) gives some very interesting notices of his proceedings. He went, we are told, into Gaul, and brought from thence "caementarios qui lapideam sibi ecclesiam juxta Romanorum, quem semper amabat, morem facerent," and afterwards sent to the same country for makers of glass to glaze the windows of his church. At a later time he went to Rome, and brought thence pictures of the Virgin Mary and the twelve apostles, "quibus mediam ejusdem ecclesiae testudinem ducto a pariete ad parietem tabulato praecingeret, imagines evangelicae historiae quibus australem ecclesiae parietem decoraret, imagines visionum Apocalypsis beati Johannis quibus septentrionalem aequae parietem ornaret." As it appears from this passage that there was a nave with aisles, the north and south walls were probably the ends of the transept, and the church was therefore perhaps cruciform. That in the 7th century the founders of churches in England strove to emulate the splendour of the Continental churches, we may learn from the verses of Aldhelm (pp. 116, 117, ed. Giles) on the church built by Bugge, daughter of Kentwin:—


— Praeclum mole aedilium

Bugge construxit supplex vernacule Christi,  
Quae fulgent aene his seno nomine aeneae,  
Insuper apsidam consecrat Virgine aene.

Aurum contortis flavescent pallia filis,  
Quae sunt altaris sacri volumina pulchra,  
Aeneas atque calix gemmis fulv-scit opertus.  
U's coelum rutilat stellis ardentibus aptum,  
Sic lata argento constat fabricata patena.  
Hic crucis ex auro fulgescit lumen fulvo,  
Argentique simul gemmis ornata metallo;  
Hic quoque thuribulum capitellis undique cinctum  
Pendet de summo fumosa foramina pendens,  
De quibus ambrosium spirabant thura Sabaeae,  
Quando sacerdos missam offerre jubetur."

The influence of the Irish missionaries upon church architecture in England is perhaps rather to be inferred than proved from existing examples; carrying, as they did, their principles of asceticism even into their churches their rude

and humble chapels offered no models which could compete with those supplied by the architects brought from Gaul or Italy who built in the manner of the Romans; but when we call to mind how large an extent of country they occupied, and more or less Christianized, and in what great veneration they were held, it is difficult to believe that the peculiarities of their ecclesiastical architecture were wholly without influence upon that of England. But for the eventual triumph of the Roman system over theirs, more tangible proofs of this would no doubt have existed, but it is possible that the preference of a square over an apsidal termination, which is so strongly shown in English churches from the 12th century downwards, is really due to the habit of imitating the forms of the oratories which St. Cuthbert, St. Aidan, or their disciples, may have constructed. That



Church Tower, at Eborac Barton

the influence of the Irish school upon ornamentation was very great, there can be no doubt, as it is amply proved by existing manuscripts, as the Gospels of Lindisfarne, written about A.D. 710. That these patterns of interlacing ribbons and animals were copied in stone may be observed in the doorway of Monkwearmouth, and on many crosses and other monuments of the period.

No existing example shows what a large church would have been if constructed without

Roman influence, but the little oratory of Cornwall and that at Ebb's Meek, in Northumberland (v. CHAPEL), will serve to show what was the character of their lesser religious buildings.

The third influence, that of an existing school of timber architecture, made itself felt more in the smaller class of churches than in the larger, and though very many portions of churches which exhibit marks of it exist, no entire church of any early date which manifests it has remained. The chief peculiarity is the use of narrow stones placed upright, dividing the wall into sections, exactly in the same manner as timber quartering. No better example of this can be found than the tower of the church of Earls Barton, in Northamptonshire; but it is difficult to find any safe ground for assigning a date to this building, as it is certain that the style was continued into the 11th century. Another peculiarity is the use of the baluster as a shaft, and it has been supposed that this was copied from some Roman example; but the facts that these balusters were turned in a lathe, that they were in use at a very early date, and in every part of England, all seem to point to their having originated in an indigenous style of wooden architecture.

Many churches were constructed entirely of wood. Bede (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 25) tells us that Flavia, who came from Iona, built at Lindisfarne a church "episcopali sedis congruam, quam tamen more Scottorum non de lapide sed de robore secto totam composuit atque barundine texit;" and according to an Irish writer of the 11th century, Conchubhan (*Vit. S. Modurnae*, A.D. 88, *Boll.* 6, Jul. 11), the Scots were accustomed to build with boards "tabulis dedolatis," or, as we may perhaps understand the passage, with timbers not left in the round, but smoothed with the adze. In this way, though no doubt at a much later date, the church at Greenstead, in Essex, was constructed, the elms of oak left after a plank had been sawn out of the middle having been smoothed on the inside with the adze, and placed upright with the curved portion outwards, side by side, so as to form a wall. Very many such structures, no doubt, were erected in districts where wood was plentiful and stone scarce.

[A. N.]

**CHURCH-BOOKS** (*Libri Ecclesiastici*). Under this name the following classes of books are understood to be included:—

1. Such works as were necessary for the performance of the sacred offices, whether of the altar, the baptistery, or the choir [**LITURGICAL BOOKS**].

2. Certain pastoral letters of venerable bishops, canons of councils, and acts of martyrs, which were occasionally read in public. For instance, we have the testimony of Dionysius of Corinth in Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 23, § 11) that the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians was preserved and publicly read in the Corinthian Church [**CANONICAL BOOKS**]. The so-called Canons and Constitutions of the Apostles were probably regarded as *libri ecclesiastici* in many churches. On the use of acts of martyrs, see Reinart, *Acta Sincera*, pref. § 5.

3. Not unfrequently in ancient times the term church-books included all books contained in the library of a church [**LIBRARY**].

## CHURCH

4. In some cases the church-registers, whether of the baptized or of the dead (**DIFTERENCES**), seem to be included under the term *libri ecclesiastici*. [C.]

**CHURCHES, MAINTENANCE OF** (*Fabrics Ecclesiasticæ*). The funds for the maintenance of the fabric of a church are, and have been from ancient times, derived from two sources.—estates appropriated to that purpose and voluntary offerings. As early as the 5th century we find ordinances, that a definite proportion of the general income of a church should be set apart for the maintenance and repair of the fabric. According to decrees of Pope Simplicius, A.D. 475 (*Ep. iii.* in Binius, *Concilio*, iii. 582), and Pope Gelasius, A.D. 494 (*Ep. in* Binius, iii. 636), this proportion was to be a fourth part; while in Spain a third part was to be appropriated to this purpose. See the Council of Tarragona (A.D. 516), c. 8; the second of Braga (A.D. 572), c. 2; of Merida (A.D. 666), cc. 14, 16; the sixteenth of Toledo (A.D. 683), c. 5. In the Frankish kingdom the repair of the fabric was provided for by setting aside for that purpose a certain part of the endowment of the church; a provision the more necessary, as the voluntary contributions diminished in proportion as the endowments increased. And as estates of the church often fell into the hands of laics, a Diet of the Empire held at Frankfurt in 794 laid down the principle, that the maintenance of the fabric of the church was a charge upon church-lands, in whatever hands they were (*Porta, Monumenta Germ.* iii. 74). A similar provision was made by some of the ecclesiastical councils held in the year 813 by command of Charlemagne; as in that of Mentz (c. 42), the fourth of Aries (c. 25), and the third of Tours (c. 46). At a somewhat later date, the obligation of forced labour for the benefit of the fabric was laid upon the tenants of the church. (*Hervog, Real-Encycl.* i. 737). There are special treatises on this subject by Helfert (*Von der Erbauung, Erhaltung und Herstellung der kirchlichen Gebäude*, 2nd ed. 1834), by Von Reinhardt (*Ueber kirchliche Baukunst*, Stuttgart, 1836), and by Permaneder (*die kirchliche Baukunst*, München, 1838). [C.]

## CHURCH SCHOOLS. [SCHOOLS.]

**CHURCH** (*Symbols of*). Early representations of the Church of Christ are very numerous, and may be divided into (A) personifications and (B) symbolisms; both of the highest antiquity. Those derived from Holy Scripture may be taken first.

(A) 1. The Lord's comparison of Himself to the Good Shepherd, constantly represented in the Catacombs, and supposed to be the most ancient of purely Christian emblems in painting or sculpture, has frequently united with it pictures of two or more sheep at His feet, beside the one carried on His shoulders. The word "fold" represents the Church, exactly as the word "church" the congregation of Christ's people. [*LAMBS, GOOD SHEPHERD, &c.*] The fresco in the Calistine catacomb (Bottari, *tav. lx., xlii.*, and Aringhi, vol. i. lib. iii. ch. xxii. p. 327, ed. Par. 1657), of the Shepherd sitting under trees, and surrounded by sheep, or sheep and goats, as here, may be taken as one example out of many. See also that at *tav. xvi.* in another (Bott. *vol. ii.*

nav. cxviii.) the sheep are issuing from a small building, seeming to stand for a town, at whose gate the Shepherd stands, or leans on His staff. The sheep of the Gentile and of the Jewish Churches are distinguished in the painting in Ciampini (*Vet. Mon.*), where two flocks are issuing from separate towns or folds, Hierusalem and Bethleem, and moving towards our Lord. [See BETHLEHEM.] In a woodcut given by Martigny, He stands on a small rock, which, by the winding lines at its base, and the word IORDANES above, would seem to refer to His baptism, and our baptism into His death, by which the sheep reach Him. (See Martigny, *Dict. s. v. "Église."*)

In a mosaic mentioned by Martigny at Sta. Sabina's, Rome, the two churches are represented by two female figures, standing each with an open book in hand. (See also Aringhi, lib. iii. c. xxii. p. 327.) Over one is inscribed ECCLESIA EX CIRCUMCISIONE, and St. Peter stands above her; the other is named ECCLESIA EX GENTIBUS, and above her is placed St. Paul. (See Gal. ii. 7.) The same subject occurs in a compartment of the ancient gates of the cathedral of Verona, treated with somewhat of the quaintness of Lombard fancy, but quite intelligible as to meaning. The twofold church is represented by two women, shaded by trees; one suckling two children, the other two fishes. [FISH.] Martigny gives a woodcut of an interesting plate in P. Garrucci, *Hagioglypt.* p. 222. It represents two lambs looking towards a pillar, which symbolizes the Church, and is surmounted by the Lamb bearing on his back the decussated monogram of Christ. From it spring (apparently) palm-branches; and two birds, just above the lambs, may be taken for doves. The figures of St. Peter and St. Paul, with their division of the Church into Jewish and Gentile, seem to be represented in the fresco given by De Rossi (vol. ii. Tav. d'Aggiunto A.); but are almost destroyed by the opening of a tomb, which has been broken into through the fresco, as so frequently happens. There can be no doubt that the Orantes, or praying female figures in the Catacombs, are for the most part personifications of the Church. (See Bottari, tav. xxxviii., Orante with doves placed next to Good Shepherd.) In the corners of the square ceiling of the well-known crypt of Lucina, in the Callixtine catacomb (De Rossi, *R. S.* tav. x.), the Orante alternates with the Good Shepherd. In a recently discovered painting in St. Callixtus (De Rossi, *IXOTC*, tav. i. n. 2), the Orante is offering the eucharistic sacrifice by the hands of a consecrating priest.

2. A few representations exist within our range, of Susanna and the elders, as typical of the Church and its persecutors, Jewish and Pagan. Martigny names three sarcophagi as the only certain examples of this subject in old Italian art. For one he refers to Buonarrotti, *Vetri*, p. l. Of the two others one is from the Vatican, the other from St. Callixtus. They are found in Bottari, tavv. xxxi., and lxxxv., sarcoph. from St. Callixtus. In Southern Gaul they are more numerous (Millin, *Midi de la F.* pl. lxxv. 5; lxxvi. 8; lxxviii. 4). All these are bas-reliefs,

containing the elders as well as Susanna; and the third represents them as eagerly watching her from behind trees. An allegory is given below in woodcut, drawn from vol. i. pl. lxxviii.



of M. Perret's work, of a sheep between two wild beasts: SUSANNA and SINIORIS are written above.

3. The Woman with the Issue of Blood has been considered as a type of the Gentile Church, which would account for the frequent representations of that miracle to be found on ancient sarcophagi. (See Bottari, tavv. xix. xxi. xxxiv. xxxix. xli. lxxxiv. lxxxv. lxxxix. cxxxv.) So St. Ambrose (lib. ii. in Luc. c. viii.).

(B) *Symbolisms* of the Church (it is not generally observed how important the distinction between symbolism and personification is) begin with the ark of Noah; passing by easy transition to the ship of souls and the ship of Jonah in the storm. It is singular that our Lord's similitude of the net is very rarely found illustrated by the graphic art of early Christendom. The idea of the Lord's drawing forth the sinner from the waters, as with a hook and line (see BAPTISM, p. 168), seems to have prevailed over that of the sweeping net. The net is perhaps assigned to St. Peter in the Vatican sarcophagus there represented (Bottari, tav. xlii.). A small net is used on one side of the bas-relief. [FISH, SHIP.]

The ark is very frequently used as a type of the Church militant. On tombs it is held to imply that the dead expired in full communion with the Church. In Bottari, tav. xlii., an olive-tree stands in the ark, in the place of Noah. It is of a square form, a chest in fact (Bottari, tavv. xl. cxx. clxxii. &c.); and in tav. cxviii. it is placed in a boat or ship. The dove appears with the olive-branch in almost all these, or is represented by itself: in Bottari, tav. cxxxi., it is placed on the poop of the ship of Jonah. In tav. xxxvii. and *passim*, Noah stands in a square chest on the shore, receiving the dove in his hands; Jonah is being thrown from a boat into the sea next him. This ship represents the Church militant, and is one of the most frequent of all symbolic works in the Catacombs, no doubt on account of the Lord's own comparison of Himself to the prophet. For representations in the catacomb of Callixtus and elsewhere see De Rossi and Bottari. The ship "covered with the waves" is represented in Martigny, from a fresco lately discovered in St. Callixtus. A man stands in the waist or near the stern of a sharp-prowed vessel with a square sail, such as are used in the Mediterranean to this day. The waters are dashing over her close to him, and he is in an attitude of prayer: far off is a drowning man who has made shipwreck of the faith. The vessel in full sail (Boldetti, pp. 360, 362, 373) is also common as the emblem of safe-conduct through the waves of this troublesome world; that with sails furled, as quietly in port resting after her voyage (as in Boldetti, pp. 363, 366), is the


\* These subjects are repeated very frequently in the ancient mosaics of Rome and Ravenna. See Mr. J. H. Parker's Photographs.



symbol of the repose of individual Christians in death.

An even more interesting symbolism is where not only the ship is painted as analogous to the Church, but the actual fabric of a church is made like a ship. This was the case with many of the early Romanesque churches, where the apse which completed the basilica had the bishop's throne placed in the centre, as the steersman's place, with semicircular benches below for the

clergy; so that a real and touching resemblance followed. See the memorable passage in Ruskin's *Stones of Venice*, vol. ii., on the ancient church of Torcello, the mother city of Venice, and an extract in Martigny (s. v. *Navis*) of a long passage in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (ii. 57) to the same effect,—the bishop being likened to the steersman, the deacons to seamen, the faithful to passengers, and the deaconesses, strangely, to the collector of fares.



The ship placed on the back of a fish is found in a signet illustrated by Aléandre (*Nav. Eccles. referent. Symb.* Romae, 1628; see also s. v. *FISH*). Another such gem is in Ficoroni's collection (*Germ. Ant. Litt.* tab. xi. 8, p. 105). A jasper given by Cardinal Borgia (*De Cruce Velutern.* p. 213 and frontispiece) places the Lord in a galley of six oars on a side, holding the large steering oar. This rudder-oar—or rather two of them—are inserted in the rudest ship-carvings, where other oars are omitted.

The column surmounted by a dove is mentioned by M. Leblant in his *Inscriptions Chrétiennes de la Gaule*, vol. i. p. 167, as existing on a lamp said to have been found at St. Just. Another had on it the monogram of Christ on a column. Reference is made to Bosio, p. 167, for a column between two doves turning to look at it; but is inclined, see p. 187, to regard it as a symbol of Christ Himself rather than of the Church. [R. St. J. T.]

**CHURCHING OF WOMEN; or, THANKSGIVING OF WOMEN AFTER CHILDBIRTH.** (*Mulierum post Partum Purificatio*; sometimes called *Initium post partum*: see Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* xix. 671.)

The Mosaic law lays down (*Lev. xii.*) precepts for the offerings and purification of women after childbirth; and these legal precepts were observed by the Mother of the Lord herself. Possibly in Jewish-Christian communities this observance passed over, like some other ceremonies, with little change into the Christian congregation; but of this nothing certain is known. There is no mention of any purificatory ceremony after childbirth in the works of Clement of Alexandria, in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, or in the works of the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. The notion, however, that childbirth occasioned some kind of defilement continued to prevail among the Christians of the East, hence the rituals of the Oriental Churches in relation to this matter refer more to purification from defilement than to thanksgiving for safety. Dionysius of Alexandria (canon 2; in Beveridge's *Pandectas*, ii. 4) lays it down as a matter admitting of no question, that a woman ought not to be present in church, nor to receive the Holy Communion, within forty days after having given birth to a child. To the

same effect, the ninth of the Arabic canons of Nicaea enjoins: "Women ought to abstain from entering the church and from partaking of Holy Communion for forty days after a birth; after which, let the woman carefully wash her garments and bathe her person and the child; then let her, together with her husband, present him in the church at the steps of the altar; whom, with their accompanying friends, let the priest receive, and say for her the prayer of purification and bless the child according to the prescribed ceremonies of the Church." The forty days' period, then, was clearly regarded as the necessary extent of the woman's purification. Meantime, however, she was not wholly neglected by the Church. Immediately after the birth, a prayer was said over mother and child, and the child signed with the cross. This rite is thought to be alluded to by Chrysostom (on 1 Cor., *Hom.* 12, p. 108, ed. Montfaucon). The office which accompanies it is believed by Goar to be of modern origin. On the eighth day the midwife, or some other matron, brings the child to the church. Before the door the priest again signs it with the cross, and carries it into the church, when the name is given which it is to bear after baptism. Such a ceremony took place, though not in a church, at the birth of the emperor Theodosius II. (A.D. 401), related in the following manner in the life of Porphyrius of Gaza, a contemporary witness: "When seven days were accomplished from the birth of the child, the empress Eudoxia approached and met us at the door of the chamber, bearing the infant wrapped in purple. She bowed her head, and said, 'Bless me, O fathers, and the child which the Lord hath granted me through your holy prayers;' and gave the infant into their arms, that they might sign it with the cross. Then the holy bishops signed both her and the infant, and after praying sat down." (*Acta Synodorum*, Feb. iii. 653). If the child was in danger of death before the stated period for baptism, it was at once baptized, but the unclean mother was no longer allowed to suckle it, or even to enter the room where it was (*Mansi, Supplement.* Conc. i. 815). If the mother died within the period of uncleanness, her body was taken into the church, and the prayers of purification said over it; after which it was regarded as clean

(*Canon. Niceno-Arab.* a. 10; in *Harden's Concilia*, I. 512).

On the fortieth day after the birth, the mother and the child, accompanied by the godfather, went solemnly to the church. Before the church-door the priest received them, signed the mother with the cross, and said over her several prayers. He then took the child, made the sign of the cross with it, and carried it up to the altar; the godfather then received it from the priest and left the church. In the Ethiopic Church, mother and child are anointed on the brow with holy oil, and receive the Eucharist.

In the Latin Church, also, we find traces of the same feeling that exist in the East with regard to the purification after childbirth. Even St. Augustine lays down that the Levitical law of the forty days was still binding under the new dispensation (*Quæst. in Levit.* lib. iii. quæst. 64). That Theodore of Canterbury held the same opinion is not to be wondered at, as he brought Oriental opinions from his early home in Tarsus. He (*Penitential*, I. xiv. 18, in *Haddan and Stubbs's Documents*, iii. 189) prescribes penance for a woman entering a church within forty days after childbirth. Augustine of Canterbury, however, had previously appealed to Pope Gregory I. for his opinion on this point, who answered, with characteristic largeness of mind, that the Mosaic law was not binding on Christians, and that if a woman went to church to give thanks to God on the very day on which she had given birth to a child, she sinned not, although the old custom of keeping at home for forty days was not to be blamed, when it was observed in a right spirit (*Gregorij Ep.* xi. 64; p. 1158). Gregory's decision influenced subsequent capitularies of the Franks and canons of councils in the West. Even a council of the Maronites (*Mani, Supplement. Conc.* vi. 1217) rejected the "simplicity or superstition" of repelling women from church for the space of forty days after the birth of a child.

2. It will readily be supposed that no thanksgiving followed the birth of a child which was the fruit of adultery or fornication. As women who sinned in such sort were excluded from the congregation until due penance had been done, they were of course excluded from a service which included thanksgiving for the fruit of the womb. Harard of Tours (?871), enjoining women to return thanks in church as soon as may be after a birth, expressly makes the exception, "*nisi forte sit adultera*" (*Canon* cit. quoted by Binterim, *Denkwürd.* vi. 2, 190). To the same effect are some decrees of later councils.

3. The service to be used in the churching of women was probably in ancient times left to the discretion of the priest, for no formularies for this purpose are found in the ancient sacramentaries. Martene (*De Ritibus Eccl.* ii. 136, 137) gives only two forms, from Gallican codices of probably the 14th century. If a larger number of ancient benedictionals had descended to our times, we might possibly have found forms for the benediction of women after childbirth; but these are rare. Binterim (*Denkwürd.* vi. 2, 199 ff.) gives a churching-service of the Ethiopic Church, that contained in the Greek *Euchologion*, and a Latin formula. The latter is from a MS.

of the 14th century, and none probably are, in their present form, very ancient. [C.]

**CHURCHWARDENS.** These officers would seem to be the representatives in the later Church of the *seniores ecclesiastici*, of whom frequent mention is made by St. Augustine and Optatus. We gather from these writers that the *seniores ecclesie* were a sort of elders who were not of the clergy, but yet had some concern in the care of the Church. Thus, St. Augustine inscribes one of his epistles to his own church of Hippo, "*Clere, senioribus et universis plebi*." Some of these *seniores* were the chief men or magistrates of the place, such as we still call *eldermen*; who also formed a sort of lay council of the bishops, giving advice and assistance in many weighty matters of the Church. But there were others known more properly as *seniores ecclesiastici*, who were entrusted with the *utensilia, thesauri*, and outward affairs of the Church, but had no concern in its government or discipline; and these may be regarded as the predecessors of our churchwardens. The lay elders, so called, of modern times are ranked above the deacons in their own communities, and cannot therefore be identified with the *seniores ecclesiastici* of the ancient Church, who, not being reckoned of the clergy, were ecclesiastically inferior to the order of deacons (*Blagham*, ii. 18). [D. B.]

**CHURCHYARD.** The subject of places set apart for Christian burial has already been considered under *AREA*, *CATACOMB*, and *CENOTAPH*. The present article relates simply to burial in the precincts of churches.

The laws of the empire against burying in cities of course prevented the use of churchyards within the walls for the purpose of interment as long as those laws continued in force. The first attempts to bury in or near churches seem to have occurred in the case of those churches or memorial cells which were built over the remains of apostles or martyrs; for both Theodosius (*Codes*, lib. ix. tit. 17; *De Sepulc.* *Nov. leg.* 6; and Justinian (*Codes*, lib. i. tit. 2; *De Eccl. leg.* 2) expressly provide against such churches being made exceptions to the general law. When the church had kings for nursing-fathers, the privilege of being buried within the precincts was sometimes extended to Christian emperors. Thus Constantine desired (*Euseb. Vita Const.* iv. 71) to be buried near the apostles whom he had anshrined, and his son Constantius carried out his wish by causing him to be buried in the *ATRIUM* of the church; a fact to which Chrysostom more than once alludes (*On 2 Cor.*, *Hom.* 26, p. 829, ed. Paris, 1816; *Quod Christus sit Deus*, c. 8, p. 839). Theodosius the elder, Arcadius, and Theodosius the younger, are said by a late historian (*Nicéphorus, H. E.* xiv. 58) to have been similarly buried. The council of Braga of the year 563 (can. 16) allows corpses to be buried, if need be, around the church (*deforis circa murum basilicæ*), but utterly forbids any to be buried within, alleging the respect due to the relics of saints.

Archbishop Theodora of Canterbury laid down (*Penitential*, II. l. 5 and 6, in *Haddan and Stubbs' Councils*, iii. 190) the following rule: in a church in which bodies of unbelievers are buried it is not lawful to consecrate an altar; but if the church itself is of good material, let it be pulled

down and rebuilt after the logs of which it is composed have been planed or washed. If the altar has been previously consecrated, mass may be said upon it if 'religious' persons are buried there; but if a pagan be buried there, it is better that the altar should be purified and taken out of the building. It is clear from this passage that burials frequently took place in the rude wooden churches of the 7th century in England, and that only the bodies of pagans were held absolutely to desecrate the place, though the practice of burying in churches does not seem to be looked upon with favour. The council of Nantes, held probably towards the end of the 7th century, in the 6th canon, permits burials in the atrium or fore-court, in the cloister, and in the outbuildings (exedrae) of a church, but utterly forbids them in the church itself and near the altar, where the Body and Blood of the Lord are. The same precept is repeated in the canons of later councils, as in the 52nd of that at Mentz in 813, which however expressly excepts bishops, abbots, worthy presbyters, and faithful laymen. Similar to this is the injunction of Theodulf of Orleans (*Capitul. ad Presbyt.* ix.). The council of Tribur (A.D. 895), repeating the prohibition with regard to laymen (can. 17), implies that the prohibited burials had already taken place, by the provision that bodies buried in churches in times past were not to be exhumed; but in case the multitude of tombs was such that the ground could not conveniently be levelled, it provides, in almost the same terms as Theodulf, that the altar should be removed, and the church made a mere cemetery-chapel or catacomb.

In the East, the Emperor Leo VI., about the year 900, abrogated (*Novell.* 53) all the old laws against burying in cities, and left men at liberty to bury either within or without the walls; a permission which no doubt gave occasion to burving in the precincts of city churches.

We conclude, then, that burying in the precincts of churches was practised, in the case of very distinguished persons, from the 4th century; more generally, from the 7th century; but that the increasing practice of burying in churches was constantly resisted by ecclesiastical authorities during the whole period with which we are concerned, and was held to be almost a desecration.

Monastic bodies had from very ancient times burying-grounds of their own, that they who had consorted together in their lives might rest together in death (Isidore of Seville, *Regula*, c. 23); these were however originally outside the precincts of the monastery, as we see from the instances of Pachomius, Benedict, and many others. Bede, in the *Life of St. Cuthbert*, speaks of a dead monk being carried to his burial in a cart, which would not have been necessary if the interment had taken place within the monastery. It appears that in many places a chapel or oratory was built on the spot chosen for the interment of the brethren. For instance, Abbot Bertinus (A.D. 660) enclosed a graveyard for his monastery on a neighbouring hill, and built in the midst of it a church dedicated to St. Mary (*Acta SS. Bened. saec. iii.* pt. 1, p. 110). Afterwards, graveyards were formed within the convent walls, but not within the cloister, and were provided with a separate church. Of this kind is believed to have been the cemetery formed

by Eigil at Fulda, the church of which was dedicated in the year 822 (*Life of Eigil* by Candidus, c. 20, in *Acta SS. Bened. saec. iv.* pt. 1, p. 238). Benedict of Aniane also caused an oratory to be constructed in the cemetery of his monastery (*Life*, c. 39, in *Acta SS. Ben. saec. iv.* pt. 1). The ancient plan of St. Gall shows only a cross in the midst of the graveyard within the convent walls. And in process of time burials took place in the cloister itself. Abbot Walfrid, when dying (A.D. 765), desired to be buried in the midst of the cloister (*Life*, c. 8, *Acta SS. Ben. saec. iii.* pt. 2); and it appears that other monks of that rule were buried in the cloister (*u. s. c.* 14). Later instances are frequent. Monks of distinguished sanctity were occasionally buried in the church itself, as St. Vouel of Soissons in the 8th century (*Acta SS. Ben. iv.* 2, p. 550). Except in the case of very saintly persons, burial was not permitted within the first eight centuries in monastic more than in secular churches. (Bingham's *Antiquities*, bk. xxiii. c. 1; Martene, *De Ritibus Eccl. Ant.* lib. iii. c. 7, §§ 10-14; *De Rit. Monach.* lib. v. c. 10, §§ 100-104; Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vi. 3, 443 ff.) [C.]

CIBORIUM. [ALTAR: DOVE, EUCHARISTIC.]

CILICIA (COUNCIL OF), A.D. 423, at which Theodorus of Mopsuestia, a town in this province, who was still alive, was condemned for his errors (Mansi, iv. 473-4). [E. S. F.]

CINGULUM. (*Zōrēh*, Zona, Balteus, Funis.) The girdle, in ancient times, was generally associated with the idea of active exertion, inasmuch as it served to confine and to gird up the long flowing garments which, when unconfined, interfered with all activity. But as a richly-ornamented girdle commonly formed a part of the robes of state worn by Eastern monarchs, we find the girdle occasionally alluded to as a symbol of royal dignity. So Patriarch Germanus of Constantinople, c. 715 A.D., *Myst. Theor.* p. 206, speaks of the girdle, then worn as part of a priest's dress, as signifying the beauty wherewith Christ entering upon His kingdom did gird Himself withal, even the beauteous majesty of Godhead. See *Vestiarius Christianum*, pp. 84, 85. Lastly, through yet other associations, which will be obvious to all students of antiquity, the girdle connected itself with the idea of chastity; and it is in this connexion that it is commonly referred to by the later ecclesiastical writers. See, for example, St. Jerome on Ezek. xlv.; Celestine, bishop of Rome, †432, apud Labbé, *Concilia*, ii. 1618 ("in lumborum praecinctione castitas . . . indicatur"); Rabanus Maurus, *de Instit. Cleric.* lib. i. c. 17; Pseudo-Alcuinus, *de Div. Off. (Vest. Christ.* p. 111); Ivo Carnotensis (*ib.* p. 121). Both in East and West it formed part of the monastic dress from the earliest times. Among Western writers see the *Life of Fulgentius*, bishop of Ruspa, by Ferrandus Diaconus ("pelliceo cingulo tanquam monachus utebatur"); Salvianus, *ad Eccl. Cathol.* lib. iv. (addressing a monk of unworthy character—"Licet religionem vestibis simules, licet fidem cingulo afferas, licet sanctitatem pallio mentiaris," &c.); Joannis Cassiani, *de Coenob. Instit.* lib. i. c. 11, apud Migne, *Patrol.* xlix. 60; the *Regula* of St. Benedict, Migne, lxvi. 490 ("vestiti dormiant, et cincti cingulis aut funibus").

Mildemar, in the 9th century (apud Migas, tom. c.), explains the distinction between 'cingulum' and 'fascia.' "Fascia est qui de canaba fit vel line in rotundum; cingulus (sic) autem cor-fictus est de lana vel lino, sed non in rotundum sicut fascia, sed in latum sicut tricia." For Eastern usage see St. Jerome, *Præfat. in Regulum S. Pachonii*, opp. ii. 49; Palladius, *Lausiacum*, cap. 38 (Migas, lxxiii. 1157) and St. Germanus of Constantinople, in a passage above referred to. He there says of the monastic habit that it was like that of John the Baptist, whose raiment was of camel's hair, and who wore a leathern girdle about his loins. Celestine, bi-hop of Rome, in his letter to the bishops of Vienna and Narbonne, already referred to, dating about 430 A.D., marks the time when the wearing of a girdle as part of the episcopal dress (probably in imitation of the monastic habit) was first introduced into Gaul. He reproves those to whom he writes for dressing in a pal-lium and wearing a girdle about the loins, and on seeking to observe the truth of Scripture not in the spirit but in the letter. "Amicti pallio, et lumbos præcincti, credunt se Scripturam fidem non per spiritum sed per iterum completuros." See Labbé, *Concilium*, II. 1618; *Vind. Christ.* p. 45. [W. B. M.]

#### CIRBA, COUNCILS OF. [AFRICAN COUNCILS.]

**CIRCUMCELLIONES.** (1) A name given to the Donatist fanatics in Africa during the 4th century, from their habit of roving from house to house, plundering (Aug. c. *Quædam*. i. 3.). They went about in predatory gangs, committing chiefly of rustics, on the borders of the Ghatulian desert, ravaging Numidia and Mauritania, provinces at that time neither thoroughly Christianised nor thoroughly subjected to Roman law. According to Augustine they were notorious for their lawless violence against the Catholics (Aug. c. *Quædam*. i. 28, 32; *Rav.* 69; c. *Parvum*. i. 11; c. *Crescon.* iii. 42, 46, 47; *Epp.* 84, 105, 185), as well as against property (Aug. *Epp.* 15, 65, 185). To restrain their turbulence their own bishops were constrained to invoke the aid of the Roman counts. Augustine defends Maximus and Taurinus from the charge of having been unduly severe against them, and reproves the exultation of these fanatics over the death of Urmicus (Aug. c. *Litt. Petilian.* cc. 22, 25). At the Conference of Carthage in 411 A.D. the imperial commissioner decreed a fine on those districts wherein the "circumcelliones" were not kept in order (Cœli Com. l. iii.). At Bagai they fought, but unsuccessfully, against Roman cavalry. The war-about of these "avengers" or "champions of God," as they styled themselves (*ἀνταρμαχοί*, Optat. Milevit. *de Schism. Donat.* iii. 4), "Deo laudes," in opposition to the "Deo Gratias" of the other party, was terrible to all peaceful people as the roar of a lion (Aug. in *Pa. cxxxv.* v. 6). Instead of swords, which for some time they felt a religious scruple against using (cf. St. Matt. xxvi. 52), they brandished clubs at first, which they called "Israels" (Aug. in *Pa. x.* v. 5). Like the Syrian "assassins," the followers of the "Old Men of the Mountain" in the time of the Crusades, the "Circumcelliones" courted death, wantonly assaulting the Pagans at their festivals

(Aug. c. *Quædam*. i. 32, 49; *Epp.* 12, 16, 185) and, in their frantic eagerness for martyrdom, challenging all whom they met on their way to kill them (Aug. c. *Crescon.* iii. 46, 49; c. *Litt. Petil.* ii. 114; *De Unit. Eccl.* 50; Theodorët. *Rav.* iv. 6). Among the titles which they assumed was that of "Agnostici," to indicate their contempt for learning (Aug. in *Pa. cxxxv.* v. 6). Though pledged by profusion to celibacy, they were guilty of frequent outrages on women, if their opponents may be believed (Aug. c. *Litt. Petil.* i. 16, ii. 185; *De Unit. Eccl.* 50). For these and similar offences, as well as on the charge of aiding the Vandals, they were ordered by Honorius, 412 A.D., to be fined (Hefele in *Kirchenlex.*, iii. 261). Gibbon compares these "circumcelliones" to the "camionards" of Languedoc in the commencement of the 18th century (*Pechins and Fall*, ii. 445, Bohn, 1855).

Circumcelliones (2) were vagabond monks, censured by Cassian, under the name of Sarcinæ, for roving from place to place (*Coll. xlviii.* 7). Probably the name was transferred to them from the Donatist fanatics. St. Augustine rebuts this comparison as unmerited, at least within his experience (in *Pa. cxxxii.* v. 6). But elsewhere (*De Oper. Monach.* 28) he inveighs with characteristic warmth against the idle, vagrant monks, "nequam menses, nequam fides, nequam estates, nequam sedentes," &c., who scoured the country for alms, vending fictitious relics. Benedictus Ananensis quotes *litteras de Offic. Eccl.* (ii. 15) against these "circumcelliones" or "circilliones" as spurious Anchorites (*Concord. Regg.* c. 3, cf. Menard, ad loc.). These vagabond monks were condemned as unstable and scandalous (Conc. Tolet. vii. c. 5); and as mock-hermits (*αυαδισμοί φευδερμῆται*) in the Synodical Epistol. Orientalis addressed to the Emp. Theophilus (Suicer. *Thesaur.* sub voce). They are denounced also by Nilus (*Epp.* lvi. 18); and are probably the "gyrovagi" censured in the *Regula S. Benedicti* (c. 1). The name occurs so late as in Monachus Rangallensis, who relates how a monk, one of the "circumcelliones," "ignarus discipline imperatoris," intruded into the choir in the presence of Carl (*de Gest. Carol. M. l. 6, v. Cassini Antiqu. Lectiones*). [I. G. S.]

**CIRCUMCISION.** As a Jewish rite, or as connected with the controversies of the Apostolic age, this ordinance does not come within the limits of this work. It claims a place, however, even in a Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, as having been adopted from a remote period in the Church of Abyssinia, and as still in use there. In this, as in many other practices, the influence of a large Jewish population has made that community the representative of a type of Judæo-Christianity which must have been common in the first two centuries, but which has since been lost. It has to be noted that circumcision is practised there (and the present usage rests upon an immemorial tradition) before baptism, between the third and the eighth day after birth, and that an analogous operation is applied to female children.

Stanley, *Eastern Church*, p. 12. [K. H. F.]

#### CIRCUMCISION, FESTIVAL OF.

1. *Origin of Festival*.—From the necessary connection of the event commemorated on this day with the Nativity, we must obviously not



look for notices of its celebration at a date earlier than that at which we first meet with those of the Nativity itself.

It will follow from the prescribed interval between the birth of a child and its circumcision that the festival of the Circumcision will fall on the octave of the Nativity; and consequently we continually find January 1 thus marked, even where the service contains references to the day as the anniversary of the Circumcision. It is not until later that we find the day to have acquired sufficient independent rank to bear the title of the Circumcision rather than of the octave as its special distinguishing mark.

It is hard to say when the earliest traces of an observance of the day under either designation are to be found. There is extant a long homily by Zeno, bishop of Verona in the 4th century, which would appear to have been meant for delivery on this day; but, on the other hand, it is not mentioned in the *Kalendarium Carthaginense*, or in that of Bucherius, both probably documents of the 4th century. Now it has been shown elsewhere [CHRISTMAS] that the first certain allusions to an observance of Christmas as a distinct and independent festival occur towards the end of the 4th century, and that this observance of it was later in the East than in the West. This agrees with what is said above, and with the instances we shall further quote, which tend to disprove the existence of any save perhaps a more or less local recognition of the festival before the end of the 4th century. Here, as in the case of the parent festival of the Nativity, our earliest illustrations come from the West.

Thus we find the day noticed in the Gelasian Sacramentary, the Gregorian Sacramentary and Antiphony, the Gallican Sacramentary and Lectionary, in the Calendar of Fronto, the Mozarabic Liturgy and Breviary, and the *Martyrologium Hieronymi*.

Passing on to the Eastern Church, we find that in the calendar of the Coptic Church given by Selden (*de Synedriis Ebraeorum*, lib. iii. c. 15), the Circumcision is reckoned among the minor festivals, and that the *Apostolic Constitutions*, a work doubtless of Oriental origin, ignores it altogether.

In process of time the day became more and more recognized, and at last the observance became universal.

A reason for the Church's apparent slowness in recognizing and commemorating so important an incident in our Lord's earthly life, at which He received the name Jesus—an event, one would suppose, itself of more than ordinary interest—is doubtless to be found in the fact that on the Kalends of January was held a great heathen festival, characterized by an excessive amount of riot and licentiousness. The Christians, anxious to avoid an apparent toleration of these abominations by holding a festival of their own, even though of a totally different character, on the same day, enjoined a solemn fast, as a wholesome protest and as a means of guarding the unwary from being led astray. See Augustine, *Sermon*. 197, 198 (*Patrol.* xxxviii. 1024 sq.).

There is also an allusion to this in a canon of the 2nd Council of Tours, A.D. 567 (*Conc. Turonense* II. can. 17; Labbé, v. 857). Further we

find in the *Martyrologium Romanum* (January 1), that a certain Almachius suffered martyrdom for saying, "Hodie octavae Dominici diei sunt, cessate a superstitionibus idolorum et a sacrificiis pollutis." If, as is asserted, this Almachius be the same with the Telemachus mentioned by Theodoret (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 26), this event must be referred to the time of Honorius, and will point to a certain recognition of the day by the Roman Church at the end of the 4th century. To the subject of this fast we shall briefly refer again.

We shall now proceed to discuss the observance of the day more in detail.

II. *Liturgical Notices.*—It is impossible to determine the character of the evidence borne as to this day by the Leonine Sacramentary, for it is mutilated at the beginning, and commences with the month of April. The last section in it, however, is "In jejuniis mensis decimi," for which five Masses are given, thus furnishing evidence for the observance of the time, though none for the name by which the day was known (ii. 156, ed. Ballerini). It may be added, however, that with this exception there is no allusion to the day in the writings of Leo I., although he has many sermons on the Nativity itself. The Gelasian Sacramentary gives a Mass for the day, *In Octavas Domini*, and there follows one *Prohibendum ab idolis*, pointing to what we have already said as to the heathen festival on this day (*Patrol.* lxxiv. 1061). In the former Mass, the main idea is evidently of the octave of the Nativity, and not of any special commemoration of the day itself, there being merely a passing allusion to our Lord's Circumcision, as contrasted with such expressions as "Cujus hodie octavas nati celebrantes . . ." and the like.

In the Gregorian Sacramentary the Mass for the day is headed *In Octavis Domini* (Greg. *Sacr.* col. 13, ed. Menard), but the Gospel treats of the Circumcision, Luke ii. 21–32. Of two collects given, one has special reference to the Virgin, the other to the octave, and in Pamelius' edition of the Sacramentary, and in the *Cd. Reg. Suec.* is read *Ad S. Mariam ad Martyres*; in the *Kalendarium Romanum* is *Natale S. Mariae*, and thus in the Gregorian Antiphony (*op. cit.* 660) we have *De Sancta Maria in Octava Domini*.

All this points to a twofold commemoration of the day, the one having regard to the octave of the Nativity or the Circumcision, the other to the Virgin, and hence the special prominence given to the mention of her in the Mass for the day in the modern Romish Missal. The Preface and the Benediction in the Gregorian Sacramentary do indeed refer to the Circumcision—"Cujus hodie Circumcisionis diem et Nativitatis octavam celebrantes—"; but there is a certain amount of evidence against their authenticity, they are omitted by Pamelius and are wanting in the *Cd. Reg. Suec.* Possibly, therefore, they are a later addition.

We may next briefly notice the ancient liturgical documents of the Gallican Church. The ancient Lectionary published by Mabillon (*de Liturgia Gallicana*, p. 112), gives lections *In Circumcisione Domini* for matins and for the Mass; for the former, Isaiah xlv. 24–xlv. 7, and for the latter, Isaiah i. 10–20; with 1 Cor. x. 14–31 and Luke ii. 21–40 for the Epistle

and Gospel, the Gospel being the same as in the Gregorian and Mozarabic liturgy; the prophetic lection and Epistle in this last being Isaiah xlviii. 12-20 and Philippians iii. 1-8. It will be observed that the Epistle in the Gallican liturgy has reference to the idol practices which characterized the day. The Gotho-Gallic Missal (ib. 200) gives an *Ordo Missae in Circumcisione Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, and the Mozarabic Breviary and Missal style the day *Circumcisio Domini*.

It is thus probable that we must look to Gaul and Spain for early examples of this title of the day. The first definite instance that we have observed is to be found in the canon of the 2nd Council of Tours (567 A.D.) already referred to, which, after remarking that every day was a festiva from Christmas to Epiphany, adds, "excipitur triduum illud, quo ad calcandam Gentilium consuetudinem patres nostri statuerunt privatas in Kalendis Januarii fieri litanias, et in ecclesiis psallatur, et hora octava in ipsis Kalendis Circumcisionis Missa Deo propitio celebretur" (Labbé, l.c.). There is also some evidence for supposing that the title of the Circumcision was applied to the day in Spain before the death of Isidore (636 A.D.), for we read in one place, "placuit etiam patribus a die Natalis Domini usque ad diem Circumcisionis solemne tempus efficere" (*Regula Monachorum* 12; *Patrol.* lxxiii. 880). Arevalus does indeed suggest (*not. in loc.*), from the belief that the title Circumcision is probably of later date, that the original words of Isidore here may have been *Kalendas Januarias*; but when the passage is taken in conjunction with the above quoted canon, there seems the less reason for having recourse to this hypothesis. Further, remarks in the laws of the Visigoths shew that by the middle or latter part of the 7th century the day ranked in Spain of so high importance that on it the law courts were closed, and that it then bore the name of the Circumcision (*Codex Leg. Wisigoth.* lib. ii. tit. 1, lex 11; lib. xii. t. 3, l. 6; in *Hispania Illustrata*, iii. 863, 1004, Frankfort 1606). Still, the old name survived, for we find it at the end of the 8th century in the *Regula* of Bishop Chrodegang (*Patrol.* lxxxix. 1090), and in the proceedings of the Council of Mainz, 813 A.D. (*Conc. Moguntinum*, can. 36; Labbé, vii. 1250).

Briefly then to sum up the results so far obtained: we have seen that the *a priori* expectation, which would assign the end of the 4th century as the earliest possible date of the recognition of the day under either title, is borne out by the fact of the absence of allusions to it before that date; and further that, until at the earliest the middle of the 6th century, it was solely as the octave of the Nativity, and not as the Circumcision that the day was known. It may be remarked here that the whole of Christendom agrees in celebrating the Circumcision on January 1 except the Armenian Church, which still adheres to the old Eastern practice of commemorating the Nativity and Epiphany together on January 6, and necessarily therefore celebrates the Circumcision on January 13.

The primary idea of the day as a fast and not a festival has already been referred to. The canon of the 2nd Council of Tours which we have cited shows the state of the case in France; that the same custom prevailed in Spain is shown

by an allusion in a canon of the 4th Council of Toledo, A.D. 633 (*Conc. Tol.* iv. can. 11; Labbé, v. 1709); cf. Isidore, *de Eccl. Off.* lib. i. c. 46; although it must be added that a heading in the Mozarabic Breviary points to the three days before the Epiphany as the period of the fast: "Officium jejuniorum in Kal. Jan. observatur tribus diebus ante festum Epiphaniae." Lastly, we may refer to the *Ordo Romanus*, which, after speaking of the heathen abominations which defiled the day, adds, "Statuit universalis Ecclesia jejunium publicum in isto die fieri" (p. 20, ed. Hittorp.\*).

It will, of course, be inferred from what has been already remarked that there is an absence of homilies or sermons for the day in the works of early patristic writers. We may here again, however, refer to the discourse of Zeno of Verona, *de Circumcisione* (lib. i. tractat. 13, p. 99, ed. Ballerini, where see note 1). In an ancient MS. of this of the 9th century (the Cd. Remensis) is added a note in the margin of this discourse, *In Octava Domini pontificis nona lectio*. The Ballerini consider these notes to have been written at the time when Archbishop Hincmar (ob. 882 A.D.) gave the MS. to the abbey of St. Remigius at Rheims, and while the MS. belonged to the Church of Verona (*Praef.* § 5), and that this discourse was there spoken on the octave of the Nativity. They infer from the marginal note the relative importance of the day, considering that such a remark about the ninth lection would be made only in the case of the more important festivals. Bede has written a homily for the day on Luke ii. 21 (*Hom.* x.; *Patrol.* xciv. 53).

When the fast became a festival it is impossible definitely to say. Probably the process was a gradual one, and the period varied in different countries. The statutes of St. Boniface (ob. 755 A.D.) include it among the special festivals on which no work was to be done (D'Achery, *Spicilegium* ix. 66). Still, at a period subsequent to this, traces of the old state of things survived, the latest we have observed being in the *Capitula* of Atto, bishop of Vercelli in the 10th century, who dwells on the expediency of maintaining the ancient protest (*Patrol.* cxxxiv. 43).

[R. S.]

CIRCUS. [CHARIOTEER.]

CIRINUS. [CYRINUS.]

CITHINUS, one of the "martyres Scillitani" at Carthage, July 17 (*Cal. Carthay.*, Bedae, *Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

[C.]

CLARUS, presbyter, and martyr "in pago Vilcasino," Nov. 4 (*Mart.* Usuardi).

[C.]

CLAUDIANUS. (1) Martyr in Egypt under Numerian, Feb. 25 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr at Nicomedia, March 6 (*Mart.* Usuardi).

[C.]

CLAUDIUS. (1) Martyr at Ostia under Diocletian, Feb. 18 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr at Rome, with Pope Marcellinus, April 26, A.D. 304 (*Mart.* Usuardi).

\* The alleged *Statuta Ecclesiae Rhemensis* (Labbé, v. 1694), attributed to Bishop Sonnatius, in which (c. 20) reference is made to the Circumcision as one of the days "abaque opere forendi excolenda," are probably fabrications of a later date.

(3) Martyr at Rome, with Nicostratus and others, July 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

(4) Martyr in Aegea, Aug. 23 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Usuardi).

(5) Martyr at Rome, with Nicostratus and others, Nov. 8 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Bedae, *Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi). Compare (3).

(6) The tribune, martyr at Rome under Numerian, Dec. 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi); Aug. 12 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [C.]

**CLAVUS.** We continually find in ancient Christian frescoes and mosaics garments decorated with long stripes of purple, sometimes enriched with embroidery or an inwoven pattern, called *clavi*. These generally run from the top to the bottom of the garment, and are broader or narrower according to the dignity of the wearer. Thus, the Lord is often distinguished by a broader clavus than those of the apostles, as in a fine fresco in the cemetery of St. Agnes (Perret, *Catcombs*, ii. pl. xxiv.). Undistinguished persons also wore clavi, but very narrow. In nearly all cases these clavi are two in number, and run from each shoulder to the lower border of the dress. This arrangement of the clavi is alluded to in the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas, where the Good Shepherd is said to have appeared to the former "*distinctam habens tunicam inter duos clavos per medium pectus*" (Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, p. 32, ed. Verona). Tertullian (*De Pallio*, c. 4) speaks of the care which was taken in the selection of shades of colour.

There are a few examples of the single clavus, running down the centre of the breast, which Rubenius believes to have been the ancient fashion of wearing it. These occur only in representations of the Three Children in the fiery furnace (Bottari, *Sculture e Pitture*, tav. cxlix. clxxxi.). Clavi are common to both sexes; women may be seen represented with that ornament, for instance, in pictures of the Wise and Foolish Virgins (Bottari, tav. clviii.); and female figures are sometimes found adorned with *two* clavi on each side. Jerome (*Epist.* 22, *ad Eustochium*) alludes to the use of the clavus by women, single as well as married. It is also common in early art to personages of the Old Testament and the New; it is given to Moses, for instance, in a painting engraved by Perret (i. pl. xxiv.), and to the apostles in nearly all representations of them, whether in fresco, in mosaic, or in glass. Angels also wear the clavus in early mosaics, as may be seen in examples given by Ciampini (*Vet. Mon.* i. tab. xlv. ii. tab. xv.), in the Menologium of Basil (see particularly Dec. 16 and Dec. 29), and in several ancient miniatures.

These purple stripes were worn on the penula as well as the tunic: a fresco from an arcosolium in the cemetery of Priscilla (Bottari, tav. clxii.) furnishes three examples. They are found also in the pallium: a mosaic of St. Agatha Major at Ravenna represents our Lord with clavi of gold on such a garment. The dalmatic and colobium were similarly decorated: the latter seems to have had only one broad band of purple (*latus clavus*) descending from the upper part of the chest to the feet. See the Christian sarcophagi engraved by Bottari (tav. xvii. cxxxvii. and others).

Priests, after the example of the senators of

old Rome, are said to have worn the broad clavus, while deacons contented themselves with the narrow one on their tunics or dalmatics. The clavus is sometimes represented as descending only to the middle of the chest: it is in these cases decorated with small discs or spangles, and terminates in small globes or *bullae*. This is said to be the kind of decoration which is sometimes called *paragaudis*. (Rubenius, *De Re Vestiaria et praecipue de Lato Clavo*, Antwerp, 1665; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. chrét. s. v. Clavus*.) [C.]

**CLEMENT.** (1) Of Ancyra, martyr, A.D. 296; is commemorated Jan. 23 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Pope, martyr at Rome under Trajan, Nov. 23 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Bedae, *Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi); Nov. 24 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(3) Of Alexandria; is commemorated Dec. 4 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

**CLEMENTINE LITURGY.** [LITURGY.]

**CLEMENTINUS**, martyr at Heraclea, Nov. 14 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Usuardi). [C.]

**CLEONICUS**, martyr, A.D. 296; is commemorated March 3 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**CLEOPHAS**, martyr, at Emmaus, Sept. 25 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi). [C.]

**CLERESTORY**, or **CLEARSTORY.** An upper story or row of windows in a church, rising clear above the adjoining parts of the building. As the clerestory was a common feature in the old civil basilica, it was probably soon adopted in buildings of the same type used for ecclesiastical purposes. See for instance, the ancient basilica of St. Peter at Rome, under **CHURCH**, p. 370; also p. 381. [C.]

**CLERGY.** [CLERUS; IMMUNITIES OF CLERGY.]

**CLERMONT, COUNCILS OF.** [GALLICAN COUNCILS.]

**CLERUS**, deacon, martyr at Antioch, Jan. 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi). [C.]

**CLERUS** (and **CLERICUS** = one of the *Clerus*), at first equivalent to the whole body of the faithful, as being the lot or inheritance of the Lord (1 Pet. v. 3 = *κληρονομία*, r. Theodoret, *ad loc.*, and so still used by e.g. Theophanes, *Hom.* xii. 70, quoted by Suicer); but appropriated almost immediately to all, "*qui in ecclesiastici ministerii gradibus ordinati sunt*" (Isid. *Hispal. De Eccl. Offic.* ii. 1); the distinction of clergy and laity being found in 1 Cor. xiv. 16, and in St. Clement of Rome, and the term being applied to the former exclusively, "*vel quia de sorte sunt Domini, vel quia Ipse Dominus sors, est, pars clericorum est*" (St. Jerome, *Ad Nepotian.*, followed by Isidore, as above, and by Rab. Maur. *De Instit. Cleric.* i. 2). The more modern derivation, from the lots cast at the appointment of St. Matthias (so e.g. Suicer), seems set aside by the fact, that clergy were *not* chosen by lot. The word *clericus* was further subdivided when the minor orders came into existence; all being called *clerici* (*πάντας κληρικούς καλοῦμεν*, Justin. *Novell.* cxxiii. 19), but the name being also sometimes given in particular to the *lectores*, *psalmistae*, *ostiarii*, &c. who "*clericorum nomen retinent*" (*Conc. Carthag.* iii. A.D. 397, c. 21); and who in later centuries are often so called exclu-

sively, while the three proper orders became distinguished as "primi clerici" (*Concl. Theodos. lib. xiii. De Judaeis et Coelicol.*), and the lower orders as "inferioris loci" (*ib. leg. 41*). See also the *Can. Apost. 17*, al. 18, 24, al. 25, 30, al. 31, 84; and *Conc. Laodicea. cc. 24, 27, 30*, the latter distinguishing the *ἐπαρκολοί* from the *κληρικοί*, i.e. bishops, priests, and deacons, from subdeacons, readers, &c. The terms *maiores* and *minores ordines* are of much later date. In *Conc. Chalced. A.D. 451*, can. 2, *κληρικὸς* appears to be used as coextensive with those in the *κανὼν* or roll, and to include expressly even the *οἰκονομὸς* and the *defensor*, &c. In c. 3 of the same council it is opposed to bishop on the one hand, and to layman and monk on the other. On the other hand, the term is sometimes found actually used of monks, even as early as by Sozomen (*viii. 18*); and, again, by St. Germanus of Paris, by Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Mart. ii. 21*, and frequently), and by many later writers quoted in Du Cange. The use of the term as meaning a scholar (*γραμματέων ἐπιστήμονες* only ought to be made *clerici*, according to Justinian, *Novell. vi. 4, cxxiii. 12*) dates from the 11th century. The introduction of monks made yet a third class, besides clergy and laity. And the term 'regularis' coming into use when *Regulae* began to multiply, and when monachism was becoming regarded as 'religion,' i.e. about the 8th century, the term 'saecularis' also lost gradually its general sense of 'worldly,' and became simply the antithesis of a 'regular' or monk; the latter term, however, including canons also at their first institution ("Canonici, id est, Regulares Clerici," in the so-called Egbert's *Excerpts*, in Pref., and so also *Conc. Aquisgran. A.D. 789, c. 73*). *Clericus regularis* would thenceforth mean a clergyman who was also a monk; and *Clericus saecularis*, a parish clergyman, or one who kept a school, or lived in any way not under a rule; the class being called 'clerici' simply in *Capit. i. c. 23* of A.D. 802 = "parochitani presbyteri," in *Conc. Emerit. A.D. 656, c. 18*. *Canons*, however, were soon classed as distinct from *Regulars*; as e.g. in the laws of Charles the Great (in *Murator. tom. I. P. ii. p. 100. 6*, quoted by Du Cange),—"Vigilanter curent [Episcopi], ut Canonici secundum canones et Regulares secundum regulam vivant." In *Conc. Vernens. A.D. 755, c. 3*, the *clerus* are distinguished from the *regulares* (Labbe, vi. 1665), which seems the earliest instance of the use of the latter term. The further distinction of *Canonici* themselves into *Regulars* and *Seculars* (canons who had, and canons who had not, a canon or rule) dates from A.D. 1059, when Pope Nicolas II. substituted a new rule for the original rule for Canons enacted at Aix-la-Chapelle, followed by a yet stricter rule enjoined by Ivo, bishop of Chartres; those who adopted the rule of Nicolas being styled *Saecular*, while those who preferred Ivo's were called *Regular* or *Augustinian Canons*. [A. W. H.]

CLETUS, or ANACLETUS, pope, martyr at Rome under Domitian, April 26 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CLICHY, COUNCILS OF [CLIPPIACENSE], near Paris; provincial:—(1) A.D. 628, summoned by Lothaire, but nothing more known of it (Labbe *Conc. v. 1854*, from Aimain). (2) A.D. 633, in the presence of Dagobert, respecting the sanctuary

of St. Denis (Labbe *ib.*). (3) A.D. 659, in which Clovis II. confirmed certain privileges to St. Denis (*ib. vi. 489, sq.*). [A. W. H.]

CLIMACUS, JOHN, Holy Father, δ συγγραφεὺς τῆς Κλίμακος, A.D. 570; is commemorated March 30 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

CLINIC BAPTISM. [SICK, VISITATION OF.]

CLIPPIACENSE CONCILIUM. [CLICHY.]

CLOISTER (*Clastrum, Claustra*, fem.). The word *claustrum* applies strictly to the wall or enclosure of a monastery; as in the phrase "claustra monasteriorum," in the 22nd and 29th canons of the third council of Tours. Thence it became a name for a monastery. According to the definition of the *Breviloquium*, "claustrum dicitur inhabitatio religiosorum, vel domus includens monachos et moniales sub certa regula viventes." In this sense it is frequently used in the *Capitularies* of Charlemagne, where we read of "claustra monachorum, clericorum, clericorum." Compare French *cloître*, German *Kloster*. A Roman synod of the year 826 (c. 7) enjoins that a cloister should be formed near each church, for the better discipline and instruction of the clerks.

But *claustrum* (like our word *cloister*) is applied in a special sense to the quadrangle of a monastery, or college of canons, one side of which is generally formed by the church, and the others by the conventual buildings, and which frequently has an arcade or colonnade running round the sides, to serve as an ambulatory. This was assigned in some ancient statutes as the place for the reading of the monks in suitable weather. The ancient *Ordo Conversat. Monast. c. 9*, desires that the monks of a convent should assemble in one place for their reading, or sit in the cloister. Similarly Hildemar (*MS. Comment. on Benedict's Rule, c. 48*, quoted by Martene) and Dunstan (*Concordia, c. 5*) desire the monks, after terce and mass, to sit in the cloister to read.

The monks of St. Gall in the 9th century excluded from their cloister all secular persons whatever, unless under the guidance of a brother and wearing a monk's hood. (Ducange's *Glossary, s. v. Claustrum*; Martene, *De Ritibus Monachorum, lib. i. c. vii. § 4; lib. ii. c. iii. § 19*.) [C.]

CLOISTER SCHOOLS. [SCHOOLS.]

CLOVESH, COUNCILS OF, provincial; locality unknown, except that it was in the kingdom of Mercia, and probably near London (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc. iii. 122*). It was selected by the Council of Hertford, A.D. 673, as the place for the yearly synod of the English Church (*ib. 120*), yet (singular to say) the first recorded Council of Clovesho was not until (1) A.D. 716, when the privilege of Wihtried of Kent to the churches of Kent was confirmed by a general synod of the English bishops, under Ethelbald, king of Mercia (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc. iii. 300-302*). This was followed by (2) A.D. 742, a council, also under Ethelbald, for the same purpose (*ib. 340-342*); and (3) A.D. 747, September, the Great Council under Cuthbert for reformation of abuses, communicated to, but apparently not suggested by, St. Boniface of Mentz (see the acts and letters, &c. *ib. 360-385*);



which appointed also a festival day for both St. Gregory the Great and St. Augustine of Canterbury. (4) A.D. 794, called "Synodale Concilium," and "Sanctum Concilium": two grants are extant made there (Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus*, 164-167; Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, 483-485). (5) A.D. 798, referred wrongly by Spelman to A.D. 800: some charters were passed there (Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus*, 175, 188, 1019; Haddan and Stubbs, *ibid.* 512-518). There are intimations also of the annual synod having been held, but without mention of the place (e.g. A.D. 704, and 736 or 737, both Mercian councils, and again, A.D. 755, Haddan and Stubbs, *ibid.* 267, 337, 390), which may easily therefore have been Clovesho, and probably was so. [A. W. H.]

**COADJUTOR BISHOP**, with a right of succession, was distinctly against canon; on the principle that such an appointment interfered with the right of election in clergy and people, &c. [BISHOP.] The institution of *chorepiscopi* appears to have been among the earliest plans for meeting the case of overgrown dioceses. But instances must have occurred at all times of bishops incapacitated by sickness either of body or mind, or by old age. And under such circumstances resignations were, although grudgingly, permitted. [BISHOP.] Nevertheless, coadjutors also,—meaning by the term full bishops, but acting simply in place of the proper occupant of the see (still remaining so), and with no right of succession,—occur, although at first rarely; almost every early case being mixed up with the succession-question. St. Ambrose certainly speaks of a coadjutor in this special sense being given to Bishop Bassus, "in consortium regendae ecclesiae" (*Epist.* 79). And the 5th Council of Paris (A.D. 577), considerably later, contemplates the case as an exceptionally legitimate one. "Nullus episcoporum se vivente alium in loco suo eligat, . . . nisi certae conditiones extiterint ut ecclesiam suam et clerum regere non possent" (can. 2). And in course of time such coadjutors became at length common, and were provided for by, e.g. Boniface VIII. (in *Sexto c. Pastoralis*). St. Gregory the Great meets the case of temporary sickness by the temporary help of a neighbouring bishop; but in more permanent cases he distinctly recommends a coadjutor, but without right of succession, as, e.g. in the case of John of Justiniana Prima (*St. Gregory M. Epist.* ix. 41). [A. W. H.]

**COARB** (*Coarbo*, *Comharba*, Latinized into *Corba*, = *Conterraneus*, or *eiusdem terrae*, or *districtus*—so Colgan), the title in the Celtic-Irish and Scottish churches, of the abbatial successor of the original founder of a monastery. So an abbat of Hy would be called the Coarb of Columba; of Armagh, the Coarb of Patrick; of Raphoe, the Coarb of Adamnan, &c., &c. The word occurs much earlier in the Annals; but its common use dates from late in the 8th century, when such abbacies had become hereditary in many cases, and not only so, but had passed into the hands, in some instances, of laymen, while a prior discharged the spiritual office. The transformation in lapse of time of the *herenach* or *airchennach*, who was originally the representative of the lay *Advocatus* of the monastery, but gradually usurped the position of hereditary

lay possessor of his original third of the profits of monastic lands, brought him also by a different line to a condition closely resembling what the lay coarb became (as e.g. at Dunkeld); so that the coarb became to a monastery what the herenach was to any church, monastic or not. A female coarb occurs once or twice (Reeves, at Adamn. *V. S. Columbae*, *Add. Notes*, p. 404). Coarbs that were still clergy, became styled in Ireland in later times *Plebani* = rural deans, or archpresbyters, or chorepiscopi (in the later sense of the word), i.e. the head of a "plebs ecclesiastica," viz. of clergy who served chapels under him as rector. [Reeves, *Colton's Veneration*, pp. 4 note, 145, 209; Spelman, *Gloss. in v. Corba*; E. W. Robertson, *Early Scotl.* i. 330.] [A. W. H.]

**COAT, THE HOLY.** Its miracles are commemorated on Oct. 1 in the *Georgian Calendar*.

**COCHLEAR.** [SPOON.] [C.]

**COCK.** Representations of this bird occur frequently on tombs from the earliest period. When not associated with the figure of St. Peter, as Bottari, *tav. lxxiv.*, or placed on a pillar, as Boldetti, p. 380; Bottari, *tav. xxxiv. xliii.*, &c., it appears to be a symbol of the Resurrection, our Lord being supposed by the early Church to have broken from the grave at the early cock-crowing. A peculiar awe seems always to have attached to that hour, at which all wandering spirits have through the Middle Ages been supposed to vanish from the earth. *Hamlet* and the ancient ballad called *The Wife of Usher's Well* occur to us as salient examples of an universal superstition. Prudentius' hymn *Ad Galli Cantum* (*Cathem.* i. 16) adopts the idea of the cock-crowing as a call to the general judgment ("Nostris figura est iudicis"); and further on (45 seqq.) he says:

"Hoc esse signum praecidi  
Noverunt promissae apes,  
Qua non saporis liberti  
Speramus adventum Dei."

And again, 65 seqq.:

"Iude est, quod omnes credimus,  
Ilio quietis tempore,  
Quo gallus exultans canit,  
Christum redire ex inferis."

See Aringhi, vol. ii. pp. 328-9 (in a complete list of animal symbols). Fighting-cocks (see the passage last quoted) seem to symbolize the combat



From a Cup (Aringhi, ii. 614).

with secular or sensual temptations. The practice of training them for combat has probably always existed in the East, and certainly was in favour at Athens (cf. Aristoph. *Av.*, αἶρε πλῆκτρον, εἰ μαχεῖ, &c.). For a symbol drawn from such a pastime, compare St. Paul's use of the word ὁμιλία (1 Cor. ix. 27). See Bottari, vol. ii. t. 137.

Two cocks accompany the Good Shepherd in Bottari, tav. clxxii. (from the tympanum of an arch in the cemetery of St. Agnes). [R. St. J. T.]

## CODEX CANONUM ECCLESIAE

GRAECAE.

ROMANAE.

UNIVERSAE.

To treat of them in their chronological order, we must reverse their alphabetical, and proceed from the last to the first. Dionysius Exiguus, in dedicating his own collection (Migne's *Patrol.* lxxii. 139) to Stephen, bishop of Salona, speaks of two collections anterior to it; one in Greek of 165 canons, according to him, terminating with the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381; and another in Latin, long ago translated from the Greek, which he had in fact been asked to improve upon. The Greek collection was composed of 20 canons passed at Nicaea; 25 at Ancyra (which he reckons as 24); 14 at Neocaesarea; 20 at Gangra; 25 at Antioch; 59 at Laodicea; and 6 at Constantinople (which he gives as 3). All had been framed in the 4th century; and as they begin with the first General Council and end with the second, the probability is that they were put together so as to form a collection before the date of the 4th Council, by the 1st canon of which they were confirmed, and in the acts of which they are more than once cited as still numbered in this collection. [CONCIL. CHALCED.] To it we may suppose to have been appended meanwhile—Justellus (*Patrol.* v. p. 29) thinks by Stephen, bishop of Ephesus, who attended the 4th Council, as there seems to be a collection of his still extant containing them—the 8 canons of Ephesus: and it was further enlarged by the canons of Chalcedon on being confirmed there. In this shape it was ordered to have the force of law by the Emperor Justinian in his 131st Novel. Whether it included more than 27 canons of Chalcedon is, however, open to question; as Dionysius, who must have translated it rather before then, ends with the 27th, telling Stephen expressly, "in his Graecorum canonum finem esse declaramus." And so far is he from standing alone in this, that even John Scholasticus, a presbyter of Antioch, who became patriarch of Constantinople in the last year of Justinian, attributes no more than 27 canons to the Council of Chalcedon in his collection, by which he means of course the first 27. With these, therefore, this code terminated. The Ephesine canons indeed are not translated by Dionysius, nor in the old Latin version of which he speaks; but they are particularly named by Justinian: and John Scholasticus, though he reckons them at seven, has quoted the 8th, passing over the 7th in all probability for no other reason than its irrelevancy to the subject-matter of his collection. Still this code, though it was probably confirmed at Chalcedon, and became law for the empire under Justinian in this shape, seems never to have been received in this shape pre-

cisely by the Roman or the Greek Church. John Scholasticus, whose description of it checked by the number of canons assigned to it by Dionysius, has been here followed in preference to the Greek version edited by Justellus, which is of later date (v. append. ad op. S. Leon. ap. Migne, *Patrol.* lvi. p. 18), prefaces it by 85 canons of the Apostles, as he calls them; interpolates it with 21 canons of Sardica; and tacks to it 68 of St. Basil. Similarly, Dionysius Exiguus, prefacing it with 50 canons of the Apostles, omits the Ephesine, but appends, over and above the 21 Sardican, no less than 138 African canons: in other words, the entire code of the African Church elsewhere described. Out of these two collections were formed separately, (1) the code of the Roman, and (2) the code of the Greek Church.

1. Dionysius, as we have seen, speaks of an old Latin version anterior to his own; and all he remarks on it is its "confusion." It was first published by Voellus and Henry, son of Christopher, Justellus, A.D. 1661, vol. i. pp. 276–304 of their *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici Veteris*; and afterwards in a more perfect form by the Ballerini, in their learned disquisitions "De antiquis collectionibus et collectoribus canonum," appended to their edition of the works of St. Leo (Migne's *Patrol.* lvi. 747–816). It exhibits 24 Ancyran canons, 14 Neocaesarean, 21 Nicene (besides the creed), 21 Sardican, 20 Gangran, 25 Antiochian, 27 Chalcedonian, 4 Constantinopolitan; and then unnumbered, but as though belonging to the last, the 28th canon of Chalcedon, "De primatu ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae." This doubtless was its "confusion" in the eyes of Dionysius; and of course the canons of Constantinople should have preceded those of Chalcedon. But further, at the head of the bishops subscribing to the 28th canon of Chalcedon, immediately before the Roman legates, is Nectarius, who had been previously and rightly mentioned among the framers of the Constantinopolitan canons. Dionysius corrected this inaccuracy by omitting the 28th canon of Chalcedon altogether. The fact of its existence there proves, however, that this old version could not have been very much earlier than that of Dionysius himself, and also that it could never have been of any authority in the Roman Church.

That there was any regularly authorised collection in the Roman Church, in short, before Dionysius brought out his, seems improbable for the very reasons which the Ballerini bring forward in proof of one; namely, that till then the Sardican and Nicene canons, undistinguished from each other, and cited under the latter name, formed its exclusive code: for this rather shews—conformably with what passed between Pope Zosimus and the African church—that up to that time Rome was not conscious of having accepted any but the Nicene canons. At all events, no earlier collection of a public character including more than these, and used there, has been brought to light on their own shewing (v. p. 63–88), as with the collections obtaining in Africa, Spain, Britain, and France we are not concerned. That the want of a similar collection at Rome had been felt, we may infer from the immediate welcome given there to that of Dionysius. Cassiodorus, his contemporary, and a Roman by birth, says in his praise that "he com-

piled lucidly, and with great flow of eloquence, from Greek sources, those canons which the Roman church was then embracing, and using so largely" (*Divin. Lect.* c. 23): and Dionysius made them doubly acceptable there by supplementing them with a collection of the decrees of the Roman pontiffs from Siricius to Anastasius II., or from A.D. 385 to 498; which, in his dedicatory preface to Julian, "presbyter of the title of St. Anastasia," he says he had arranged on the same plan as his translation of the canons—a work that he understood had given his friend so much pleasure. Whether Dionysius omitted the canons of Ephesus, as not being canons in the ordinary sense of the word—which they are not [CONCIL. EPH.]—or because they were not in the old Latin version, as observed before, or because they were not in the particular Greek version used by him, is not, and probably will never be made clear. Again, why he added the Sardican canons, carefully distinguished from the Nicene, is another question of some interest. What he says is that he gave them as he found them published, in Latin. Had they not, then, been published in Greek likewise? Certainly, whether published in Greek as well as in Latin originally, or translated into Greek since, we know from what John Scholasticus says—of which presently—that there must have been at least one Greek collection of canons extant, at once containing and citing them as the canons of Sardica—not of Nicaea—when he published his, so that it would have been useless for any Latin to have tried keeping up the delusion of their being Nicene canons any longer. But then supposing him to have been willing to do so, had it been possible, his own spontaneous adoption of the African canons would have been a still greater puzzle. For if the canons of Sardica distinctly countenance, by making provision for, appeals to Rome, the African canons contain the most positive declaration against them to be found in history. [AFRICAN COUNCILS.] By his adoption of the African canons, therefore, which he says existed in Latin, and, as there seems every reason to think, in Latin only then, from their not being included by John Scholasticus, he placed his own candour beyond dispute; thus enhancing the intrinsic merits of his collection. How he came by his materials for the second part, or appendix to it, consisting of the decrees of the Roman pontiffs from the end of the 4th to the end of the 5th century, he omits to explain. He merely says that he had inserted all he could find; which is as much as to say, surely, that there was no collection of them extant to his knowledge before his own. That there was one somewhere, notwithstanding, the Ballerini think highly probable (*ib.* p. 200–6). However, they readily grant that in each case the excellence of his collections was so generally recognized as to make them adopted everywhere. One speedily became styled "*Codex Canonum*;" the other, "*Liber Decretorum*;" and both were presented, with some later additions to each, as some think of his own insertion or adoption, by Pope Adrian I. to Charlemagne, A.D. 787, with a dedication in verse at all events as from himself, ending in these words "A lege nunquam discede, haec observans statuta." it was printed at Mayence A.D. 1525, and afterwards at Paris, as "*Codex vetus ecclesiae Romanae*" (*Patrol.* lxxvii. 135–8, and lvi. 206–11);

a title which belonged to it long before then, as together with all other authentic collections in the West, it had been supplanted gradually by the fraudulent collection known as that of Isidore Mercator, or Peccator, and first published in the latter half of the 9th century.

2. We may now turn to the code of the Greek church, founded, as has been said, on the collection of John Scholasticus ostensibly, though his was not the earliest work of the kind when it came out. Like Dionysius, he speaks of another, or rather of others, who had anticipated him, even in his plan of arranging the canons, not in their chronological order, but according to their subject-matter; the only difference between him and them being that they had made their collection consist of sixty titles; he of fifty; they had omitted the canons of St. Basil; he had supplied them. In other respects his collection included no more than theirs, nor theirs than his: though he considered his own arrangement more intelligible, and the more so as he had given a list at starting of the councils from which he had drawn, and of the number of canons passed by each. In his own language, for instance, the Apostles had published 85 canons through St. Clement; and there had been ten synods since their time, Nicaea, Ancyra, Neocaesarea, Sardica, Gangra, Antioch, Laodicea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, whose canons together amounted to 224 (their respective numbers have been anticipated): to which he had ventured to append 68 of St. Basil. His position as Patriarch of Constantinople, doubtless, stamped his collection with authority from the first. But, like Dionysius, he rendered it still more acceptable for another reason, namely, that he supplemented it by a second work called his *Nomocanon*, from containing in addition the laws of the emperors. Thus the imperial decrees became mixed up with the code of the East, just as the papal decrees with that of the West.

The earlier of his collections received authoritative confirmation, as well as enlargement, in the 7th century, by the second of the Trullan canons, given in a former article. [CONCIL. CONSTANT.] And this code was further augmented by the 102 canons then passed, authoritatively received in the 1st canon of the 2nd Nicene, or 7th Council. This Council added 22 canons of its own; and the two Councils of Constantinople, called the 1st and 2nd under Photius, 17 and 3 more respectively: all which were incorporated by Photius into two works of his own, corresponding to those of his predecessor John, already described; one called his *Synagma Canonum*, and the other his *Nomocanon* (*Migne's Patrol. Gr.* civ. 441–1218). But there is also a third work, distinct from both, attributed to him by Cardinal Mai, being the identical text of the canons of each of the councils previously mentioned, in their chronological order (exhibited by Beveridge, *Synod.* vol. i.); followed by the canons of the different fathers, enumerated in the 2nd Trullan canon (*Synod.* vol. ii.), and by the letter of St. Tarasius to Pope Adrian I. against simoniacal ordinations; on which Balsamon, Zonaras, and Aristenus afterwards commented, and called his *Synagoge Canonum* (*Patrol.* *ib.* p. 431). Such accordingly was, and, so far as it goes, is still the code of the Greek Church: the difference between it and that of the Roman Church may be

appreciated by comparing their respective commenta.  
[E. S. F.]

CODEX. [LITURGICAL BOOKS.]

COENAE. [AGAPAE.]

COENA DOMINI. [MAUNDY THURSDAY.]

COENA PURA. [GOOD FRIDAY.]

**COENOBIMUM** (κοινόβιον). The word "coenobium" is equivalent to "monasterium" in the *liter* sense of that word. Cassian distinguishes the word thus. "Monasterium," he says, may be the dwelling of a single monk, "coenobium" must be of several; the former word, he adds, expresses only the place, the latter the manner of living (*Coll.* xviii. 10). The neglect of this distinction has led to much inaccuracy in attempting to fix the date of the first "coenobia" or communities of monks under one roof and under one government. Thus Helyot (*Hist. des Ordre Mon.* Diss. Prelim. § 5) ascribes their origin to Antony, the famous anchorite of the Thebaid in the 3rd century. But the counter-opinion, which ascribes it to Pachomius of Tabenna a century later is more probable (cf. Tillem. *H. E.* vii. 167, 176, 676); for it seems to have been the want of some fixed rule to control the irregularities arising from the vast number of eremitae, with their cells either entirely isolated from one another or merely grouped together casually, which gave the first occasion to "coenobia." Martene indeed makes the community monastic prior in time to the solitary life (*Comm. in Reg. S. B.* c. 1); but in this he appears to be misled by the common error of attaching to "monasterium" (μοναστήριον) in the oldest writers the meaning, which it assumed only in course of time (cf. Tillem. *H. E.* vii. 102). Cassian himself in the very passage cited by Martene in support of this theory, distinctly traces back the word to the solitaries (οἱ μοναχοί), the earliest of monks (*Coll.* xviii. 5). In allowing that the earliest mention of Lauras occurs a little before the middle of the 4th century, Helyot supplies a strong argument against himself (Diss. Prel. § 5). For the Lauras were an attempt at combining the detached hermitages into a sort of community, though without the order and regularity which constituted a "coenobium;" and thus appear to have been a stepping-stone towards the "coenobium" of Pachomius. In view of other considerations to the contrary, much importance cannot be attached to the passage which Helyot cites from the *Vita Antonii*, called by St. Athanasius, as it may probably be one of the many interpolations there; nor to the passage from Ruffinus (*De Verb. Sen.* 31) which speaks of Pior being dismissed at the early age of 25 by Antony, as already fit to live alone, for there is nothing here about a community, only about Pior being himself trained by the great eremite (cf. Tillem. *H. E.* vii. 109). In fact, the growth of coenobitism seems to have been very gradual. Large numbers of ascetics were collected near the Mons Nitrius (Ruff. *Hist. Mon.* 30 [v. CELITAE]), and doubtless elsewhere also, even before Pachomius had founded his coenobium. But the interval is considerable between this very imperfect organisation of monks thus herding lawlessly together (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* c. 7), and the symmetrical arrangement of the Benedictine system. Tabenna forms the connecting link.

CHRIST. ANT.

Very probably the earliest coenobia were of women; for, though the word *παρθενών*, in the account of Antony having his sister in the charge of devout women (*Ath. Vita Ant.*) is by no means conclusive (but cf. Tillem. *H. E.* vii. 107), the female eremites would naturally be the first to feel the need of combination for mutual help and security.

The origin of the coenobitic life is traced back to the time before the Christian era. Something similar is seen in the pages of Plato (*Legg.* 780, 1), and the Pythagoreans are described by Aulus Gellius, as living together and having a community of goods (*Noctes Atticae*, i. 9).

Opinions have been divided among the admirers of asceticism as to the comparative merits of the solitary life and the coenobitic. Cassian looks up to the life of perfect solitude as the pinnacle of holiness, for which the coenobitic life is only a preparatory discipline (e. g. *Coll.* xix. 3). Theophylact interprets "those who bear fruit an hundredfold" in the parable as virgins and eremites (*S. Marc.* iv. 20). Basil, on the contrary, and the sagacious Benedict, prefer the life of the coenobite as safer, more edifying, less alloyed by the taint of selfishness. (*Bas. Reg.* c. 7, *Bened. Reg.* c. 1.) So, too, Isidorus Hispalensis, one of the founders of monasticism in Spain (*De Off. Ecc.* ii. 15, ap. *Conc. Reg.* iii.), and Cuthbert of Lindisfarne (*Mab. Ann.* xvi. 72). Even Jerome, his monastic fervour notwithstanding, prefers life in the community to life in utter solitude; though at first he seems to have been a zealous upholder of the contrary opinion (*Hier. Epp. ad Rustic.* 125; cf. *ad Heliod.* 14). Doubtless experience had impressed on him the perils of solitude. Legislators found it expedient to curb the rage for eremitism. Justinian ordered monks to stay within the "coenobia" (*Novell.* v. ap. *Suic. Thes.* s. v. cf. *Conc. Carth.* c. 47; cf. *Conc. Agath.* c. 38). Similarly the great Karl discouraged hermits, while protecting coenobitic monks (e. g. *Conc. Francof.* 794 A.D. c. 12), and the 7th Council of Toledo censured roving and solitary monks (*Conc. Tolet.* vii. c. 5). Even in the East the same distrust prevailed of persons undertaking more than they could bear. Thus the Council in Trullo enjoined a sojourn of some time in a coenobium as the preliminary to life in the desert (*Conc. Trull.* 692 A.D. c. 41). Benedict aptly illustrates the difference from his point of view between these two forms of asceticism. The solitary, he says, leaves the line of battle to fight in a single combat (*Reg.* c. 1, cf. *Conc. Regg.* iii. cf. *Sulp. Sev. Dial.* i. 17).

"Coenobium" is used sometimes in mediaeval writers for the "basilica" or church of the monastery (*Mab. Ann. Q. S. B.* iv. 4). A Greek equivalent for "coenobitae" is *συνδοῖται*, derived from *συνδός* (*Bingh. Orig. Eccl.* vii. ii. 3, *Suicer. Thes.* s. v.). Gennadius mentions a treatise by Evagrius Monachus, "De coenobitis et synoditis" (*De Scr. Ecc.* ap. *Fabric. Bibl. Ecc.*). Jerome gives "Sauches," or "Sausses," as the Egyptian equivalent (*Ep.* 22, *ad Eustoch.*). In mediaeval Latin "coenobita" is sometimes coenobitalis, -ialis, -iota, or -ins. (Du Cange, *Gloss.* s. v.); "claustrum" (cloister) "conventus" are frequently used for "coenobium."



Besides the authorities cited, see Hospiniani (*De Origine et Progressu Monachatus*, Lib. iii. Tiguri 1588). See also ASCETICISM, BENEDICTINE RULE, and MONASTERY. [I. G. S.]

COINTA, martyr, Feb. 8. [QUINTA.] [C.]

COFFIN. [BURIAL.]

COLIDEI, = *Céli-De* = *Servi Dei* (explained also by such authorities as O'Reilly and Curry, as equivalent to *Sponsi Dei*, but, according to O'Donovan and Reeves, with less probability): in Scotch records, generally, *Keledei*, which seems the more accurate spelling: in Jocelyn (*V. S. Kenteg.*), *Calledi*; in Girald. Camb. and in the Armagh Registers, *Colidei*, as if *Deicolae* or *Dei Cultores*, or (so Girald. Camb.) *Caelicolae*; and in Hector Boece, and from him in Buchanan, and thence in modern writers, corrupted into *Culdei* or *Culdees* = at first, simply an Irish rendering of what was an ordinary Latin name for monks, and so used apparently in older Irish documents: but appropriated in Ireland about the latter part of (at least) the 8th century to a specially ascetic order of monks, established by Maelruain (ob. A.D. 792) at Tamhlacht, now Tallaght, near Dublin, whose Rule still exists (R14341l na *Celeo-nne*); and of whom it is also possible that some of their peculiar characteristics were borrowed from those of the canons established by Chrodegang of Metz about a quarter of a century earlier, inasmuch as the later Keledei of both Ireland and Scotland did in many points resemble secular canons. The name reappears in Ireland (elsewhere than at Tallaght) in the 10th and 11th centuries. But by this time, in some instances, as at Clonmacnois, the head of the Celi-De was married, and his office hereditary; although there were still instances to the contrary, as in the island in Loch Monaincha (co. Tipperary), the "Colidei" of which are distinctly called "coelibes" by the contemporary Giraldus Cambr. at the end of the 12th century. At Armagh, also, and at Devenish in Loch Erne, the original "Colidei" are found, after Northmen ravages and at later periods, displaced by, but coexisting with, a regular cathedral chapter and a priory of regular canons respectively; while, in other places, they were merged altogether into the chapter. At Armagh, indeed, the Culdee body lasted until the Reformation, and the name until at least A.D. 1628. In Scotland, the name had a parallel but a more notable history. The order seems to have been introduced into that country shortly after A.D. 800. "Calledi," living a specially ascetic life, but as "singulares clerici," and "in singulis casulis," were traditionally the clergy of St. Kentegern's cathedral of Glasgow (Jocel. in *V. S. Kenteg.*); and a distinct connection is traceable between St. Kentegern and the Irish Church. But the name *Keledei* occurs historically, as a name for a clerical body of monks, used in Scotland by writers, contemporary (or nearly so), and in charters, from the 9th century; and it becomes thenceforward the name simply of a particular but numerous class of the older monastic bodies of the Irish type, all however north of the Forth, as distinguished 1, from Columbite Monasteries, and 2, from the special Augustinian, Benedictine, and other orders introduced from the

end of the 11th century. And inasmuch as most of those older foundations had become lax in discipline, and often consisted of married men who handed on their Culdeeships to their children,—yet at the same time still commonly clerical, although in some cases (like many Scotch monasteries of that date) held and transmitted by lay abbats,—the name came to signify, not (as at first) special asceticism, but precisely the reverse. Accordingly, A.D. 1124–1153, King David commenced the great change, which finally either superseded the Keledei by superadding to them a superior body of regular canons, as at St. Andrews and Dunkeld, or merged the Keledei themselves into the chapter, as at Brechin, Ross, Dunblane, Dornoch, Lismore (Argyll), and the Isles, or into a body of regular canons in no connection with a bishop's see, as at Abernethy, &c. The middle or end of the 13th century appears to have completed in Scotland the suppression of both name and class. The name *Colidei* occurs also in England at York as early as A.D. 936, as applied to the then officiating clergy of the Minster, who were displaced apparently (like their Scotch brethren) by the arrival of Norman archbishops, but continued under another name (viz. as the hospital of St. Leonard's) until the dissolution under Henry VIII.; the name *Colidei* being still employed in their chartulary, which was engrossed in the reign of Henry V. (Dugd. *Mon.* VI. ii. 607). Lastly, the same name is applied by Giraldus Cambr. to certain ascetics in the Isle of Bardsey in Wales in the year 1188. Neither in Ireland nor in Scotland is there the slightest trace of foundation, in any really authoritative document, for any supposed peculiarities of doctrine or of church government, derived by Culdees from some Eastern or other source, and handed down by them; nor for any other connection between them and the Columbite monasteries than that both were of Irish type. The abbey of Hy itself was distinctly not Keledean, although at a very late period (A.D. 1164) a subordinate body of Keledei are found in the island. The details however of the great revolution in the organization of the Scotch Church, which involved as part of itself the transformation of the older monastic arrangements into the new, and (more noticeable still) the transfer of jurisdiction from presbyter abbats to diocesan bishops,—both processes implying in the majority of cases the suppression of Keledean foundations,—belong to a period some centuries later than that to which this article refers. As does also, much more, the history of the strange perversions of the facts of the case by combined ignorance and partisanship, which are hardly, it seems, all exploded everywhere even now.

[This account is abridged from Dr. Reeves's carefully exact monograph *On the Culdees*, Dublin, 1864; to which is subjoined an Appendix of Evidences, conclusively establishing the writer's main positions. There is a candid account of the subject also in Grub's *Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland*, vol. i., written however before the publication of Dr. Reeves's exhaustive essay; and a brief, and on the whole competent, summary of the case in ch. x. of E. W. Robertson's *Early Scotland*, written also under the like disadvantage. Earlier writers, as a rule, are not worth mentioning.] [A. W. H.]

**COLLATION** (*Collatio*). The reading from the lives or *Collationes* of the Fathers, which St. Benedict (*Regula*, c. 42) instituted in his monasteries before compline. Such compilations as, for instance, the *Collationes* of John Cassian were read, and hence probably the name. Compare Isidore, *Regula*, c. 8. Ardo Smaragdus, however (on the *Rule*, c. 42), says that this service was called *collatio* "quasi collocutio vel confabulatio," because the monks questioned each other on the portions read. To the same effect Honorius of Autun, *Gemma Animae*, ii. 63. Fructuosus (*Regula*, c. 3) desires the abbot or provost to expound the book read to the more simple brothers.

The Benedictine practice is to hold this service in the church, and this is probably in accordance with the founder's intention; for he evidently contemplated the collation being held in the same place as compline. (Maitene, *De Ant. Monach. Rit.* lib. i. c. 11, p. 35; Ducange, s. v. *Collutio*.) [C.]

**COLLECT** (*Collecta*, *Collecta oratio*, *oratio missæ*, see below). The Collects of the Western Church, for they differ in some important respects from the prayer-forms of the Eastern (Freeman's *Principles*, &c., i. 372) have certain well-marked characteristics which are common to them all. But the question what is the differentia of a collect, what it is that makes a prayer receive this name, must probably be determined by the etymology or the history of the word.

The structure of collects consists of (1) an invocation of God the Father with some attribute, and the ascription in the relative form of some property or action; (2) next follows the object desired by the prayer, often with the addition of ulterior results derived from it, (3) either an ascription of glory or a pleading of the merits of Christ. Their general character is to "combine strength with sweetness,"\* says Canon Bright, "to say much in saying little, to address the Most High in adoring awe, to utter man's needs with profound pathos and with calm intensity, to insist on the absolute necessity of grace, the Fatherly tenderness of God, the might of the all-prevailing name:" they "are never weak, never diluted, never drawling, never ill-arranged, never a provocation to listlessness; they exhibit an exquisite skill of antithesis and a rhythmical harmony which the ear is loth to lose." Many of the collects now in use are undoubtedly of very great antiquity, and are founded on prayer-forms, such as versicles or responses, still older; and this distinction between merely short petitions and what is included in the idea of collect is made by Bona in determining the date of the introduction of the collects "now in use" into the Western Church.<sup>b</sup>

Of these he says Leo the Great (pope from 440 to 461) and Gelasius (pope from 492 to 496) were the first composers, in the form that is in which we have them in the Western Church. From the SACRAMENTARIES attributed to Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory, are derived many of the collects of the English Prayer-Book. And the remote source of these collects is more ancient still.<sup>c</sup> "The idea of the Western collect, is in

all respects derived from the consideration of the Eastern system. We seem to see compressed into the terse collects of Leo, Gelasius, or Gregory, the more diffuse spirit of the Eastern hymns, and thus they would be, so to speak, the very quintessence of the gospels on which the latter were founded." "The only innovation made by the Western composers, and that a very natural one, was to incorporate the collect, not with the ordinary service only but with the communion office itself." Indeed, in the ritual of the West<sup>d</sup> the chief "means by which the ordinary office is continually linked on to the eucharistic is the weekly collect. In the East the vespers and lauds preceding a festival are largely coloured by a variety of hymns, many of them resembling prayers, and all referring to the gospel of the coming day. In the West, though originally there were several, we have now mostly only a single prayer, composed generally out of epistle and gospel taken together, or with some reference to both. And this, though used at the vespers of the eve, and characteristic of that office, is also continued throughout the week." Our "first collect, then, is not merely a link between our common and our eucharistic offices, but reflecting as it does the spirit of the epistle and gospel it presents to us the appointed variation of the eucharistic office for the current week."

It remains now to speak of the etymology of the word, and it is a question more easy to state than to settle. The word may be derived<sup>e</sup> either (1) from the circumstances of those who use the prayer, or (2) from something in the character of the prayer itself. (I.) In the former case the name is taken from the "Collecta," or people assembled for worship; and this origin of the word has the support of Krazer,<sup>f</sup> who says that in "early times the only prayer called collect was that which was wont to be said for the people when assembled (collectus) in one church with the whole body of the clergy for the purpose of proceeding to another." The sacramentary of Gregory makes this quite clear, in which on the feast of the Purification two prayers are provided, one entitled "Ad Collectam ad S. Adrianum," where clergy and people were assembled to go from thence to S. Maria Maggiore; the other "oratio ad missam" (as if the first were not an eucharistic prayer), "but as time went on," he says, "all prayers said 'ad Missam' were called collects, because the priest repeated them 'super populum collectum sive congregatum.'" This theory is perhaps not so attractive as the two others which remain to be mentioned, but it has probability on its side, as "collecta" for "oratio ad collectam" is just such an abbreviation as usage would produce, while the more recent eucharistic association of the word would account for prayers alike in other respects being called, some of them prayers and others collects. Those who reject this origin must explain the phrase "oratio ad collectam" followed immediately by "oratio ad missam" on another hypothesis.

(II.) If the prayer derives its name 'collect' from its own character, it may be so called either because (1) it is a condensation of Scripture-

\* *Ancient Collects*, pp. 198-200.

<sup>b</sup> Bona, *De Reb. Lit.* ii. §. 4. quoted by Freeman, l. 144.

<sup>c</sup> *P. D.* & l. 144-5.

<sup>d</sup> Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, i. p. 367.

<sup>e</sup> Bright, *A. C.* 202, sq.

<sup>f</sup> *De Liturg.* § 225.

teaching, and more especially in the case of the collects for Sundays and holydays,<sup>5</sup> because it is, as has been said, in many cases the quintessence of the epistle and gospel for the day. Wheatly adopts this view (ch. iii. sect. xix.) with regard to the communion collect, and Archdeacon Freeman<sup>6</sup> seems decidedly to incline to it, citing Boni (R. L. II. v. § 3) in its support, and saying that at all events it renders very accurately one great characteristic of the collect; or because<sup>1</sup> (2) "colligit orationes" it sums up the prayers of the assembly; but "the communion collect does not sum up any previous petitions," though it might be said to gather and offer up in one comprehensive prayer all the devotional aspirations of the people. And if this be the true idea of the prayer, it must have got the name not from summing up all that had been said in prayer before, for these collectae were sometimes said before the concluding part of the service,<sup>2</sup> but for the reason just given, that it collects and presents to God in a compendious form all the spoken and unspoken petitions of the congregation to Him. It is a recommendation of this derivation that it applies equally to all prayers of the collect-form, and does not apply only to the communion-collects and leave the etymology of the others undecided, an objection which may be urged against a former derivation (II. 1).

It may be said that both these latter derivations have an *ex post facto* air, that they are wanting in historical basis, and are just such as would occur to persons who finding the word set themselves to discover the origin of its use from its form; while the first rests on the fact that in the Vulgate,<sup>1</sup> and by the ancient fathers,<sup>2</sup> the word collect is used to denote the gathering together of the people into religious assemblies, and that in the sacramentary of Gregory a collect is provided to be said "ad collectam ad S. Adrianum."<sup>3</sup> Archdeacon Freeman<sup>4</sup> infers from this that in Gregory's time the ordinary office as distinguished from the communion was called "collecta," and goes on to say, "it is very conceivable that a prayer which, though also said at communion has this as its characteristic that it was designed to impart to the ordinary service the spirit of the eucharistic gospel, would on that account be called collecta," which seems to be rather going out of the way to account for a prayer being called 'collecta oratio' which was said at a service confessedly called 'collecta.' [COLLECTA.]

Whatever may have been the derivation of the word *Collecta*, it is applied in rituals especially to the following.

1. The prayers which immediately precede the Epistle and Gospel in the Mass. What was the number of these in ancient times is not absolutely certain. In the *Sacramentaries* of Gregory and Gelasius one is given in each mass; but St. Columbanus was blamed in a Council of Maçon for having introduced the custom of

using several collects, contrary to the general practice of the church, and was defended by Eustasius, his successor in the abbey of Luxeuil (*Acta SS. Bened.* sec. ii. p. 120). John, abbat of St. Alban's, is said to have limited the number to seven (Matthew Paris in his *Life*); and the same rule is laid down by the anonymous author of the *Speculum Ecclesiae*, by Belet (c. 37), and by Durandus (*Rationale*, iv. 14). The *Micrologus* (c. 4) lays down that, for mystical reasons, the number of collects should be either one, three, five, or seven. (Martene, *De Antiq. Eccl. Rit.* i. 133.)

2. In the Hour-offices. Only one collect seems anciently to have been used in each office; for Walafrid Strabo (*De Reb. Eccl.* c. 22) says that it was usual, not only at Mass but at other assemblies, for the highest in rank of the clergy present to conclude the office with a short prayer, an expression which seems to exclude the supposition that more than one of this kind was used. The assigning the collect to the person of highest rank accords with the injunction of the fifth canon of the first Council of Barcelona (A.D. 540), according to one reading, "episcopo praesente orationes presbyteri non [*al.* in ordine] colligant." But the monks of the Thebaid seem to have subjoined a collect to each psalm, or in the longer psalms to have inserted two or three collects at intervals (Cassian, *De Nocturn. Orat.* ii. cc. 8 and 9). Fructuosus of Braga (*Regula*, c. 3) also testifies to the same practice in Spain. Caesarius of Arles (*Ad Monachos*, c. 20) enjoined collects to be intermingled with the lections. The *Rule* of St. Benedict enjoins only that each office be concluded with the Lord's Prayer and *missae*, meaning no doubt what are elsewhere called *orationes*; but the practice mentioned by St. Isidore (*Regula*, c. 7) of mingling collects with the recitation of the psalms, and also concluding the office with them, was very probably in fact the custom of the Benedictine order, though it does not appear distinctly in the *Rule*; for St. Benedict would scarcely have departed from so general a practice as that of intermingling collects with the psalms, especially as he was much influenced by Egyptian precedent: and this supposition accounts for the fact that in many ancient MS. Benedictine psalters a collect follows each psalm.

It appears from Cassian's testimony (*De Noct. Orat.* ii. 9) that in the fifth century there was a difference of practice with regard to the manner of saying collects; for some monks threw themselves on their knees to pray immediately after the ending of each psalm; others said a short prayer before kneeling, and knelt for a short time afterwards in silent adoration. During prayer they stood upright, with expanded hands. Similarly Fructuosus of Braga (*Regula*, c. 3). The Benedictine practice is, that all kneel from the time that the priest says the *Kyrie Eleison* to the end of the last collect. The collects were said, in accordance with the principle mentioned above, by the abbat, or the brother who presided in his place (Martene *De Antiq. Eccl. Ritibus*, iii. 15; iv. 12, ed. Venet. 1773). [E. C. H.]

COLLECTA. (1) The collecting of alms or contributions of the faithful. From St. Leo the Great (*Hom. de Collectis*) we learn that such a collection was sometimes made on a Sunday,

<sup>5</sup> Bright, A. C. 203.

<sup>6</sup> P. D. S. 146-7.

<sup>1</sup> Freeman, P. D. S. 145.

<sup>2</sup> Bright, A. C. p. 205.

<sup>3</sup> Lev. xxiii. 36. Heb. x. 25.

<sup>4</sup> "A populi collectione collectae appellari coeperunt." Alcuin, quoted by Wheatly, ch. iii. sect. xix. § 2, n.

<sup>5</sup> Krazer, *De Liturg.* sect. iv. art. i. cap. iii.

<sup>6</sup> P. D. S. I. 146.

sometimes on Monday or Tuesday (*feria secunda, tertia*), for the benefit and sustenance of the poor. These collections seem to have been distinct from OBLATIONS.

(2) The gathering together of the people for divine service, whether of mass or hours. Jerome (*Epist.* 27 [al. 108], § 19, p. 712) states that the sound of *Alleluia* called monks to say their offices (*ad collectam*). Pachomius (*Regula*, c. 17) speaks of the *collecta* in which oblation was made, that is, the mass; he also distinguishes (cc. 181, 186) between the "*collecta domus*," the service held in the several houses of a monastery, and the "*collecta major*," at which the whole body of monks was brought together to say their offices. In this rule, as in those of Isidore and Fructuosus, *collecta* has very probably the same sense as COLLATIO.

(3) A society or brotherhood. The 15th canon of the first council of Nantes is "*De collectis vel confratriis quos consortia vocant*." See also Hincmar, *Capitula ad Presbyt.* c. 14. (Ducang's *Glossary*, s. v.) [C.]

**COLLECTIO.** In the Gallican missals certain forms of prayer and praise are called *Collectiones*. The principal of these are the *Collectio post Nomina*, which follows the recitation of the names on the diptychs; the *Collectio ad Pacem*, which accompanies the giving of the Kiss of Peace; the *Collectio post Sanctus*, which immediately follows the "*Holy, Holy, Holy*," and the *Collectio post Eucharistiam*, after communion. (Martene, *De Ritibus Eccl. Antiq.* i. c. iv. art. 13.) [C.]

**COLLECTION.** [ALMS: COLLECTA.]

**COLLEGIUM.** Corporations or guilds, called *collegia*, of persons united in pursuit of a common object, were numerous in the empire in the early days of the Christian church. The imperial government of course took cognizance of them, and did not permit such combinations for every purpose. Associations for the purpose of maintaining religious rites were however for the most part not interfered with; but when the presence of Christianity in all parts of the empire attracted attention, its *collegia*, as the several churches seemed to be from the jurist's point of view, were declared illicit, and to belong to them a misdemeanour. (Gieseler, *Eccl. Hist.* i. pp. 20, 114; Cunningham's *Trans.*, Philadelphia, 1836.) [Compare BROTHERHOOD; CANONICI; CHAPTER.] [C.]

**COLOBIUM** (κολόβιον). A tunic with very short sleeves only, and fitted closely about the arm. A few words of the Pseudo-Alcuin (*de Dir. Off.*) both describe the dress and reproduce, with a characteristic modification, an old Roman tradition concerning it. "*Pro tunica hyacinthina (i.e. the tunic of blue worn by the Jewish high-priest) nostri pontifices primo colobis utebantur. Est autem colobium vestis sine manicis*." The older tradition was that Sylvester, bishop of Rome, ordered that *deacons* should wear dalmatics in offices of holy ministry, in place of the colobia, which had previously been in use. From this circumstance of the colobium being regarded as the special vestment of a deacon it is sometimes called *lebiton* (i.e. *leviton*) or *lebitonarium*, a word which reappears in ecclesiastical Greek of the 5th and later centuries.

It is so used by Iulladius of Hellenopolis, in the *Historia Lausiaca* so-called, cap. 38, describing the dress worn by the monks under Pachomius at Tabennesis in the Thebaid (Migne, *Patrol.* lxxxiii. 1157), a dress prescribed, according to the author, by an angel in vision:—"Noctugestent lebitones lineos, succincti." And again, cap. 47: τὸ δὲ ἔνδυμα ἦν αὐτῷ ὁ λεβιτών, ὃν περ τινες κολόβιον προσαγορεύουσι. The monastic colobium in Palestine, if not elsewhere, had upon it a purple "sign," probably a cross. So St. Dorotheus, archimandrite (Migne, *Patrol. Series Graeca*, lxxxviii. 1631), describing the monastic dress of his day in Palestine, late in the 6th century, says:—τὸ σχῆμα ὃ φοροῦμεν καλόβιον ἐστὶ, μὴ ἔχον χειρίδια, καὶ ζώνη δερματίνη, καὶ ἀνάλαβος, καὶ κουκούλιον . . . Ἐχει δὲ τὸ κολόβιον σημεῖον τι πορφύρου (as a mark of service, he explains, under Christ our King). Examples of the Greek colobium may be seen in the ancient mosaics, reputed to be of the 4th century, in the church of St. George at Thessalonica. See Texier and Pullan, *Byzantine Architecture*, Ill. xxx.-xxxiii.; Marriott, *Vest. Christ.* Ill. xviii.-xx. [W. B. M.]

**COLOGNE, COUNCIL OF** (*Agrippinense*, or *Coloniense Concilium*). (1) Said to have been held A.D. 346, to condemn Euphratas, Bishop of Cologne (for denying our Lord's divinity); who was however at Sardica as an orthodox bishop the year after (*Pagi ad an.* 346, n. 6; Mansi, ii. 1371-1378). Baronius and Cave think the council spurious. Sirmond supposes Euphratas to have recanted; others that he was acquitted; others that there were two successive bishops of Cologne so named.

(2) Another council is reported to have been held A.D. 782, under Charlemagne; but this was apparently a political council: nothing is known of it ecclesiastically (Labbe and Cossart, *Concilia*, vi. 1827, from Eginhard). [A. W. H.]

**COLOUR.** The assigning of special colours in the vestments of ministers, &c. to certain seasons does not belong to the first eight centuries of Christianity (Hefele, *Beiträge zur Archäologie etc.* ii. 158), and is probably first found in the work of Innocent III. (†1216), *De Sacro Altaris Mystero*, lib. i. c. 65. There are, however, certain peculiarities in the use of colour in ancient art which may be mentioned here.

(1) *White* was held to symbolize the pure bright light of truth (Clemens Alex. *Paedagog.* ii. 10, p. 235). Hence the Lord is represented with a white robe as "*the Truth*," whether sitting in the midst of the Doctors, or teaching His disciples. See for instance the ancient mosaics of the church of SS. Cosmas and Damian (Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.* ii. tab. xvi.), and of S. Agatha alla Suburra at Rome (ib. i. tab. lxxvii.). It is because of its whiteness that Origen (*In Exodum*, Hom. vii.) finds the manna to represent the word of truth. Angels are generally represented on ancient monuments in white robes, which typify, says Dionysius the Areopagite (*De Hierarch. Coelest.* c. 15), their resemblance to God. Saints too are clothed in white; for instance, on the triumphal arch of the basilica of S. Paolo f. l. m. are represented saints clothed in white robes laying their crowns at the foot of the Divine Throne (Cassan-



plai, *Vat. Mon.* i. 281). The same circumstance may be noted in the mosaics of the church of St. Vitale at Ravenna, and elsewhere.

White, sometimes striped with purple (CLAVUS), was the almost invariable colour of ministerial vestments for all ranks of the ministry in the early ages of Christianity (*Marriott, Vestiarium Christ.* p. xxi.), as it is still for the alb, the amice, and the surplice.

White, the symbol of purity, was worn by the newly baptized during the eight days which followed their baptism.

It appears also from the evidence both of literature and art that the dead were shrouded in white linen. In a fragment of ancient glass figured by Buonarroti (*Vetri*, tav. vii. fig. 1) the grave-clothes of Lazarus are of silver, while the rest of the figures are in gold; and in the *Mesologium* of Basil the bodies of Adasutus (Oct. 4) and Philaret (Dec. 2) are represented as wrapped in white. Prudentius (*Cathemerinon*, x. 57) and Sulpicius Severus (*Vita S. Martini*, c. 12) also allude to the white colour of grave-clothes.

(3) *Red* is the colour of ardent love. Hence the Lord in performing works of mercy is sometimes represented clad in a red tunic or pallium, and also in "sending fire upon earth" by the mission of the apostles (*Ciampini, Vat. Mon.* i. tabb. lxxviii. lxxvi. lxxvii.). Arculf (in Bede, *Hist. Angl.* v. 16) describes the "monument and sepulchre" of the Lord at Jerusalem as being white and reddish (*rubicundo*).

Angels are sometimes found on ancient monuments represented with red wings, whether as the symbol of love or of flame, according to one of the derivations of the word *seraph*. This is the case for instance in the vaults of St. Vitale at Ravenna (*Ciampini, Vat. Mon.* ii. 65).

(3) *Green*, the colour of living vegetation, seems to have been adopted as a symbol of life, and hence is employed to denote the full abounding life of the angels. See Dionysius the Areopagite, *De Hierarch. Coelast.* xv. § 7. Hence angels and saints are not unfrequently clothed in green, especially St. John the Evangelist. The Virgin Mary is also sometimes clothed in this colour. And the Lord Himself is occasionally represented in a green robe as symbolizing the life which is in Him.

(4) *Violet*, the mixture of red and black, has been thought to symbolize the union of love and pain in repentance. It symbolizes, at all events, something of sorrow; hence some monuments, as the mosaic of St. Michael at Ravenna (*Ciampini, Vat. Mon.* ii. p. 63, tav. xvii.) and that of St. Ambrose at Milan (*Ferrari, S. Ambrogio*, p. 156) represent the Man of Sorrows in a violet robe. The sorrowing mother of the Lord is also sometimes represented in violet, and St. John Baptist the preacher of repentance. Angels also wear violet when they call men to repentance, or share in the sorrows of the Lord.

Abbots of the order of St. Benedict wore violet up to modern times, when they adopted black. In ancient times virgins of recluse life wore violet veils (Jerome, *Epist.* 22, ad Eustochium).

*Literature.*—Portal, *Des Couleurs symboliques dans l'Antiquité*, Paris, 1837; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. chrét. a. v. Couleurs*. [C.]

COLUM. (STRAZZER.)

## COMMEMORATION

COLUMBA. (1) Presbyter and confessor abbot of Iona († 596); is commemorated June 9 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Virgin, martyr under Aurelian, Dec. 31 (*Mart. Hieron., Bedae, Rom. Vat., Usuardi*). [C.]

COLUMBANUS, abbot, founder of many monasteries, deposition at Bobbio, Nov. 2 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [C.]

COLUMBARIUM. This word can only find its place in a Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, in order that opportunity may be given to pronounce a decided opinion on the *unreasonableness* of the view propounded by Keymer, and since revived by Mr. J. H. Parker and others, that this distinctively pagan arrangement, essentially belonging to the practice of burning the dead, which was held by the Christians in such abhorrence ("excruciatu reges et damant ignium sepulturas," *Migne, Fel.*), is ever found within the limits of, or in close connection with a Christian catacomb. The misconception has arisen from the fact that the Christian excavators in carrying forward their subterranean galleries not unfrequently came into contact with the walls of a heathen columbarium. As soon as this unintentional interference with the sanctity of the tomb was discovered, the *fossor* proceeded to repair their error. The gallery was abruptly closed, and a wall was built at its end to shut it off from the columbarium. Padre Marchi describes his discovery of a gallery in the cemetery of St. Agnese closed in this way with a ruined wall, on the other side of which was a plundered columbarium (*Monum. Primil.* p. 61). This is probably the true explanation of the fact that a passage has been found connecting a large heathen tomb full of columbaria on the Via Appia, near the Porta San Sebastiano, with a catacomb. (Marchi, *Monum. Prim.* pp. 61 sq.; Roselli, *Beschreib. der Stadt Rom*, pp. 389-390; Rasoul-Rochette, *Tableaux des Catacombes*, p. 283). [E. V.]

COLYMBION (*colymbion*). A vessel used for containing HOLY WATER at the entrance of a church. A representation of such a vessel is found in one of the mosaics of the church of S. Vitale at Ravenna, and is here engraved. The representation of this fountain given by Dr. Neale (*Holy Eastern Church*, Introduction, p. 215) is very incorrect. [C.]

COMES. [LEON-ART.]

COMMEMORATION (*Commemoratio*). The word commemoration in its liturgical use designates—

(1) The recitation of the names of those for whom intercession is made in the mass [DIFFUSUS].





(2) The introduction of the names of certain saints or events in the Divine Office, called also *memoria sanctorum* or *suffragia sanctorum*. Such commemorations are generally of the Cross, of the Virgin Mary, of St. Peter and St. Paul, and for Peace (*Macri Hierolexicon*).

(3) According to the rubrics of the Roman Breviary (*Rubricae Generales*, ix.), when a greater festival falls on the day of a 'simple' festival, the latter is 'commemorated' by the introduction of certain portions of its proper service into that of the greater festival (*R. G.* ix. §§ 8-11). [C.]

COMMENDA. [DIOCESE: MONASTERY.]

COMMENDATIO (*παράθεσις*). 1. In the third Council of Carthage (c. 29) it is provided, that if a *commendatio* of the dead takes place in the afternoon, it must consist of prayers only, without the celebration of mass. In the *Codex Canonum Eccl. Afric.* (c. 103) the set forms to be ordinarily used in churches seem to be summed up under the heads, *preces*, *præfationes*, *commendationes*, *manus impositiones*. Similarly the second Council of Milevis (c. 12), and the fourth of Toledo (c. 13). In the Greek version of the 41st canon of the *Codex Eccl. Afric.*, which is identical with the 29th of the third Council of Carthage, quoted above, the word *παράθεσις* is used as equivalent to "commendatio;" which in this case is no doubt to be interpreted "of the commendation of the dead to the mercy of God." See Zonaras on this canon (p. 429), and Balsamon (p. 655).

2. But the word *παράθεσις* is also used to designate the prayers made in the congregation on behalf of the catechumens. Alexius Aristenus (quoted by Suicer, s. v.) explains the word *παράθεσις*, designating a part of divine service, as "the prayers over the catechumens, whereby we commend them (*παραιθέμεθα*) to the Lord." (Ducauge's *Glossary*, s. v. 'Commendationes'; Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v. *παράθεσις*.) [C.]

COMMENDATORY LETTERS. The earliest trace of the practice connected with these words is to be found in 2 Cor. iii. 1. St. Paul, it would seem, had been taunted by rivals who came with letters of commendation (*ἐπιστολαὶ συστατικαὶ*) from the Church of Jerusalem, with the absence of such credentials in his own case, with his attempts to make up for the omission by reiterated self-commendation. The passage shows that the practice was already common. It was, indeed, the natural protection of a society yet in its infancy against the dangers to which it was exposed, against the tricks of impostors, the false teaching of heretics, the vices of evil-doers. It is probable enough that letters of this kind had been in previous use among the Jews, and that they thus maintained their unity as a people through all the lands of the dispersion. Other instances of it in the Apostolic ages are to be found in the letter given to Apollos by the disciples at Ephesus (Acts xviii. 27), in the mention of Zenas and Apollos in the Epistle to Titus (iii. 13). The letter to Philemon, though more distinctly personal, has somewhat of the same character. The practice was in itself so wise and salutary that it became universal, and was applied under many names, and for many different purposes. As a whole, it may be said, without exaggeration, that no single practice of the early Christian

Church tended so much as this to impress on it the stamp of unity and organization.

The bishop of any congregation, in any part of the empire, might commend a traveller, layman or cleric, to the good offices of any other. The precautions against imposture might sometimes, as in the well-known instance of Peregrinus (Lucian, *de Morte Peregrin.*), perhaps also in that of the *παρῆσακτοι ψευδάδελφοι* of Gal. ii. 4, be insufficient, but as a rule it did its work, and served as a bond of union between all Christian Churches. Wherever the Christian traveller went, if he were provided with these letters, he found the "communicatio pacis," the "contesseratio hospitalitatis" (Tertull. *de Praescript. Haeretic.* c. 20). Those outside the Church's pale, however arrogant might be their claims, could boast of no such proof of their oneness. They were cut off from what was in the most literal sense of the term the "communion of saints" (*Ibid.* c. 32). It was the crowning argument of Augustine (*Epist.* xlv. 3) and Optatus (*De Schism. Donat.* ii. 3) against the Donatists that their letters would not be received in any churches but their own; that they were therefore a sect with no claim to catholicity, no element of permanence. It was, in like manner, but a necessary sequel to the deposition of Paul of Samosata by the so-called Second Council of Antioch, when the bishops who passed sentence on him wrote to Dionysius of Rome and Maximus of Alexandria (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30), requesting them not to address their letters to him, but to Domnus, whom they had appointed in his place. The letters of Cyprian on the election of Cornelius (*Epist.* xlv.) and to Stephen (*Epist.* lxxvii.) are examples of the same kind. The most remarkable testimony, however, to the extent and the usefulness of the practice is found in the wish of Julian to reorganise heathen society on the same plan, and to provide, in this way, shelter and food for any non-Christian traveller who might be journeying to a strange city (Sozomen. *H. E.* v. 16).

It was natural, as the Church became wealthier and more worldly, that the restrictive side of the practice should become the more prominent; that it should be, what the passport system has been in the intercourse of modern Europe, a check on the free movement of clergy, or monks, or laymen. Thus it was made penal (and the penalty was excommunication) for any one to receive either cleric or layman who came to a city not his own without these letters (*Can. Apost.* c. 12). Those who brought them were even then subject to a scrutiny, with the alternative of being received into full fellowship if it were satisfactory, or, if it were otherwise, of having to be content with some immediate relief (*Ibid.* c. 33).<sup>a</sup> So the Council of Elvira (c. 25) seeks to maintain the episcopal prerogative in this matter, and will not allow *litterae confessoriae* (letters certifying that the bearer was one who had suffered in persecution<sup>b</sup>) to

<sup>a</sup> The canon ends with a warning, significant enough of the nature or frequency of the abuses to which the practice had given rise. (*Εἰς κοινὴν αὐτοῦς μὴ προσδέξασθε, πολλὰ γὰρ κατὰ συναρπαγὴν γίνονται.*)

<sup>b</sup> A more received rendering of the word is that the letters were given as a "libellum pacis" to the "lapsi" or others, by a "confessor," who thus usurped the prerogative of the bishop.

take the place of the regular *litterae communicatoriae*. It would appear, from one clause in the canon, that the abuse had spread so far that the "confessor's" passport was handed from one to another without even the insertion of the name, as a cheque payable to bearer. The same practice is condemned by the first Council of Arles (c. 9). That of Elvira denounces also the writing of such letters (the "pacificae") by the wives of presbyters or bishops. The prevalence of this abuse may perhaps explain the zeal of that synod against the marriage of the clergy. The Council of Chalcedon (c. 13) renewed the prohibition of the Apostolic canon against allowing any strange cleric, even as reader, to officiate in another city without the *συστατικά γράμματα* from his own bishop. That of Antioch (A.D. 341) forbids any strangers to be received without *ἐπ. εἰρηνικαί*, forbids presbyters to give the *ἐπ. κανονικαί*, does not allow even Chorepiscopi to give more than the *εἰρηνικαί*. That of Arles (c. 7) places those who have received the *litterae communicatoriae* under the surveillance of the bishop of the city to which they go, with the provision that they are to be excommunicated if they begin "agere contra disciplinam," and adds, extending the precaution to political offences, or to the introduction of a democratic element into the government of the Church, "similiter de his qui rempublicam agere volunt." The system spread its ramifications over all provinces (1 *C. Carth.* c. 7; *C. Agath.* c. 52). It was impossible for the presbyter who had incurred the displeasure of his bishop to find employment in any other diocese. Without any formal denunciation the absence of the commendatory letter made him a marked man. The unity of the Church became a terrible reality to him.

It will have been noticed that other terms besides the original *συστατικά* (*commendatitiae*, or *commendatoriae*) appear as applied to these letters, and it may be well to register the use and significance of each.

1. The old term was still retained, as in the C. of Chalcedon, where the prominent purpose was to commend the bearer of the letter, whether cleric or layman, to the favour and good offices of another bishop.

2. The same letters were also known as *κανονικαί*, "in accordance with the rule of the Church." This is the word used in the letter from the Synod of Antioch, already quoted, by the Councils of Antioch (c. 8) and Laodicea (c. 41). The Latin equivalent seems to have been the *litterae formatae*,<sup>c</sup> i.e. drawn up after a known and prescribed form, so as to be a safeguard against imposture. It was stated at the Council of Chalcedon by Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople, that it was agreed by the bishops at the Councils of Nicaea that every such letter should be marked with the letters Π. Τ. Α. Π., in honour of the three Persons of the Trinity.<sup>d</sup> In the West the signature or seal (*τύπος*) of the bishop was probably the guarantee of genuine-

ness. The first mention of the use of a sealing occurs, it is believed, in Augustine (*Epist.* 59; *al.* 217<sup>e</sup>).

3. From the use of the letters as admitting clergy or laymen to communion they were known as *κοινωνικαί*, and are so described by Cyril of Alexandria (*Act. Ephes.* p. 282). The corresponding Latin, *communicatoriae*, appears in the Council of Elvira (c. 25), Augustine (*Epist.* 43; *al.* 162).

4. The *ἐπιστολαί εἰρηνικαί* appear to be distinguished from the *συστατικά* as commending the bearer for eleemosynary aid. They are to be given to the poor and those who need help, clerics or laymen (*C. Chalced.* c. 11), especially, according to the Greek canonists (Zonaras ad Can. ii. *C. Chalced.*), to those who had suffered oppression at the hands of civil magistrates. The word is used also by the Council of Antioch (c. 7, 8), already quoted as applied to letters which might be given by presbyters as well as bishops.

5. There were the *ἐπιστ. ἀπολυτικά*, the "letters dismissory" of modern times. The word is of later use than the others, and occurs first in the Council in Trullo (c. 17), in a context which justifies the distinction drawn by Suicer (s. v. *ἀπολυτική*), that it was used in reference to a permanent settlement of the bearer, the *συστατική*, when the sojourn in another diocese was only temporary. [E. H. P.]

COMMERCE. It would be difficult to find in either the Old or the New Testament any passage in disparagement of trade, whether combined or not with a handicraft. In the Old Testament, if the calling of Bezaleel and Aholiab puts the highest honour on the skill of the artisan, the ordinary processes of trade are no less sanctified by connecting them with God Himself and His law in such passages as those of Lev. xix. 35-6; Deut. xxv. 13-15; Prov. xl. 1, xvi. 10, 23, xxxi. 24; Micah vi. 11. Nor is it amiss to observe that the Jewish custom which prevails to this day, of bringing up every boy without exception to a business, trade or handicraft, appears to be an immemorial one, and may serve to explain both the calling by our Lord of fishermen-apostles, His own training as a handicraftsman (Mark vi. 3), and the tent-making of Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 3). No incompatibility, therefore, between the exercise of a trade and the Christian calling, whether as a layman or as a member of the clergy, can be coeval with the Church, and all legislation to this effect must belong to what may be termed the secondary, not the primary, era of its development. It must, moreover, be observed that the places in which the Gospel seems to have preferably taken root were busy commercial cities, such as Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus; and it is a remarkable fact that the age in which Christianity first forced itself on the notice of the Pagan world, and was honoured with imperial persecution, the time of Nero, was also one of great commercial activity, as may be seen from the account, chiefly derived from Pliny, of the new trades and inventions introduced under Nero, contained in the "Anecdota de Nerone" annexed to Naudet's *Tacitus*, vol. v. p. 181 and foll. (Paris, 1820).

<sup>c</sup> The word "formata" occurs in the Acts of the Synod of Milevis (c. 20).

<sup>d</sup> The statement rests on the somewhat questionable authority of the Pseudo-Isidore; but the form is found in German documents of the 9th century. (Heizug, s. v. *litterae formatae*.)

<sup>e</sup> See the different meanings in Ducange, s. v. *Epistolae*.

That trade under the later emperors was looked upon as an occupation of inferior dignity is visible from the fact that a constitution of Theodosius and Valentinian (A.D. 436) required all bankers, jewellers, dealers in silver or clothing, apothecaries, and other traffickers to be removed from provincial offices, "in order that every place of honour and official service (*militia*) should be cleared of the like contagion" (a *contagione hujusmodi segregetur*; *Code*, bk. xii. t. lviii. l. 12). Traders generally (except the metropolitan bankers) were again excluded from the *militia* by a constitution of Justin (*Code*, bk. xii. t. xxxv.). This word indeed must no longer, as under the Republic, be deemed to imply necessarily military service, since the constitution last referred to expressly distinguishes the armed militia (*armata militia*), admission to which is forbidden to all traders alike, whilst the metropolitan bankers (*argenti distructores*) are by privilege permitted to enter any other. Soldiers conversely were by a constitution of Leo (A.D. 458) forbidden to trade (bk. xii. t. xxxvi. l. 15); and a constitution of Honorius and Theodosius forbade men of noble birth, conspicuous dignity, or hereditary wealth, to exercise a trade "pernicious to towns, in order to facilitate mercantile transactions in the way of buying and selling, between plebeians and tradesmen" (bk. iv. t. lxiii. l. 3).

As respects the smaller trades and handicrafts (it is always difficult to distinguish the two in the lower social strata) the exercise of them differed often little from slavery. A constitution of the Emperor Constantine (bk. vi. t. i. l. 5; A.D. 329) speaks of freedmen-artificers belonging to the state, and desires them to be brought back, if enticed out of the city where they reside. Artificers were exempted from all official functions, which, considering the miserable condition of the *curiales*, must rather have been a boon to them (bk. x. t. lxiv. and *passim*). They formed *collegia* (see COLLEGIA), from which they could not withdraw without presenting fit substitutes ready to accept all their obligations (l. 15). The bakers—if indeed the constitution of Leo which refers to them has not been stretched by its present title beyond its original intent—seem to have been in an almost lower condition still, since their status is expressly treated as servile. Curiously enough, the swineherds of the capitals, as carrying on a restless labour for the benefit of the Roman people, were specially exempted from all sordid offices (t. xvi. l. 1). A special title (ix.) is devoted to iron-workers (*fabricenses*), who were to be marked in the arm, and who formed also an hereditary caste, mutually responsible for the offences of every member (l. 5), and forbidden to engage in agriculture or any other occupation (l. 7). Yet being exempted from all civil and curial obligations (l. 6), and from giving quarters to troops (bk. xii. t. lxi. l. 4), their condition (which is termed a *militia*) seems to have been a coveted one, since the admission to it is regulated with especial care (bk. xi. t. ix. l. 4). It was to be by deed, before the moderator of the province or other high officer. The candidate had to show that he was neither the son nor grandson of a curial, that he owed no dues to the city, and had no obligations towards a citizen. The manufacture of arms was also by the 85th novel

limited to the official "armifactores," or "to those who are called *fabricenses*" (quaere, *fabricenses*).

Whole branches of trade, as we now understand the term, did not exist. Instead of a trade in corn, the transport of corn to the capitals was a service attached to land (*munus rei naviculariae*). Thus when Augustine was offered the estate of one Bonifacius, he declined it, because he would not have the Church of Christ a "navicularia," and so incur the risk, in the event of a ship being lost, of having to consent to the torture of the men on board, as part of the investigation (Aug. *Serm.* 355).

In the interior of the empire, trade was not only restricted by monopolies which under Justinian were carried to a cruel height (see Gibbon, c. xl.), and of which Dean Milman observes that the state monopoly "even of corn, wine, and oil was in force at the time of the first crusade," but by the reservation of various articles for imperial use. Thus the wearing of gold and silver tissue or embroidery was forbidden to private persons, nor could such tissue or embroidery be woven or worked except in the imperial gynecaea (bk. xl. t. viii. ll. 1, 2, 4). The use of the dye of the "holy murex," or any imitation of its purple, was equally forbidden (*Ib.* ll. 3, 4, 5). The employment of gems (among which pearls, emeralds, and jacinths were forbidden to be used in horse-trappings) was also regulated, as savouring of the imperial dignity (*Ib.* t. xi.). The 85th novel forbade even all sale of arms to private persons.

Buying and selling seems to have been in great measure carried on at fairs and in markets, the holding of which was by imperial grant forfeitable by ten years' non-user (*Dig.* bk. l. t. xi. *De Nundinis*, l. 1), and the dealing at which was invested with certain privileges (*Code*, bk. iv. t. lx.). Fairs, it may be observed, were often held on saints' days, though St. Basil in his *Liber Regularum* condemns the practice; thus there was a fair in Lucania on the birth-day of St. Cyprian, a 30-days' fair free of toll in Edessa at the feast of St. Thomas the Apostle, &c. (Muratori, *Antiquitates Medii Aevi*, vol. ii. Diss. 30).

Notwithstanding the low estimation in which trade was held, it seems clear that until Justinian's time at least it was not held civilly incompatible with the clerical office. The *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus (beginning of the 3rd century) show us the future pope Callistus set up by Carpophorus as a banker, holding his bank in the "Piscina Publica," and receiving deposits from widows and brethren (ix. 12). A law of Constantine and Julian indeed, A.D. 357 (*Code*, bk. i. t. ii. l. 2, which exempted the clergy from "prestations" levied from merchants), sought to compel trader-clerics (amongst others) to devote their gains to charitable uses: "If by saving, or forethought, or honourable trading they have got money together, it should be ministered for the use of the poor and needy." The next passage indicates a custom still more strange to us—that of workshops and even taverns being kept for the benefit of the Church: "Or that which may have been acquired and collected from their workshops or taverns, let them deem it when collected the gain of religion:" and the privileges of the clergy are mostly extended to their men who are occupied in trade (*Ib.*) Another law of

the same emperor, A.D. 361, which however does not seem to have been retained in his Code by Justinian (*Cod. Theod.* bk. xvi. t. ii. l. 15), exempted clerics from "sordid offices" as well as from the imposition of the *collatio*, "if by very small trade they acquire to themselves poor food and clothing;" but others, whose names are on the register of merchants, at the time when the *collatio* takes place, "must acknowledge the duties and payments of merchants." We see thus that trader-clerics were of all degrees, from the humblest traffickers to considerable merchants.

The 43rd Novel "*De officinis sive tabernis Constantinopolitanae urbis*," &c., and the 59th, "*De debitâ impensâ in exequiis defunctorum*," indicate to us the extent of the trade which was carried on in the Eastern capital on behalf of the Church, and the singular character of a portion of it. In consideration of the cathedral church undertaking what in modern French parlance would be termed the "*Pompes Funèbres*" of the city, Constantine granted to it 980 *ergasteria* or workshops, of the various trades ("*ex diversis corporibus*") of the city, to be held free of all tax; Anastasius added 150 more (Preface to Nov. 59). The total number of these cathedral *ergasteria* or *officinae*, as the 43rd novel terms them, seems from the preface to the latter to have practically sunk to 1100 (perhaps by failure of trade, see nov. 59, c. ii., which says that even of the reduced number "*plurima ceciderunt*"), at which figure it is fixed by both novels, the earlier one being grounded on the complaints of the *collegiati*—say the guilds of the city—that the number of tax-free establishments was ruining them. But all other *officinae* of the 14 wards ("*regiones*") of the city, whether belonging to any church, hospital, monastery, orphan-home, poor-house, or to any other person, were required to bear all public impositions. And in speaking of these *officinae* the word *tavern* occurs, not only as above-shown in the title, but in the body of the law (c. i. § 3). Strange therefore as may seem to us the idea of a church or cathedral bakery or pothouse, it is clear that in the 6th century a very considerable amount of trade, including the liquor-trade, was carried on on behalf of the Church and its charitable establishments in the capital of the Eastern empire.

If we turn from the Roman to the barbarian world, the barbarian codes till the time of Charlemagne scarcely contain an allusion to trade, except, perhaps, in reference to loans, pledges, or debts—see for instance the Wisigothic laws, bk. v. tt. 5, 6. Under the rule of the Ostrogoths in Italy, the Formulary of Cassiodorus indicates that the armourers were still considered as a *militia* ("*militibus te et fabris armorum . . . praefecimus*," pt. ii. c. 18, "*de armorum factoribus*"). Under the Lombards, a law of Notharis (A.D. 638 or 643) refers to the building trade in dealing with accidents among masons, and uses a term (*magistri Comacini*) which shows that this class of workmen were then drawn mainly from the same locality (the neighbourhood of Como), which mainly furnishes them still to Northern Italy (c. 144, and foll.; and see c. 152, as to accidents among other workmen). Somewhat later again, the growth of trade and industry under the Lombards is indicated by a singular law of Luitprand (bk. iii. c. 4, A.D. 717),

enacting that if any man leave his wife for trade or for the exercise of an art, and do not return after three years, his wife may apply to the king for leave to re-marry. Foreign trade is referred to by the Wisigothic code (bk. xi. t. 3) in a law "on traders from beyond the sea," which enacts that if such traders have a matter between themselves, none of the king's household shall presume to hear them, but let them be heard according to their own laws only by their toll-takers ("*apud telonarios suos*").

The legislation of the Church bears much more on commercial matters than that of the barbarian kingdoms, and we have now to consider its history.

One form of trade, it may be observed, was always forbidden by the church, that of earning a livelihood by usury. [See USURY.] In other respects it was long before trade was deemed by the Church itself incompatible with clerical functions; though the fathers might inveigh against it as a form of worldliness; as when Cyprian in his work *De Lapsis*, written about A.D. 251, speaks of those who "watch like fowlers for gainful markets." (Comp. *Ep.* 15.) The growth of some general feeling on the subject is, however, to be traced in the 18th canon of the Council of Eliberis, A.D. 305, by which bishops, priests, and deacons are forbidden to depart from their places for the sake of trade, or to go round the provinces seeking lucrative markets. To obtain their livelihood they may indeed send a son, a freedman, an agent (*mercuarium*), a friend, or anyone else; and if they wish to trade, let them trade within the province—the main object of the canon being clearly to preserve to their flocks the benefits of their ministrations, not to put dishonour on trading itself.

A collection of decrees of very doubtful authority, attributed to the Nicene Council, which will be found in Labbé and Mansi's *Councils*, vol. ii. p. 1029, and foll. under the title: "*Sanctiones et decreta alia ex quatuor regularum ad Constantinum libris decerpta*," contains amongst its "statutes for priests" (c. 14) a provision that the priest shall not be a barber, a surgeon, or a worker in iron (*ferramentarius*), the two former prohibitions turning probably on blood-letting in its most literal form, the latter on the providing instruments for bloodshed. The 4th Council of Carthage, 397, forbids clerics to go to markets, except to buy, under pain of degradation (c. 48), but at the same time enacts that "a cleric, however learned in the word of God, shall seek his livelihood by means of a handicraft, *artificio*" (c. 51), that "a cleric shall provide for himself food and clothing by a handicraft or by agriculture, without detriment to his office" (c. 52), and that "all clerics who have strength to work should learn both handicrafts (*artificiola*) and letters" (c. 53); provisions all nearly equivalent and which confirm the opinion that the canons of this and other Carthaginian Councils represent rather the whole collection of rules by which the African church was governed at their respective dates than specific enactments of those dates. They appear, indeed, to indicate that, at all events in this quarter of the church, a distinction was being taken between trade and handicrafts, and that the exercise of the former by



clerics was restrained, whilst the latter was enjoined.

By the time of the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) the line between "secular" and "religious" employments appears to have become much more sharply marked. The 3rd canon speaks of clerics who for filthy lucre carry on secular business, and forbids them to do so,—a prohibition which would seem to include every shape of trade, but which cannot have been so considered, since the Council of Chalcedon is expressly named as one of the four to whose canons force of law is given by Justinian's Code, A.D. 533 (bk. i. l. i. c. 7, § 4), which yet, as has been seen above, expressly recognises both clerical trading and trading on behalf of the church.

In the west, however, it seems clear that the feeling against clerical trading became always stronger; a letter (ix.) of Pope Gelasius I. (A.D. 492-4) to the bishops of Lucania speaks (c. 15) of his having heard from Picenum that very many clerics there are occupied with dishonourable business and filthy lucre, and enjoins them to abstain from unworthy gain, and from every device or desire of business of any kind, or else from the fulfilment of clerical functions—expressions which, in the light of altered feeling on the subject, we may also take to apply to trade generally. The Council of Tarragona (A.D. 516) enacts that "whosoever will be in the clergy, let him not be careful to buy too cheap or sell too dear, or let him be removed from the clergy" (c. 2). If a cleric lends a *solidus* in time of need, in order to receive it back in wine or wheat which it is intended to sell at a fixed time for the sake of traffic, if the actual thing be not needed by him, let him receive what he gave without any increase (c. 3)—a prohibition both of trade and of usury. The 3rd Council of Orleans, A.D. 538, in like manner, forbids clerics from the rank of deacons upwards to carry on business like public traders, or to carry on a forbidden business under another's name (c. 27). In spite of these enactments, we find in the letters of Gregory the Great (A.D. 590-603) mention made of a ship-building bishop in Campania (see Labbé and Mansi's *Councils*, vol. x. p. 559).

That the enactments of the African Councils no longer satisfied the temper even of the English church may be judged from the *Excerpta* of Egbert, archbishop of York (latter half of 8th century), the 3rd book of which (2nd series) contains a prohibition to priests and deacons to be occupied "in any worldly affairs," except those for which they are assigned (*intitulati*, c. 8). A canon of the Council of Calchyth (that is, Chelsea), A.D. 787, in favour of honesty in weights and measures, may also be quoted (c. 17).

The capitularies of Charlemagne (mostly, if not always, invested with the sanction of the church), deal repeatedly with the subject of trade. The ecclesiastical capitulary of 789 enacts that measures and weights be equal and just, "whether in cities or whether in monasteries, whether for giving or whether for receiving" (c. 73, and see the "Capitula minora" added to the Salic law, A.D. 803, c. viii.; Canon 15 of the 6th Council of Arles; and c. 45 of the 3rd Council of Tours, same year). The Frankfort Capitulary of 794 is one of several which attempt to fix the prices of victuals (c. 4; Capitulary of

Noyon, A.D. 808, c. 5). The pitch of actual cruelty is reached in the "Capitula de Judæis," where every Jew is forbidden to have money in his house, to sell wine, victuals, or any other thing, under pain of confiscation of all his goods and imprisonment till he come into the imperial presence (c. 3). The utter absence of all notion of a possible right to freedom in trading is well expressed in one of the *Capitula* published by the imperial missi, A.D. 803: "That no man presume to sell or buy or measure otherwise than as the lord emperor has commanded" (c. 10).

Markets are not to be held on the Lord's Day (Excerpts from the Canons, added to the Capitulary of Aix-la-Chapelle of A.D. 813, c. 15; and see *General Collection*, bk. i. c. 139; 6th Council of Arles, A.D. 813, c. 16; 3rd Council of Tours, A.D. 813, c. 40), except where they have been held of old and lawfully (Capitulary of Aix-la-Chapelle of 809, c. 9); a Lombard Capitulary of 779 seems however to enact generally that "markets are nowhere to be held except where they have been held of old lawfully" (c. 52, taking no notice of the Sunday). Forward-stalling for covetousness' sake is forbidden (Capitulary of Aix-la-Chapelle of 809, c. 12). The Council of Friuli, A.D. 791, even forbade generally the carrying on of secular business to an immoderate extent.

Presbyters were by one capitulary forbidden to trade, or gather riches in anywise by filthy lucre (Capitula presbyterorum, A.D. 806). On the other hand the Council of Mayence, A.D. 813, more guardedly forbids clerics and monks to have unjust weights or measures, or to carry on an unjust trade; "nevertheless a just trade is not to be forbidden, on account of divers necessities—for we read that the holy apostles traded" (*negotiosos esse*),—the rule of St. Benedict being referred to as a further authority (c. 14, see *Additio 4ta*, c. 46). Trade was, however, forbidden to penitents, "because it is difficult that between the dealing of seller and buyer sin should not intervene" (*General Collection*, bk. vii. c. 62; perhaps of later date).

The exact meaning of some of the later texts above referred to is rendered somewhat doubtful through the gradual narrowing of the term *negotium* and its derivatives, from the sense of business in its widest meaning to the specific one of trade, as in its modern French offspring *le négoce*, *négociant*. They sufficiently show, however, that whilst the avocations of the early apostles were still remembered, and the rule of St. Benedict had raised the dignity of labour itself, the growing Judaistic distinction between "secular" and "religious" acts and matters, so foreign to the spirit of a faith which is founded on the abrogation of all distinctions except those between good and evil, light and darkness, life and death, in which the recognition that in meats "there is nothing unclean of itself," but "all things indeed are pure" (Rom. xiv. 14, 20), that "every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving" (1 Tim. iv. 4), was only the type of the breaking down of "the middle wall of partition" between Jews and Gentiles (Eph. ii. 14; Acts x. 10-15, 28), had by the 9th century begun to render the very idea of trade incompatible with the clerical calling, not so much as in early

times, by reason of its distracting the minister from his sacred functions, as on account of a supposed inherent dishonour attached to it. That the distinction is in itself a result of the secularizing of the church may be inferred from a comparison with civil legislation. The ultra-refined officialism of the later Roman empire, which made the sovereign the only source of honour, and excluded the independent trader (one specially rich class excepted), even from the merely civil *militia*, let alone the military service itself, on the one hand—the rude savagery of the barbarian on the other, which looked upon war and warlike sports as the only employments worthy of a man, and almost utterly ignored in legislation the very existence of the trader—must both, whatever phenomena to the contrary may present themselves in Justinian's Code, have reacted profoundly upon the spirit of the church. The service of God, which soon claimed the title of a *militia*, must have the exclusiveness of one, whether the term were used in the Roman official sense or in the warlike barbarian one; whatever was incompatible with the dignity of the functionary of an earthly sovereign, of the soldier of an earthly chief, must be incompatible also with that of a minister of God, a soldier in His host. At the same time, the influence of this distinction had not gone so far as to exclude the whole realm of trade from church solicitude, and it is remarkable to observe in the canons of French Councils of the beginning of the 9th century similar enactments against dishonesty in trade to those of the Pentateuch. [See DEBTOR, COVETOUSNESS, USURY.] [J. M. L.]

**COMMINATION.** The “denunciation of God's anger and judgments against sinners” used in the Anglican church on Ash-Wednesday.

The ejection of penitents from the church on the first day of Lent, with prayer that they may bring forth fruits meet for repentance, seems to be a practice of considerable antiquity (Martene, *De lit. Eccl. Ant.* lib. iv. c. 17), although the canon of the Council of Agde which is sometimes cited in proof of it rests on no earlier authority than that of Gratian (Bingham, *Antiq.* bk. xviii. c. 2, § 2). But the particular practice of the English church, of reciting “God's cursing against impenitent sinners” on Ash-Wednesday seems to be a continuation of the use of the “articles of the sentence of cursing” which were read in parish churches three or four times a year in the Middle Ages. (Wheatley, *On the Common Prayer*, p. 605, ed. Corrie.) [See PENITENCE.] [C.]

**COMMUNICALES.** A term used to designate the vessels used in Holy Communion, which on certain days were carried in procession at Rome. The *Liber Pontificalis* (p. 122, ed. Muratori) tells us that Leo III. (†816) made communion-vessels (communicales) in the several regions of Rome, which were to be carried in procession by acolytes on stationary days; these were twenty-four in number. [C.]

**COMMUNICATIVE LIFE.** [MONASTICISM.]

**COMMUNIO.** (1) An anthem in the Roman and cognate missals, said by the celebrant after

he has taken the ablutions. It is so called, because it was originally appointed to be sung during the communion of the people, and was sung antiphonally after each verse of a psalm, which was continued till the priest gave the signal for the *Gloria*, when the communion of the people was ended (*Ordo Rom.* iii. 18). “Deben omnes communicare interim cum Antiphona cantatur, quae de Communionis nomen mutatur cui et Psalmus subjungendus est cum *Gloria Patri*, si necesse fuerit” (*Microlog. de Eccl. Obserr.* cap. 18). Afterwards the *Communio* was looked upon more as an act of thanksgiving, to be said after the communion. It varies with the day. That for the Missa in nocte Nat. Dom. is: “In splendoribus sanctorum ex utero ante luciferum genui te.”

(2) An anthem in the Mozarabic missal sung by the choir after the communion has taken place. There are only two forms: one used in Lent, the other during the rest of the year. This latter is: “Refecti corpore et sanguine te Laudamus Domine. All: All: All:” [H. J. H.]

**COMMUNION, HOLY.** The present article does not treat of the whole of what in England is generally called the *Communion Office* or *Service* [see LITURGY], but of that portion of it which immediately relates to the distribution and reception of the consecrated elements in the Eucharist.

**NAMES.**—Κοινωνία, τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνία (Chrysostom); μυστήριον συνάξεως or κοινωνίας, θεαρχική κοινωνία (Dionysius Areop.); μετάληψις ἁγιασμάτων, εὐχαριστίας, μυστηρίων; ἁγία or μυστική μετάληψις. The verb κοινωνεῖν is used absolutely to describe participation of the Eucharist (Basil, Chrysostom), and also with a substantive descriptive of the sacred feast, as μυστικῆς κοινωνεῖν θυσίας (Philostorgius). So μετέχειν εὐχαριστίας (Conc. Nic. I. c. 13); and μεταλαμβάνειν, absolutely (Theophylact), or with a substantive, as ἀχράντου θύματος μεταλαβεῖν (Philostorg.), τοῦ Δεσποτικού σώματος καὶ αἵματος μεταλαμβάνειν (Theodoret).

*Communio, communicatio*; they who partake of the consecrated elements are said *communicare*, absolutely (e.g. IV. Conc. Tolet. c. 18). The leading notion implied in the use of these words is expressed by Isidore of Pelusium (*Ep.* 228) thus: “quia nobis conjunctionem cum Deo conciliat, nosque regni ipsius consortes ac participes reddit;” by Papias (in Ducange, s. v. *Communio*), thus: “Communio dicitur spiritualis esca, quia in commune ad vivificandas animas a cunctis percipitur dignis.” Other terms are *perceptio Corporis et Sanguinis, participatio*. The word *accipere* is used to designate the act of taking the bread or the chalice into the hands; *sumere* or *consumere*, the act of eating or drinking the particle or the wine.

The word *communicare* is also used actively, to denote the act of presenting the consecrated Bread; the deacons following with the cup are said *confirmare Sanguine Dominico*, or *confirmare* simply: “Episcopi communicant populum; post eos diaconi confirmant;” “subdiaconus regionalis . . . confirmat populum” (*Ordo Rom.* I. c. 20). The word is used no doubt to signify the completing or perfecting of the act of communion (*Micrologus*, c. 19).

## GENERAL ACCOUNT OF HOLY COMMUNION.

The earliest extant description of Holy Communion is the well-known passage of Justin Martyr (*Apol.* I. c. 65), already quoted under CANON (p. 267). No description is here given of posture or gesture, whether of ministrants or recipients, or of any words accompanying administration; Justin tells us only that after the *εὐχαριστία*. "those whom we call deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and of the wine and water over which thanks have been given" (*τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος*), and carry away to those who are not present." He repeats substantially the same account in c. 67, using the words *διδόσις* and *μετάληψις* for distribution and reception.

From Tertullian we learn that in the African Church of the 2nd century the Eucharist was administered to *all* who were present; for he recommends (*De Oratione*, c. 14) those who hesitated to be present at the celebration on stationary days [*STATIO*] for fear of breaking their fast, to be present indeed, but to *reserve* the portion which they received. This applies to the Bread only; it was consecrated bread, which some were in the habit of putting to their lips before an ordinary meal (*Ad Uxorem*, ii. 5). The Eucharist was received, not at the usual meal-time, as the Lord's command seemed to require (*et in tempore victus et omnibus mandatum a Domino*), but in assemblies before dawn and from no other hands than those of the presidents (*praesidentium*); it was given into the hands; for Tertullian laments the impiety of those idol-makers who—whether as clerics or laics—touched the Lord's Body with hands so contaminated (*De Idol.* c. 7); and Christians felt an anxious dread lest any portion of the bread or the wine should fall to the ground (*De Corona*, c. 3), for the Holy Communion was administered, ordinarily at least, under both kinds. Tertullian has also a probable allusion to the *Amen* of the recipient in response to the words of administration (*De Spectac.* c. 25).

From Cyprian we learn (besides much as to the worthiness of communicants) that the deacon presented the cup after consecration to those who were present, probably in a certain order (*De Lapsis*, c. 25); the bread was received into the right hand (*Ep.* 58, c. 9, Hartel), and was not unfrequently carried home in a casket (*De Lapsis*, c. 26). Compare ARCA.

Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. c. 1, p. 318 Potter), speaking of the necessity of men trying and examining themselves, illustrates his position by a reference to the Eucharist, "in distributing which according to custom some permit each several person in the congregation to take his portion." There is no reason for supposing (Probst, *Lit. der Drei Ersten Jahrhunderte*.) that these *rites* were schismatics; and the passage seems to imply that there were churches where the ministers, in distributing the elements, permitted all who were present to partake if they

would; and other churches where they judged who among the congregation were or were not worthy.

The directions of the second book of the *Apostolical Constitutions* are as follows (c. 57, § 14): "After the sacrifice has been made, let each rank (*τάξις*) severally partake of the Lord's Body and of the precious Blood, approaching in rank with reverence and godly fear as to the body of a king; and let the women draw near with veiled heads, as befits the rank of women. And let the doors be watched, lest any unbelieving or uninitiated person enter." By "ranks" we are no doubt to understand the several orders of the clergy and ascetics, according to dignity, then laymen, then women.

The testimony of Origen (*in Exodum*, Hom. xi. c. 7, p. 172; xiii. 3, 176) shews that, after the sermon the people drew nigh to the marriage-supper of the Lamb; that not the priest alone, but the faithful also who were present, received the Sacrament; and that they were careful that no particle of the consecrated elements should fall to the ground, receiving the Bread no doubt into their hands. His comment on Psalm xxxiii. [xxxiv.] 9, perhaps alludes to the use of *Γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε* as an antiphon during communion.

Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria from 248–266 (in Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 9), mentions the principal ceremonies of communion, when he speaks of one who had long attended the Eucharistic Service, joined in responding *Amen*, stood by the Table, stretched forth his hand to receive the Holy Food and received it, had partaken of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Cyril of Jerusalem describes the manner of receiving in his time (c. A.D. 350) and country, thus (*Catech. Mystag.* v. 20–22):

After the *SANCTA SANCTIS*, "ye hear the voice of the chanter (*τοῦ ψάλλοντος*) with divine melody inviting you to partake of the holy mysteries, and saying, 'O taste and see how gracious the Lord is.' Permit not the bodily palate—no, but faith unfeigned, to judge of these things; for they who taste are bidden to taste not of bread and wine, but of the copy (*ἀντίτυπον*) of the Body and Blood of Christ. When you approach, then, draw near not with the wrists straight out nor with the fingers spread, but making the left hand a throne for the right, as for that which is to receive a king; and hollowing the palm, receive the Body of Christ, saying after reception the *Amen*. Then after carefully hallowing thine eyes by the touch of the Holy Body, partake of it (*μεταλαμβάνε*), giving heed lest any portion of it fall aside and be lost; for whatsoever thou hast lost, by so much hast thou suffered damage of thine own members . . . Then, after communicating (*κοινωνῆσαι*) of the Body, draw near also to the Cup (*ποτήριον*) of the Blood; not stretching forth thy hands, but bending, and with an air of adoration and reverence, saying the *Amen*, sanctify thyself partaking also of the Blood of Christ. Further, touching with thy hands the moisture remaining on thy lips, sanctify both thine eyes and thy forehead and the other organs of the senses (*αἰσθητήρια*). Then, while awaiting the prayer, give thanks unto God, who hath thought thee worthy of so great mysteries."

\* This is the translation usually given of *εὐχαριστία* (*see* Abbot's *Patrologie*, p. 71): but it may perhaps be interpreted "the bread presented as a thank-offering." (*See* Eucharist.)

In the later *Apost. Constitutions* (viii. 14, § 3), after the *Sancta Sanctis*, the directions proceed: "And after this let the bishop partake, then the presbyters and the deacons, and subdeacons, and the readers, and the chanters, and the ascetics; and of the women's side, the deaconesses and the virgins and the widows; then the children, then all the people, with reverence and godly fear, without disturbance. And let the bishop minister the oblation (*προσφοράν*, i.e. the Bread) saying, 'The Body of Christ,' and let him that receiveth say *Amen*; and let the deacon hold the cup, and say as he administers, 'The Blood of Christ, the Cup of Life,' and let him that drinketh say *Amen*. And let the 33rd Psalm [34th E.V.] be said while the rest are partaking (*ἐν τῇ μεταλαμβάνειν*): and when all the men and women have partaken, let the deacons take what remains over and bear it into the sacristy (*τὰ παστοφóρια*)." Then followed thanksgiving, prayer, benediction, and dismissal.

In the Liturgy of St. James, the *Sancta Sanctis* is followed by Fraction and Commixtion; then the priest, after saying the prayer before reception, administers to the clergy; the antiphon "O taste and see" is sung; when the deacons take up the patens and the cups to administer to the people, the priest utters an ascription of glory to God: special forms of "Gloria" are also given to accompany the placing of the sacred vessels on the side-table or credence (*παπατράπεζον*), for taking them up again, and for placing them on the Holy Table; but no formula of administration is given either in the Greek or Syriac form of the liturgy.

In the Liturgy of St. Mark, after the *Sancta Sanctis* and Fraction, the priest communicates, saying the prayer "According to Thy mercy," or "Like as the hart desireth the water-brooks." And when he administers the Bread to the clergy, he says, "The Holy Body;" on administering the cup, "The precious Blood of our Lord and God and Saviour." Then follow thanksgiving, prayer, and dismissal. The form for the communion of the people was in all probability the same as that for the clergy.

In that of St. Basil, after the *Sancta Sanctis* stands the rubric, "Then the communion (*μεταλήψεις*) being completed, and the Holy Mysteries lifted from the Holy Table, the priest prays;" then follow thanksgiving, prayer, and dismissal.

In the much more fully developed Byzantine Liturgy (St. Chrysostom's), the priest elevating the Bread says the *Sancta Sanctis*, to which the usual response is given, and the choir chants the communion-antiphon of the day or the saint. Then follow Fraction and Commixtion, and the peculiar rite of pouring a few drops of boiling water into the chalice; then "the Priest, taking the Holy Bread, gives it to the deacon; and the deacon, saluting the hand that imparts it to him, takes the Holy Bread, saying, 'Impart (*μετάδος*) to me, sir, the precious and holy Body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ.' And the Priest says, 'To N., sacred deacon (*ιεροδιακόνῳ*), is imparted the precious and holy and undefiled Body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, for forgiveness of sins and life eternal.' And he passes behind the Holy Table, bowing his head, and prays as the priest does. In like manner the priest,

taking one particle of the Holy Bread, says, 'The precious and all-holy Body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ is imparted to me, N., priest, for forgiveness of sins and life eternal.' Then, bowing his head low, he prays." Then follow directions for replacing the vessels on the Holy Table. Then the door of the sanctuary (*βῆμα*), within which the actions previously described have taken place, is opened, and the deacon standing in the doorway elevates the cup. This rubric follows: "Be it known that if there are any who desire to partake, the priest takes the Holy Cup<sup>b</sup> from the hands of the deacon and imparts to them, saying: 'The servant of God N. partakes of the precious and holy Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for forgiveness of his sins and life eternal.'" Then, after a blessing, the priest and deacon return to the Holy Table, and rubrics follow prescribing the various observances with which the sacred vessels are carried to the sacristy.

Of the Western rites, we will speak first of the Roman.

After the *Libera nos* of the CANON follow the Kiss of Peace and the breaking or FRACTION of the Host, during which the AGNUS DEI was said.

Then, in the ancient form of Papal Mass, a deacon (or, according to the *Ordines V.* and *VI.*, an acolyth) bore the paten to the Pope's seat, west of the altar; the Pontiff awaited his coming, standing up with folded hands; he bit a portion from the oblate on the paten, and placed the oblate in the chalice held by the archdeacon; from this chalice he partook of the Wine by means of a gold or silver pipe [FISTULA].

When the Pontiff has communicated, the archdeacon draws near the horn of the altar (*Ordo Rom. I.* c. 20; *II.* c. 14), and pours a little of the wine from the chalice which had been used in consecration into the cup (scyphum) held by an acolyth; then the bishops approach to receive the communion from the hands of the Pontiff; then the presbyters in like manner (*O. R. I.* u. s.); according to the *Ordo R. II.* the presbyters drew near not to the Papal seat but to the altar to communicate. The *Ordo V.* describes the manner of communicating with more detail: "let the presbyters also drawing near communicate, to whom the bishop gives the Holy Body into their hands, and let them go to the left-hand horn<sup>c</sup> of the altar and kiss it, and communicate. In like manner after them let the deacons communicate." The *Ordo VI.* makes the distinction that subdeacons are to receive the Body into their mouths, while the higher orders receive it into their hands.

After the Pontiff had ministered the Bread, the archdeacon ministered the Wine to the clergy; after which he poured the remainder of

<sup>b</sup> It must be borne in mind that the cup contains a portion of the consecrated bread as well as the wine; and that in nearly all the Eastern churches the sacred elements have from ancient times been administered to the laity with a spoon (*λαβίς*).

<sup>c</sup> i.e. the north side. "Right" and "left" in liturgical language at present refer to the right and left hand of the crucifix over the altar: but anciently they referred to the right and left of a person standing with his face towards the altar. [ALTAR, p. 61.]



the wine from the chalice into the cup (scyphum), from which the laity were to communicate by means of a tube, or pugillaris [FISTULA]. The wine in this cup was regarded as completely consecrated by the infusion of the consecrated Wine from the chalice (see Mabillon, *Comm. Prævius in Ordines RR.* p. xciii.). The Pope delivered the bread to the principal persons present, the archdeacon following with the cup; meantime the choir sang the antiphon *Ad Communionem*. When the principal persons in the SENATORIUM had communicated, the bishops ministered the bread to the rest of the laity, and the deacons the cup; or sometimes, at the bidding of the Pontiff, presbyters administered both the bread and the cup (*Ordo R. I.* c. 20, and *II.* c. 14). As to the form of words accompanying administration; Gregory the Great used the following: "Corpus Dom. N. J. Christi conservet animam tuam" (Joann. Diac. *Vita Greg.* ii. 41). The *Missa Illyrici* (in Bona, *De Reb. Lit.* p. 554, ed. 1672) gives the following. For the priest himself when he receives: "Corpus Domini Nostri Jesu Christi sit mihi remedium sempiternum in vitam aeternam," and "Sanguis D. N. J. Christi custodiat me in vitam aeternam." On delivering the Body into the hands of priest or deacons, the form is "Pax tecum. R. Et cum spiritu tuo;"<sup>d</sup> or "Verbum caro factus est, et habitavit in nobis:" on delivering the cup, in which a portion of the consecrated bread is immersed [COMMIXTION], "Haec sacrosancta commixtio corporis et sanguinis D. N. J. C. prosit tibi ad vitam aeternam." For the subdeacons and inferior orders the form is: "Perceptio Corporis et Sanguinis D. N. J. C. sanctificet corpus et animam tuam in vitam aeternam. Amen." For the laity: "Corpus et sanguis D. N. J. C. prosit tibi in remissionem omnium peccatorum et ad vitam aeternam." About the time of Charles the Great, the following was a common formula: "Corpus D. N. J. C. custodiat te in vitam aeternam" (Krazer, *de Liturgiis*, p. 561).<sup>e</sup>

In the Gallican Church, after the benediction and the communion of the priest, the faithful, men and women alike, drew near the altar and received the Eucharist into their hands.

During the time of communicating, a psalm or canticle was chanted. On this point Aurelian, bishop of Orleans, gives the simple rule, "Psallendo omnes communicant" (*Regula*). Germanus of Paris, his contemporary, calls the canticle or antiphon which was sung during communion *Trecanum*, and says that it signified faith in the Holy Trinity; it was probably either the *Gloria Patri*, or something equivalent to the *Unus Pater, Unus Filius, Unus Spiritus Sanctus*, of the Eastern Church [SANCTA SANCTIS]. In the Mozarabic liturgy, after the priestly benediction and salutation, the choir chants the antiphon *Ad Accedentes*, during which the people were to draw near. After the antiphon, the priest takes from the paten the particle *Gloria* [see FRACTION], saying inaudibly "Panem coelestem de

mensa Domini accipiam et nomen Domini invocabo,"<sup>f</sup> and, holding it over the chalice, says prayers for worthy reception; then consumes the particle which he holds in his hand, and then the remaining particles on the paten. Immediately after he communicates the people. He then uncovers the chalice and, after the prayer "Ave in ævum coelestis potus," and "Corpus et Sanguis D. N. J. Christi custodiat corpus et animam meam in vitam aeternam, Amen," drinks thereof, and says prayer for benefit from reception. The choir chants the COMMUNIO, or antiphon for communicating. No direction is given for the communion of the people further than that contained in the words "et statim populo communionem impertit." After the ablution of the chalice, *Alleluia* is chanted, post-communion follows, salutation and dismissal.

In the Ambrosian rite, after the Fraction and the Kiss of Peace, the priest thrice strikes his breast, saying, *Domine non sum dignus*; on taking the bread into his hand, he says, *Quid retribuam Domino?* and immediately before communicating, "Corpus D. N. J. C. custodiat animam meam in vitam aeternam. Amen." On taking the cup into his hand, he again says the *Quid retribuam*, and before communicating, "Praesta, quaesumus, Domine, ut perceptio Corporis et Sanguinis D. N. J. C. ad vitam nos perducatur aeternam;" then if any are to communicate he administers to them before PURIFICATION. The ancient form of administration we learn from the Pseudo-Ambrosius *de Sacramentis* (iv. 5); "dicit tibi sacerdos, *Corpus Christi*, et tu dicis, *Amen*, id est, verum," which is identical with the *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* of Eastern ritual. The form for the cup was probably similar.

The prayers which accompany communion vary much in different copies of the Ambrosian missal, and are probably all of comparatively modern date.

*All who were present communicated.*—This is contemplated in all the early accounts of Holy Communion; hence the care taken to exclude from the mysteries all who were not fit to participate. The second canon of the Council of Antioch (A.D. 344; compare *Canon. Apost.* c. 9 [10]) orders that those who came into the church and heard the service, so far as the lections of Scripture, but declined to partake in the prayers of the people or to communicate, should be cast out of the church until they should have confessed and repented of their fault. This would seem to imply that the practice of some of the worshippers leaving the church before the more solemn part of the liturgy (εὐχή) was commenced, was already known (though censured) in the 4th century; for if they had remained in the church, they could hardly have been described as *μὴ κοινωνοῦντας εὐχῆς ἅμα τῷ λαῷ*. Martin of Braga (A.D. 560) inserted this in his *Collectio Canonum* (c. 83) for the use of the Spanish Church. Gratian (*De Consecrat. Dist.* ii. c. 10) quotes a decree of Pope Anacletus, which

<sup>d</sup> These words were no doubt used as appropriate to the Kiss of Peace given by the ministrant to the recipient, as was occasionally done even as late as the 12th century. (Innocent III. *De Myst. Missae*, vi. 9.)

<sup>e</sup> A good collection of such formulae may be found in the work of Dominic Georgi, *de Liturgia Rom. Pontif.*

<sup>f</sup> In the printed missals, which are much interpolated, the direction follows in the rubric, "et dicat sacerdos *memento pro mortuis*;" as to which Krazer (*de Lit.* p. 621) notes, "qui ritus, ut jam inenavimus, Gotthelfianus non est; hinc et nulla in missali illius occurrat formula."

distinctly orders all to communicate when consecration was completed, if they would not be cast out of the church. The decree is of course spurious; but it is interesting as indicating what was the law of the Roman Church at the time of the Isidorian forgeries (about 830), and also probably that the practice of non-communicating attendance had then begun; for the decree would not have been put forth without a purpose. One class of persons only seems to have been permitted in ancient times to be present at Holy Communion without communicating—the *consistentes* (*συλειτουργοί*) or fourth class of penitents, who were permitted to be present at the whole service, but not to make oblation or to communicate. See *Conc. Nicae.* c. 11; *Ancyra*, c. 8; *Basil, Ep. Canon.* c. 56.

On the question of private and solitary masses, see MASS.

*Communion under both kinds.*—That in the solemn public administration of the Lord's Supper the laity received under both kinds from the foundation of the Church of Christ to the 12th century is admitted on all hands. (See Mabillon, *Acta SS. Bened. Saec. III. praef.* c. 75.) The danger of spilling the consecrated wine led to the adoption of a tube, or FISTULA, through which it might be drawn.

When this practice too was found to have its peculiar disadvantages, the custom sprang up in some churches, and continues in the East to this day, of administering to the people the Eucharistic Bread dipped in the consecrated wine, in which case the particle was administered by means of a SPOON, made for that purpose. This practice seems to be alluded to in the first canon of the 3rd Council of Braga (A.D. 675), which condemns those who were accustomed “intinctam eucharistiam populis pro complemento communionis porrigere.” In this case, we are not to understand that the administration of the immersed particle was over and above communion proper, for the later portion of the canon distinctly implies that this “intincta eucharistia” was substituted for the evangelical practice of administering separately the bread and the cup. How this practice, which was condemned in the West as schismatical and against apostolic tradition, came to be so widely spread in the East is difficult to say. That in the time of Chrysostom the deacon still ministered the cup to the people may be shown by various passages in his works, which proves that the administration of “eucharistia intincta” had not then begun in the Byzantine Church. Nor is it easy to say when it was introduced. This manner of communicating was widely prevalent in ancient times in the case of sick persons [SICK, COMMUNION OF].

*Posture of Reception.*—All the testimonies of ancient writers adduced in this article, so far as they determine anything on the point, describe the communicants as receiving *standing*. As this was the usual posture of prayer and praise on every Lord's Day and during the Easter solemnities, the faithful would naturally communicate standing on such days. Nor are testimonies wanting that the same was true of other days also, though these concern rather the Eastern than the Western Church (Bona, *De Reb. Lit.* ii. c. 17, § 8; Valesius on Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 9). In a Pontifical Mass at Rome, the deacon still

communicates standing, a relic no doubt of the ancient practice. On other occasions, the celebrant alone communicates standing, the rest, whether clergy or laity, kneeling. Dr. Neale (*Eastern Ch. introd.* p. 524) mentions a capital at Rheims, probably of the 12th century, which represents a standing communion.

*Delivery of the Bread into the Hand.*—There is abundant proof, besides that already adduced, that the Eucharistic bread was in ancient times delivered into the hands of communicants. Thus, Ambrose (in Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 17) asks Theodosius, after the massacre of Thessalonica, how he could venture to receive the Lord's Body with hands still dripping from the slaughter of the innocent; and Augustine (*c. Litt. Petilian.* ii. 23) speaks of a bishop in whose hands his correspondent used to place the Eucharist, and receive it into his own hands from him in turn; and Basil (*Ep.* 289) says that in the church the priest delivers a portion of the Eucharist into the hand, and the communicant carries it to his mouth with his own hand. Chrysostom (*Hom.* 20, *ad Pop. Antioch.* c. 7) speaks of the need of having clean hands, considering what they may bear. The narrative in Sozomen (*H. E.* viii. 5) of a transaction of Chrysostom's describes a woman after receiving the bread into her hand bowing her head as if to pray (*ὡς ἐν-ζόμενῃ ἀνέκυψε*), and passing on the particle she had received to her maid-servant.

The 101st canon of the Trullan Council (an. 692) reprehends a practice which had sprung up of providing receptacles of gold or other precious material for the reception of the Eucharist. After insisting on the truth, that man is more precious than fine gold, the canon proceeds: “if any man desires to partake of the immaculate Body . . . let him draw near, disposing his hands in the form of a cross, and so receive the communion of the divine grace;” and priests who gave the Eucharist into such receptacles (*δοχεῖα*) were to be excommunicated. John of Damascus also (*de Fid. Orthod.* iv. 14) desires Christians to dispose their hands in the form of a cross to receive the body of the Crucified. His contemporary Bede (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 24) describes Caedmon on his deathbed (about 680) as receiving the Eucharist into his hand. As he mentions this without comment, it was no doubt the practice of his own time also.

Before the end of the 6th century women were forbidden to receive the Eucharist on the naked hand, and were compelled to receive it on a napkin called DOMINICALE. See *Conc. Antisiod.* [AUXERRE], canons 36 and 42. Caesarius of Arles, in a sermon printed as St. Augustine's (*Serm.* 252, *de Tempore*), exhorts the women to have their hearts as clean as the napkin which they brought to receive the Body of Christ. The Greek Fathers however say nothing of any such practice, and the censure of the Trullan Council would evidently apply as well to linen as to other materials.

How long the custom of giving the Eucharist into the hands of lay persons continued in the Roman Church cannot be precisely determined. Gregory the Great (*Dialogus*, iii. c. 3) asserts indeed that Pope Agapetus (535–536) placed the Eucharist in the mouth of a certain dumb and lame person; but from a case so peculiar nothing can be concluded except that the express men-

tion of the sacrament being placed in the *mouth* of this person probably indicates that the general practice was otherwise. At the time when the *Ordo R. VI.* was drawn up (9th century?), the ancient custom had ceased at Rome, for the form of reception which was not permitted to subdeacons was certainly not permitted to the laity. A council held at Rouen (probably in the year 880) strictly prohibited presbyters from placing the Eucharist in the *hand* of any lay person, male or female, commanding them to place it in their mouths. This practice, which probably originated in a desire to protect that which is holy from profane or superstitious uses, gradually became the almost universal rule of the Church. So in 1549, because the people "diversely abused" the Sacrament "to superstition and wickedness," it was thought convenient that the people commonly receive the sacrament of Christ's Body in their mouths at the priest's hand. (See the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. in Keeling's *Litt. Britt.* p. 235.)

**Responding Amen on Reception.**—Besides the instances already given of this practice, the following may be cited: Jerome (*Ep.* 62, *ad Theoph. Alex.*) wonders how one could come to the Eucharist, and answer *Amen*, when he doubted of the charity of the ministrant. Augustine (c. *Faustum Manich.* xii. 10) speaks of the responding *Amen* on reception of the Blood of Christ as a universal custom.

**Place of Communicating.**—The second synod of Tours (A.D. 567), in the fourth canon (Bruns's *Canones*, ii. 226), prohibited lay persons from standing in the space within the rails (*cancelli*) reserved for the choir during the celebration of the mysteries; but expressly allowed lay men and women to enter the sanctuary (*sancta sanctorum*) for the purpose of praying and communicating, as had been the custom in times past. The existence of this custom is further proved by the story told by Gregory of Tours (*de Mirac. S. Martini*, ii. c. 14) of the paralytic girl, who, being miraculously healed, approached the altar to communicate without help.

Yet at nearly the same time the 1st Council of Braga (A.D. 563) in Spain, in the canon (13) headed "*Ubi omnes communicant*," ordered that no lay person should approach within the sanctuary of the altar to communicate, but only clerics, as is provided in the ancient canons.

We have already seen, that in the liturgy of St. Chrysostom the priests and deacons communicated within the sanctuary, the lay people outside; and some distinction of this kind probably became general from about the 6th century. The distinction between the communion of the clergy and that of the laity always tended in fact to become broader, and as differences increased not only in respect of precedence, but in respect of the manner and place of communicating, the degradation of a clerk to lay communion became a more marked punishment [DEGRADATION].

#### CONDITIONS OF ADMISSION TO HOLY COMMUNION.

1. *Communicants must be baptized persons, not under censure.*—None could be admitted to Holy Communion but baptized persons (*οὐδὲς ἀβάπτιστος μεταλαμβάνει*, Theophylact on Matt. 14),

CHRIST. ANT.

lying under no censure [EXCOMMUNICATION]. The competency of ordinary members of any church would be known as a matter of course to the clergy administering the sacrament. Persons from a distance were required to produce certificates from their own bishops (*γράμματα κοινωτικά*, *litterae communicatoriae, formatae*; see COMMENDATORY LETTERS) that they were in the peace of the Church, before they could be admitted to Holy Communion (*Conc. Carthag.* i. c. 5; *Eliberit.* cc. 25, 58; *Arles*, i. c. 9; *Agde*, c. 52). Some have thought that the expression *communio peregrina* designates the state of those strangers who, being unprovided with such letters, were admitted to be present at divine service, but not to communicate (see Bona, *De Reb. Lit.* ii. c. 19, §§ 5, 6; Bingham, *Antiq.* XVII. iii. 7).

2. It seems also that, in some cases at least, within the first eight centuries, *Private Confession* was enjoined before communicating. In the *Penitential* of Archbishop Theodore (about A.D. 700) in the chapter *De Communionē Eucharistiae* (l. xii. 7) is the provision, "*Confessio autem Deo soli agatur licebit, si necesse est*;" to which is added in some MSS. the note of a transcriber of perhaps a century later, "*et hoc necessarium*." The same provision is repeated in the *Penitential* of Cumineus, the work almost certainly of the later Cumineus, an Irish monk who lived and wrote near Bobbio, in the early part of the 8th century. The purport of the rule seems to be, that confession to a priest was the ordinary practice, but that it might be dispensed with in case of necessity.

That confession to a priest was a usual, though not a necessary, preliminary to Holy Communion is perhaps implied in the narrative of Adamnan (*Vita S. Columbae*, i. 17, 20, 30, 41, 50) and of Bede (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 25, 27). The whole subject is discussed in Ussher's *Religion of the Ancient Irish*, c. 5; and in Lanigan's *History of the Irish Church*, iv. 67. Compare PENITENCE.

In the case of reconciliation of penitents after excommunication and penance, the intervention of the bishop—or of a priest in his absence—was of course necessary (Theodore's *Penit.* l. xiii. 2, 3); and clergy ordained by Scotch or British bishops were not admitted to communion in the Anglican church until they had "confessed" their desire to be restored to unity (*Ib.* l. ix. 3).

On the Communion of Children see INFANT COMMUNION.

3. *Fasting Reception of Holy Communion.*—So long as Holy Communion accompanied or followed an AGAPE, or common meal, it is evident that it was not received fasting. But as, in course of time, the tone of thought in the Church was altered, and the rite itself received a different colouring and different accessories, it came to be regarded as essential that both the celebrant and the recipients should be fasting at the time of communion. Something of this feeling probably underlies Tertullian's words, when he contrasts the Lord's own practice with that of his own time in the passage (*De Corona*, c. 3) quoted above, and on stationary days (*De Orat.* c. 14), he clearly contemplates the fast being continued until reception. Cyprian too (*Ep.* 63, cc. 15 and 16, quoted above) insists on the greater worthiness of the morning compared with the

evening communion. But the necessity of communicating fasting does not appear to be distinctly recognised before the 4th century. Then we find Basil (*Hom. ii. De Jejunio*, p. 13) laying it down that no one would venture to celebrate the mysteries otherwise than fasting; and Chrysostom (in 1 Cor. *Hom. 27*, p. 231) insisting on fasting as a necessary preliminary to worthy communion; and again (*Ad pop. Antioch. Serm. 9*, p. 103) exhorting even those who were not fasting to come to church, not indeed to communicate but to hear the sermon; and again (*Ep. 125*, p. 683) complaining that his calumniators accused him of having admitted to communion persons who were not fasting, a charge which he denies with the strongest asseverations. We have already seen that Ambrose recommended the faithful to fast even until evening, when the communion was late. A remarkable passage of Augustine (*Ep. 118*, c. 6; p. 191, ed. Cologne, 1616) is conclusive as to the practice of his own time. "It is beyond dispute," he says, "that when the disciples first received the Body and Blood of the Lord, they did not receive fasting. Are we therefore to blame the whole Church because every one does receive fasting? No; for it pleased the Holy Spirit that, in honour of so mighty a sacrament, the Body of the Lord should pass the Christian's lips before other food; for it is on that account that that custom is observed throughout the whole world . . . The Lord did not prescribe in what order it should be received, that He might reserve this privilege for the Apostles, through whom He was to regulate the churches; for if He had recommended that it should always be received after other food, I suppose that no one would have deviated from that practice." With respect to his correspondent's question, as to the custom to be followed on the Thursday in Holy Week with regard to morning or evening communion, or both, he admits that the practice of the Church did not condemn communion on that day after the evening meal.

This rule, however, was not quite invariable. In Augustine's lifetime—as appears from the epistle just quoted—the custom prevailed that on the Thursday in Holy Week, the anniversary of the institution, the faithful received Holy Communion in the evening and after eating. So the *Codex Canonum Eccl. Afric.* (canon 41; = *III. Conc. Carth. c. 29*) provides, "ut sacramenta altaris non nisi a jejunis hominibus celebrentur, excepto uno die anniversario quo Coena Domini celebretur." A canon of Laodicea (c. 50) which is sometimes quoted as directed against this custom, simply refers to the habit into which some had fallen of breaking their Lent-fast on the Thursday in the last week, not specially to non-fasting communion; but the Council in *Trullo* (can. 29), in the year 680, did expressly forbid the celebration of the mysteries even on this Thursday by any but fasting men.

Socrates (*Hist. Eccl. v. 22*, p. 295) expressly states that the inhabitants of that part of Egypt which borders on Alexandria and of the Thebaid had a celebration of the Eucharist on Saturday, as others had; but that, contrary to the general custom, they communicated after taking their evening meal without stint.

Regulations intended to check the practice of non-fasting communion were made in Gaul in the

6th century. The council of Auxerre (can. 19 *Brun's Can. ii. 239*) enjoined that no presbyter, deacon, or subdeacon should venture to take part in the office of the mass, or to stand in the church while mass was said, after taking food or wine. The reason for the latter clause was no doubt that clerics who were present at mass always in those days communicated. The 2nd Council of Mâcon in the year 585 (*Conc. Matisconens. ii. can. 9*; in *Brun's Canones, ii. 251*) expressly forbade any presbyter full of food or under the influence of wine (*crapulatus vino*) to handle the sacrifice or celebrate mass; referring to the African canon already quoted. In Spain decrees on this subject were made by the 1st Council of Braga (can. 16), and the second (can. 10) in the years 563 and 572 respectively (*Brun, ii. 32 and 42*). The first of these anathematizes those who, instead of celebrating mass fasting in the church at three in the afternoon of Maundy Thursday, celebrated on that day masses for the dead at nine in the morning without fasting, after the Priscillianist fashion. The second, by occasion of those who consecrated masses for the dead after having taken wine, condemns those who ventured to consecrate after having taken any food whatever. Walafrid Strabo (*de Off. Divinis*, c. 19), referring to the first of these, rightly infers that if non-fasting communion was not permitted on a day when the practice of the law and a certain degree of precedent might be pleaded, it was not permitted on other days. The abuse censured by the second council probably arose from the late hour at which masses for the dead were held and the presence of the priest at the funeral-feast. The *Codex Eccl. Afric.* (can. 41 = *III. Carth. c. 29*) had already provided that services for the dead held in the afternoon should consist of prayers only, without sacrifice, if the clerics who performed the service were found to have taken food. Gratian (under *Presbyter*, dist. 91, quoted by Bona, *R. L. i. c. 21*, § 2) refers to a council of Nantes or Agde, which enjoined priests to remain fasting until the hour fixed, in order that they might be able to take part in the funeral-mass.

In two cases only non-fasting communion is expressly permitted. The first is, when the necessity suddenly arises of administering the Viaticum to one in the article of death; in which case it is sanctioned, says Cardinal Bona (*R. L. i. 21*, 2), by the practice of the whole Church. The second is, when the celebrating priest, from sudden sickness, is unable to finish the office; in which case, if the elements have been consecrated, another priest, even though he be not fasting, may complete it. See the second canon of the 7th Council of Toledo (*Brun's Can. i. 262*) of the year 646, which at the same time enjoins most earnestly that neither shall a priest resign the unfinished service nor a non-fasting priest take it up without the most absolute necessity. And to prevent such cases, the 11th Council of Toledo (A.D. 675) ordered (can. 2, p. 315) that wherever it was possible the priest saying mass should be attended by another, fasting, who might take up the service in case of need.

#### TIME OF COMMUNION.

1. *Days.*—The well-known passage in the Acts of the Apostles (ii. 46) is commonly held to prove that the "breaking of bread" for Holy



Communion took place *daily* in the primitive Church. In the only case in which a particular day is mentioned in the Acts on which bread was broken solemnly (xx. 7), the day is the Lord's Day, the first day of the week; and it seems probable that St. Paul, when he prescribed the laying by for the poor on the first day of the week, designed to associate almsgiving with the Eucharist. The Bithynian Christians (Pliny, *Ep.* x. 97) met on a fixed day for worship and communion; the expression "stato die," which determines nothing as to the particular day of the week, shows plainly that communion was not daily (see Mosheim, *Institutiones Majores*, p. 378 f.). Justin Martyr (*Apol. I.* c. 67) distinctly mentions Sunday (ἡ λεγομένη ἡλίου ἡμέρα) as the day of Christian Communion; the day on which God made the light and on which Christ rose from the dead. There is, in fact, no reason to doubt that from the first "Lord's Day" to the present time Christians have met on the first day of the week to "break bread" as the Lord commanded.

The days which next appear as dedicated to Holy Communion are the fourth and sixth days of the week, the *Dies Stationum* [STATIO]. These days appear as days of special observance and administration of Holy Communion in the time of Tertullian (*De Oratione*, c. 14). Basil (*Ep.* 289) adds to these days the Sabbath, or seventh day of the week, which has always been a day of special observance in the Eastern Church. "We communicate," he says, "four times in the week, on the Lord's Day, the fourth day, the Preparation Day [i.e. Friday], and the Sabbath." But this was not a universal custom; for Epiphanius (*Expositio Fidei*, c. 22, p. 1104) speaks as if the celebrations (συνάξεις) of the Wednesday, Friday, and Sunday were alone usual in his time and within his knowledge, which included a large part of the East during the latter portion of the 4th century. The Synod of Laodicea, about A.D. 320 [al. 372], enjoins that bread should not be offered in Lent, except on the Sabbath and on the Lord's Day; the Sabbath being in the East a festival approaching in joyfulness to the Lord's Day. In the West, where the Sabbath was generally a day of humiliation, there is no trace of its being preferred for the celebration of Holy Communion.

When Christianity became the recognised religion of the empire, daily celebration of the Eucharist soon became usual. For the Church of Constantinople this is proved by the testimony of Chrysostom, who (in *Ephes.* Hom. iii. p. 23) complains of the rarity of communicants at the daily offering. St. Augustine testifies (*Ep.* 98, c. 9) that in Africa, in his time, Christ was sacrificed (immolari) every day for the people; yet he also proves (*Ep.* 118 *ad Januarium*) that this was by no means a universal custom, saying, "in some places no day passes without an offering; in others offering is made on the Sabbath only and the Lord's Day; in others on the Lord's Day only." That the daily sacrifice was observed in the Spanish Church at the end of the 4th century we have the testimony of the 1st Council of Toledo (circ. 398), which enjoins (canon 5) all clerics to be present in church at the time of the daily sacrifice. With regard to the Roman Church, Jerome, writing to Lucinius (*Ep.* 71) refers to a question which his correspon-

dent had asked, whether the Eucharist were to be received daily, "according to the custom which the Churches of Rome and Spain are said to observe." Although the expression used is not absolutely decisive, Jerome seems to write as if the custom of Rome was in fact the same as that of Spain, where, as we have seen, the daily sacrifice was customary at the time when he wrote. Yet Socrates (*Hist. Eccl.* v. 22, p. 295) assures us that, at Alexandria and Rome, ancient tradition still forbade to celebrate the joyful feast of the Eucharist on the Sabbath, as was the universal custom elsewhere. Athanasius, it is true, if the treatise in question be his (*On the Parable of the Sower*, *Opp.* iv. 45), says that Christians met together on the Sabbath to adore Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath; but this proves nothing as to the celebration of the Eucharist, and consequently does not invalidate Socrates' testimony. Socrates also (l. c.) mentions as a peculiar custom, that at Alexandria, on Wednesday and Friday, the Scriptures are read and the teachers interpret them, and all is done that pertains to a meeting of the congregation, short of the celebration of the mysteries (πάντα τὰ συνάξεως γίνονται δίχα τῆς τῶν μυστηρίων τελετῆς). The words of Innocent I (*ad Decentium*, c. 4), that on the Friday and the Sabbath in the Holy Week no sacraments were to be celebrated, because those two days of the first Holy Week were spent by the Apostles in grief and terror, probably imply that in ordinary weeks the sacraments were celebrated on the Sabbath as on other days; and in the so-called *Comes Hieronymi* Epistles and Gospels are given for Sabbaths as well as other days (see Quesnel, *De Jejuniis Sabbathi Romae celebrato*). On the want of proper offices in the ancient Sacramentaries for the Sundays following the Ember-days, for the Thursdays in Lent, and for the Saturday before Palm Sunday, see Krazer, *de Liturgiis*, pp. 646 ff. Cf. STATIO.

2. *Hours*.—There can be little doubt that in the apostolic age Holy Communion was at the time of the evening meal (δειπνον, coena), as even Baronius admits (*ad ann.* 34, c. 61). Indeed, it is almost certain from the nature of the case that in days when Christianity was an illicit religion, the peculiar rite of Christian communion must have been celebrated in such a way as to attract the least possible attention. St. Paul's "breaking of bread" in the Troas (Acts xx. 7, 8) was after nightfall, and the service was not over at midnight. Pliny (*Ep.* x. 97) says that the Christians were accustomed to meet before dawn. The heathen calumnies mentioned by Justin Martyr (*Dial.* c. *Tryphone*, c. 10) show that the meeting of Christians took place after nightfall; and the same custom earned them the epithets of "latebrosa et lucifuga natio," which Minucius Felix (*O. tarius*, c. 8) tells us were bestowed upon them. Origen too (c. *Celsus*, i. 3, p. 5, Spencer) tells his opponent that it was to avoid the death with which they were threatened that Christians commonly held their meetings in secrecy and darkness. And still in the 3rd century we find Tertullian, Cyprian, and others speaking of "coetus antelucani," "convocationes nocturnae," of "sacrificium matutinum et vespertinum." See, for instance, Tertullian *ad Uxorem*, ii. 4; *de Corona Mil.* c. 3, in the latter of which passages it seems to be implied, that Chris-

tians communicated at the evening meal, as well as in assemblies before dawn. Cyprian (*ad Caecilium*, *Ep.* 63, cc. 15, 16) refers to some who in the morning sacrifice used water only in the chalice, lest the odour of wine should betray them to their heathen neighbours; and warns such not to salve their conscience with the reflection that they complied with Christ's command in offering the mixed chalice when they came together for the evening meal (*ad coenandum*) at which the rite had been originally instituted. This no doubt implies some kind of communion both morning and evening; but that in the evening seems to have been rather a domestic than a public rite; for Cyprian expressly says that at this the whole congregation (*plebs*) could not be called together, so as to make the rite—what it ought to be—a visible token to all of their brotherhood in Christ. And he goes on to say, that though it was no doubt fitting that Christ should offer at eventide, as foreshadowing the evening of the world and being the antitype of the evening passover-sacrifice (*Exod.* xii. 6); yet that Christians celebrated in the morning the resurrection of the Lord. In short, he clearly regards the morning as the proper time for public and solemn communion.

When the Church received its freedom, set hours began to be appointed for Holy Communion. The third hour of the day (about nine o'clock), the hour when the Holy Spirit descended on the apostles, was fixed at an early date as the hour of morning sacrifice on Sundays and festivals. The *Liber Pontificalis* attributes to Pope Telesphorus (127–138) the decree, “ut nullus ante horam tertiam sacrificium offerre praesumeret;” and this statement is repeated by Amalarius (*de Eccl. Off.* iii. 42) and others. It is almost needless to say the decree is one of the well-known forgeries. The same regulation is attributed by the spurious *Gesta Damasi* (see Bona, *de Reb. Lit.* i. 21, § 5) to Pope Damasus (366–384); but here too no weight can be attached to the authority. More satisfactory testimonies are the following. Sidonius Apollinaris, who died A.D. 489, says (*Ep.* v. 17) that priests held divine service at the third hour; and Gregory of Tours in the 6th century speaks (*Vita Nicetii*) of the third as the hour when the people came together to mass; Gregory the Great (*in Evang. Hom.* 37) speaks of one who came to offer the sacrifice at the third hour; and Theodulph of Orleans (ob. 821) orders (*Capitulum*, c. 45) that private masses should not be said on the Lord's Day with so much publicity as to attract the people from the high or public mass, which was canonically celebrated at the third hour. That on ordinary or *ferial* days mass was said at the sixth hour (twelve o'clock) as late as the 12th century we have the testimony of Honorius of Autun (*Gemma Animæ*, i. c. 113); but this practice seems to have been matter of custom rather than of canonical prescription. On fast-days the liturgical hour was the ninth, probably because the ancient Church was unwilling to introduce the joyful eucharistic feast into the early hours of a fast-day, and because on such a day it was not thought too onerous to continue fasting until three o'clock in the afternoon (Martene, *de Rit. Antiq.* i. p. 108). Epiphanius (*Expositio Fidei*, c. 22) testifies to the fact that throughout the year on Wednesday and Friday the liturgy was

said at the ninth hour; excepting in the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, and on the Epiphany when it fell on Wednesday or Friday; on these days, as on the Lord's Day, there was no fasting, and the liturgy was said at an early hour in the morning (*ἀπ' ἑωθέρ*).

The Council of Mentz, quoted by Ivo of Chartres (pt. 4, c. 35), desires all men on the Ember-days to come to church at the ninth hour to mass. The same reasons which caused the mass to be deferred at other fasting-seasons applied also to Lent; hence Ambrose, preaching in Lent, begs the faithful to defer eating until after the time of the heavenly banquet; if they had to wait until evening, the time was not so very long; on most days the oblation was at noon (on Psalm 118 [119], *Serm.* 8, *Opp.* iv. 656, ed. Basle, 1567); and Theodulph (*Capitulum*, c. 39) says that those broke the Lenten fast who ventured to eat as soon as they heard the bell at the ninth hour, an hour at which he seems to imply that the “*missarum solemnities*,” as well as “*vespertina officia*,” were celebrated.

These prescriptions as to the hours of mass, as well as of the ordinary offices, have long ceased to be observed: in the Roman Church at least mass may be said at any hour from dawn (*aurora*) to noon. But a trace of the ancient practice is found in the following rubric (xv. § 2) of the Roman missal:—“*Missa autem Conventualis et Solemnis sequent ordine dici debet. In Festis duplicibus et semiduplicibus, in Dominicis, et infra Oct., dicta in Choro hora tertia. In Festis simplicibus et in Feriis per annum dicta sexta. In Adventu, Quadragesima, Quatuor Temporibus, etiam infra Octavam Pentecostes, et Vigiliis quae jejuntur, quamvis sint dies solemnes, Missa de Tempore debet cantari post nonam.*”

The celebration of Holy Communion in the night-time, once—as we have seen—common in the Church, ceased at an early date, except on certain days of special observance. Of these the principal is that on the night of the Lord's Nativity. A Coptic tradition (mentioned by Bona, *R. L.* i. 21, 4) ascribes the institution of a nocturnal communion at Christmas and Epiphany to the Nicene Council: the fact may perhaps have been, that when the celebration of the Lord's Nativity was transferred from the sixth of January to the twenty-fifth of December [CHRISTMAS], the nightly communion was continued on both days. In the Gregorian Sacramentary (p. 5) besides the mass for the Vigil of the Nativity, said at the ninth hour, is one *In Vigilia Domini in nocte*, that is, to be said in the night between Christmas Eve and Christmas Day.

A nightly communion was usual in ancient times on the night of the “*Sabbatum Sanctum*” or Easter Eve. It is probably to this custom that Tertullian alludes when (*ad Uxorem*, ii. 4) he says that a heathen husband would not permit a Christian wife to pass the night from home on the Paschal solemnities; Jerome (on *St. Matt.* xxv.) mentions that it was an apostolic tradition on Easter Eve not to dismiss the congregation before midnight; and Theodore Balsamon (on the Council in *Trullo*, can. 90) writes that persons of especial piety were accustomed to remain in the churches the whole of that Saturday, to communicate at midnight, and at

one o'clock in the morning to begin Matins. The *Ordo Romanus Vulgatus* also orders that the people should not be dismissed before midnight, and that at dawn of day they should return to the churches; in monasteries it enjoins the bells to be rung as soon as a star was seen in the sky, a litany to be chanted, and then the mass to follow. The same custom is mentioned by Amalarius (*de Divin. Off.* iv. c. 20; cf. c. 40), who says that all continue fasting until night, when the mass of the Lord's Resurrection is celebrated. Durandus (*Rationale*, vi. c. 76) says that the ancient rite was observed in some churches at the time when he wrote, in the latter part of the 13th century. In modern times the mass of Easter Eve is said at midday, but the unchanged collects still testify to the fact that it was formerly said at night.

A nocturnal celebration anciently took place also in the night between the Vigil and the day of Pentecost; hence in the prayer *Communicantes* on that day we have the words, "diem sacratissimam Pentecostes praevenientes" (Gregorii *Sacram.* p. 97; see Ménard, note 393). The *Ordo Romanus* provides that at the eighth hour of the eve the vigil service or mass should begin, and should be finished before the end of the ninth hour.

Four times in the year, on the Saturdays of the EMBER weeks, was a nightly mass, or rather one on the morning of the succeeding day, which was reckoned to belong to the Saturday; hence, as the *Micrologus* (c. 29) observes, the Sundays which follow the Ember-days have no proper offices in the ancient sacramentaries, but are called *Dominicae vacantes*; for the mass which was celebrated late on the Saturday served for the Sunday also. So the Council of Clermont (A.D. 1095) ordered (can. 24) that the fast, if possible, should be prolonged through the Saturday night, that the mass might be brought as near as possible to the Sunday morning.

In some cases, when we read of *missae vespertinae* (e.g. *Conc. Agath.* c. 30; *III. Aurel.* c. 29), we must bear in mind that the word *missa* does not in all cases imply the celebration of the mysteries of the altar, but was applied also to the hour-offices. Cf. MASS: MAUNDY THURSDAY: and p. 416.

#### FREQUENCY OF COMMUNION.

An ancient rule of the Church is expressed in the 21st canon of the Council of Eliberis (about A.D. 305), that if any one dwelling in a town should absent himself on three Sundays from church, he should be for a time suspended from communion. As at that time in a city having a bishop Holy Communion was administered at least every Sunday, and non-communicating attendance was unknown, we infer that weekly communion was the rule of the Church, to fail in which was to be unworthy of its privileges. Theodore of Tarsus, archbishop of Canterbury, testifies (about A.D. 688) that in his time this was still the rule of the East. In the West, signs of a relaxation of this rule appear at a comparatively early period. Thus the Council of Agde [*Agathense*] in the year 506 laid down the rule (can. 18) that if a layman did not communicate at least at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, he should no longer be reputed a Catholic. To the same effect are the 14th canon of

the Council of Autun (A.D. 670), and the 38th of the *Excerpta* attributed to Egbert of York (A.D. 740). Bede (*Ep. ad Eubert.* p. 311, ed. 1722) desires his correspondent to insist strongly on the wholesome practice of daily communion, according to the custom of the churches of Italy, Gaul, Africa, Greece, and the whole East. But this, he says, in consequence of defective teaching, is so far from being the custom of English laymen, that even the more religious among them do not presume to communicate except at Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter; though countless innocent boys and girls, young men and maidens, old men and old women, do not scruple to communicate every Lord's Day, and perhaps on the days of Apostles and Martyrs besides, as Egbert himself had witnessed, in the Roman and Apostolic Church.

The 3rd Council of Tours, in the year 813, laid down (can. 50) a rule nearly identical with that of Agde; that all laymen, not disqualified by heinous sin, should communicate at least three times in the year. The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle had previously (A.D. 788) re-enacted (c. 70) the decree of the Council of Antioch (c. 2) which ordered all who came to church at the time of service but declined reception to be suspended from communion until they should amend; and it was probably the failure of this attempt to revive the primitive practice which led to the much looser rule of Aix-la-Chapelle.

If the Pseudo-Ambrosius (*de Sacram.* v. 25) is to be trusted, some Christians at least of the East in the 4th century communicated only once a year, and he complains that this practice had extended to his own community, recommending himself the practice of *daily* communion. [C.]

#### COMMUNION BOOKS. [LITURGICAL BOOKS.]

#### COMMUNION OF CHILDREN. [INFANT COMMUNION.]

#### COMMUNION OF THE SICK [SICK, VISITATION OF.]

#### COMMUNITY OF GOODS. [MONASTICISM.]

COMMISTIO or COMMIXTIO. In the Roman missal, after the breaking of the Host [FRACTION], the priest places a particle in the chalice, saying *secreto*: "Haec commistio et consecratio corporis et sanguinis D. N. J. C. fiat accipientibus nobis in vitam aeternam." And this practice of placing a particle of the Host in the cup appears to be an ancient one, and to be considered as a kind of consecration [CONSECRATION]. It is found in the liturgy of St. James (Neale's *Tetralogia*, p. 177), where the priest, after breaking the bread, places the portion which he holds in his right hand in the chalice, saying, "The union (*ἔνωσις*) of the all-holy Body and precious Blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ."

The 4th Council of Toledo (A.D. 633), canon 18, orders the commixtion (*conjunctionem panis et calicis*) to take place between the Lord's Prayer and the Benediction. [C.]

#### COMPATRES AND COMMATRES. [SPONSORS.]

#### COMPENDIENSE CONCILIIUM. [COMPIÈGNE.]

## COMPETENTES. [CATECHUMENS.]

COMPIÈGNE, COUNCILS OF. [COMPENDIENSE.] (1) A.D. 756, held in Pipin's palace, passed canons respecting marriage, degrees of consanguinity, &c. (Labb. *Conc.* vi. 1694). (2) A.D. 757 (Eginhard), or 758 (Ado), an assembly or "placitum" in the same place, but rather civil than ecclesiastical, its purpose being to receive the homage of Tassilo, duke of the Bavarians, and of his subjects (*ib.* 1884). [A. W. H.]

COMPLETORIUM. (1) The last of the Canonical hours of prayer [HOURS OF PRAYER].

(2) An anthem in the Ambrosian rite, said at Laud and Vespers. Sundays have two at Lauds, and four at Vespers; and week days one, varying with the day, at Lauds, and one, unchanging, at Vespers. The first at Lauds on Sunday is "Dominus in caelo, paravit sedem suam: et regnum ejus omnium dominabitur. Kyr. Kyr. Kyr." They are all of the same type. On Festivals the number varies with the office. [H. J. H.]

COMPLINE. [HOURS OF PRAYER.]

COMPUTUS. [CALENDAR.]

CONCORDIA, nurse of St. Hippolytus, martyr at Rome, Aug. 13 (*Mart. Bedae, Usuardi*). [C.]

CONCORDIUS, presbyter, martyr at Spoleto under Antoninus, Jan. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CONCUBINAGE.—The relation between the sexes which was denoted by this word had, under the legal system with which the early Church was brought into contact, a twofold character. There was (1) the connexion, temporary, depending on caprice only, involving no obligations, concubinage in the modern sense, not distinguishable ethically from fornication. But there was also (2) a *concubinatus* recognised by Roman law, as in the *Lex Julia et Papia Poppæa*, which had a very different character. Here the cohabitation was permanent, and involved therefore reciprocal obligations, and, although it did not stand on the same level as a *connubium*, and did not entitle the issue of the union to inherit as legitimate, it was yet regarded, somewhat as a morganatic marriage is in Germany, as involving no moral degradation. In dealing with this last form, Christian feeling was divided between the fear of recognising what might seem a half-marriage only on the one hand, and the desire to sanction any union which fulfilled the primary condition of marriage on the other. The question was complicated by the fact that, for the most part, these unions were contracted with women who were slaves or foreigners, and therefore not *ingenue*, and that consequently to have placed them on a level with *connubia*, would have been to introduce a *mésalliance* into the succession of respectable or noble families. Cases where the man who kept the *concubina* had a wife living, though sanctioned by the lax morality of Roman society, admitted, of course, of no question, and were denounced as adultery (August. *Serm.* 224). Where the man was unmarried the case was different. The Apostolical Constitutions, on the one hand (viii. 32), authorised the admission to bap-

tism of such a slave-concubine belonging to an unbeliever, if she were faithful to the one man with whom she lived. If Marcia, the concubine, first of Quadratus, and afterwards of Commodus, who is known to have favoured the Christians, had ever been one of them, it must have been by virtue of some such rule. The case of a Christian who had a concubine was somewhat more difficult, and the equity of the Church's judgment was disturbed by considerations of social expediency. If she was a slave he was to get rid of her, apparently without being bound to make any provision for her maintenance. If she were a free woman, he was either to marry or dismiss her (*Apost. Const.* viii. 32). So, too, at a later date, we find Leo the Great treating this dismissal of a mistress followed by a legal marriage, not as a "duplicatio conjugii," but a "profectus honestatis" (*Epist.* 92; *ad Rustic.*, c. 5).<sup>a</sup> In other instances, however, we trace the influence of the wish to look upon every permanent union of man or woman as possessing the character of a marriage in the eyes of God, and therefore in the judgment of the Church. Thus Augustine, speaking of a concubine who promises a life-long fidelity, even should he cast her off, to the man with whom she lived, says that "*merito dubitatur utrum ad percipiendum baptismum non debeat admitti*" (*De Fide et Oper.* c. 19).<sup>b</sup> The first Council of Toledo went even farther, and while it excluded from communion a married man who kept a concubine, admitted one who, being unmarried, continued faithful to the one woman with whom he thus lived (1 *C. Tolet.* c. 17). The special law forbidding a Jew to have a Christian wife or concubine (3 *C. Tolet.* c. 14), implying, as it does, the legitimacy of the latter relation, where both parties were Christians, shows, in like manner, that it was thought of as ethically, though not legally, on the same level as a *connubium*.

The use of the word *concubina* as a term of reproach for the wives of the clergy who were married, was, of course, a logical deduction from the laws which forbade that marriage, but the unsparing use made of it, as by Peter Damiani and Hildebrand, belongs to a somewhat later date than that which comes within the limits of this book. [E. H. P.]

CONFESSIO. Originally the place where a saint or martyr who had "witnessed a good confession" for Christ was buried, and thence the altar raised over his grave, and subsequently the chapel or *basilica* erected on the hallowed spot. From its subterranean position such an altar was known as *κατάβασις* (Theophan. p. 362) or *descensus*. Of these subterranean *confessiones* we have examples in Rome in the churches of St. Prisca, St. Martino ai Monti, St.

<sup>a</sup> It may be questioned, however, which class of concubines, the illicit or the legalised, are here contemplated.

<sup>b</sup> It is interesting to note, in this lenity of judgment, the influence of a tender recollection of one with whom Augustine, before his conversion, had lived in this relation, and who on parting from him made a declaration that she would live with no one else. (*Conf.* vi. 15.) She was apparently a Christian ("vovens tibi," *sc. Deo*) and Monica, though she wished her son to marry and settle respectably, does not seem to have condemned the union as sinful, and adopted Adeodatus, the issue of the connexion, into her warmest affections.



Lorenzo fuori le Mura, &c., and above all in the basilica of St. Peter's. Not unfrequently they were merely imitative, and not *confessiones* in the original sense, as at St. Maria Maggiore, and in the crypts of our early churches in England. *Confessio* was also used for the altar in the upper church, placed immediately above that built over the martyr's grave, sometimes covered with silver plates (Anastas. §§ 65-69, 79, 80, 198), and its *ciborium*, or canopy (*ib.* § 65).

Other synonymous terms were *concilia martyrum*, *memoriae martyrum*, and *martyria*.

*Concilia martyrum* is applied to the burial places of the martyrs in the catacombs, e.g., "Hic (Damasus) martyrum . . . concilia versibus ornavit" (Anast. § 54; cf. Baron. ad ann. 259, no. 24). Jerome speaks of the graves the young Nepotian had been in the habit of decorating with flowers as *martyrum conciliabula* (*Ep. ad Helvet.* iii.; cf. Aug. *de Civ. Dei*, 22, 8). The analogous Greek term was *συνάξεις τῶν μαρτύρων* (Concil. Gangr. Can. 20).

*Memoriae martyrum* is a term of constant occurrence in early Christian writings for the memorial chapel of a saint or martyr, also called *cella* (August. *de Civ. Dei*, xxii. 7, 10; *cont. Faust.* xx. c. 21; *Serm. de Diversis*, 101; *Opatus cont. Parmen.* ii. 32). The corresponding Greek term was *martyrium*, *μαρτύριον* (Euseb. *de Vit. Const.* iii. 48; Soc. iv. 18 [the martyrium of St. Thomas at Edessa]; *ib.* 23 [the martyria of St. Peter and St. Paul at Rome]). The church of St. Euphemia, where she lay buried, in which the Council of Chalcedon was held, is styled in the acts of that council *μαρτύριον Εὐφημίας* (cf. Soc. vi. 6); and that erected by Constantine over our Lord's sepulchre on Calvary, *μαρτύριον Σωτῆρος, ἀναστάσεως*, &c. (Euseb. iv. *de Vit. Const.* 40-49, &c. Cf. Concil. Laod. canon 8.) The word *τροπαια, τὰ τροπαια τῶν ἀποστόλων*, is used by Caius, apud Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 25, for the tombs of SS. Peter and Paul in the Roman cemeteries. [CELLA MEMORIAE.]

The Cod. Theod. (*De Sepulchro violato, lex vii*) contains an express sanction for the erection of a "martyrium" in memory of a saint, and the addition of such buildings as might be desired. [E. V.]

CONFESSIO, LITURGICAL (*Confessio*, *Ἀπολογία, δμολογία*).

The acknowledgment of sin made publicly in certain services of the Church.

I. *The Confession preceding the celebration of the Eucharist*.—It is so natural to confess sin and unworthiness before engaging in so solemn an act as the consecration of the Eucharist, that we scarcely need to search for precedent; yet it has been supposed by some that the Christian presbyters borrowed the custom of confessing sin before the Eucharistic celebration from the Jewish priests, who before sacrificing confessed their sin in such terms as these: "Verily, O Lord, I have sinned, I have done amiss and dealt wickedly; I repent and am ashamed of my doings, nor will I ever return unto them." See Morinus *de Poenitent.* lib. ix. ii. c. 21, § 4; Buxtorf *de Synag. Judaica*, c. 20.

Whether the precedent of the Jewish sacrificing priest were followed or not, no doubt

the same feeling which prompted the use of the Psalm *Judici* [26th] in the early part of the liturgy caused also the use of a public general confession by the priest and ministers before the altar.

In many Greek liturgies some acknowledgment of sin and unworthiness forms part of the office of the prothesis, said in the sacristy before entering the sanctuary: in the liturgy of St. James, for instance, the priest adopts the words of the publican, "God be merciful to me a sinner," and of the prodigal, "I have sinned against Heaven and in Thy sight." The words of the prodigal are also adopted at greater length in the opening of the Mozarabic liturgy.

For the West, many forms of the liturgical confession, or *apologia*, of the priest about to celebrate are given by Ménard (on the Gregorian *Sacramentary*, p. 242); and by Bona (*de Reb. Lit.* ii. c. 1, § 1). Ménard states that these were formerly used before the offertory, with which the *Missa Fidelium* began; but in the *Missa Illyrici* and some others, these *apologiae* are directed to be said immediately before the Introit, while the *Gloria in Excelsis* and the Gradual are chanted by the choir. But the ancient formularies of the Roman Church contain no trace of a confession in a set form to be made publicly at the beginning of mass. The ancient *Ordines Romani* only testify that the celebrant after paying his devotions before the altar in a low voice, with bowed head besought God's pardon for his own sins. It is an error, therefore, to attribute the introduction of this rite to Pope Pontianus or Pope Damasus. The very diversity of the form and manner in saying the confession in different churches shows that no form was prescribed by any central authority, but that the several churches followed independent usages.

The usual place for the liturgical confession before mass is the lowest step of the altar; but there was anciently considerable diversity of practice; for the confession was sometimes made (as in the East) in the sacristy, sometimes by the side of the altar, sometimes in the middle of the presbytery. A peculiar custom, probably derived from ancient times, was long maintained in the church of St. Martin at Tours, that the celebrant should make his confession at the tomb of St. Martin (Martene *de Ritibus Eccl.* lib. i. c. 4, art. 2).

II. *In the Matin office*.—Something of the nature of confession of sin appears to have formed part of the matin office from very early times. This custom is thought by some to have been inherited from the synagogue, which has, in the ancient "Eighteen Prayers," the form, "Have mercy upon us, O our Father, for we have transgressed; pardon us, for we have sinned. Look, we beseech Thee, on our afflictions; heal, O Lord, our infirmities." Very similarly, the Greek matin office has, "O most Holy Trinity, have mercy on us; purify us from our iniquities, and pardon our sins. Look down upon us, O Holy One; heal our infirmities." (Freeman, *Principles of Litine Service*, i. 64 ff.).

It is at least certain that in the 4th century the early matin office of many Eastern churches began with a confession; for St. Basil (*Ep.* 63, p. 843, ed. Paris 1618) describes the early matins of the church of Neo-Caesarea in the following manner. The people, he says, at early

dawn seek the house of prayer, and, after confession made with sighing and tears to God, rising at length from their prayer pass to the chanting of the Psalms. It appears then that a public liturgical confession commenced the matin office in the days of St. Basil, and he expressly states that this practice was consonant with that of other churches known to him.

In the Western matin office the confession is made in the form called CONFITEOR (q. v.) from its first word.

III. Confession of past sins formed also one of the preliminaries of baptism, as we learn from Tertullian, *de Baptismo*, c. 20. See BAPTISM.

IV. An instance of a profession of faith, commonly called a confession, is the following:—

In all liturgies of the Alexandrine family, and in many other Oriental liturgies there is found, immediately before communion, a confession, or declaration of faith by the recipient, that the bread and wine are now really and truly the Body and Blood of Christ. For instance, in the Coptic St. Basil (Renaudot, *Litt. Orient.* i. 23), the priest, holding the elements, says, "The Holy Body and precious, pure, true Blood of Jesus Christ the Son of our God. Amen. This is in very truth the Body and Blood of Emmanuel our God. Amen." Compare the Coptic St. Gregory (Ren. i. 36); the Greek St. Basil (i. 83); St. Gregory (i. 122), and other passages. [C.]

#### CONFESSOR. [PENITENTIARY.]

##### CONFESSOR. (Ὁμολογητής.)

1. One who has confessed Christ by suffering death for Him. [MARTYR.] Thus, St. Ambrose (*ad Gratianum*, ii. p. 63, ed. Basil, 1567) speaks of the deaths of confessors.

2. One who has borne for Christ suffering short of death. Pseudo-Cyprian (*de Duplici Martyrio*, c. 31) says that the Church "*martyres appellat eos qui violenta morte decesserunt, confessores qui constanter in cruciatibus ac minis mortis professi sunt nomen Domini Jesu.*" In this sense Celerinus (Cypriani *Epist.* 21, c. 4, ed. Hartel) speaks of Severianus and all the confessors who had passed from Carthage to Rome; and Sozomen (*H. E.* i. 10) speaks of the number of confessors (ὁμολογητῶν) who, after the cessation of persecution, adorned the churches, as Hosius of Cordova and Paphnutius of Egypt.

3. The word *confessor* is used in a more general sense for one who shews the spirit of Christ in his ordinary life, "qui pacifica et bona et justa secundum praeceptum Christi loquitur, Christum cottidie confitetur" (Cyprian, *Epist.* 13, c. 5). So Theodore Balsamon (on *Can. Apostol.* 62, p. 265) says that the Church desires all its orthodox members to be confessors (ὁμολογητάς) of the faith. Hence, in later times it came to designate persons of distinguished holiness, who had passed to their rest without violence or torture. Pseudo-Egbert (*Excerptiones*, c. 28; a work not earlier than the 9th century) speaks of "sancti Patres, quos Confessores nuncupavimus, id est, episcopi, presbyteri qui in castitate servierunt Deo" (Ducange s. v. *Confessor*; Suicer s. v. ὁμολογητής).

4. In the Gregorian *Sacramentary*. Feria iv. post Palmas (p. 63, ed. Ménard), we have the following: "Oremus et pro omnibus episcopis, presbyteris, diaconibus, subdiaconibus, acolythis, exorcistis, lectoribus, ostiariis, confessoribus, vir-

ginibus, viduis, et pro omni populo sancto Dei." The order of words shews that the confessors here are persons of inferior dignity, and Ménard (ad locum) supposes *chanters* to be intended who confess God by singing His praise. See the first council of Toledo, cc. 6 and 9, where the word 'confessor' seems to be used in a similar sense, the latter canon forbidding a professed religious woman to sing antiphons in her house with a *confessor* or servant in the absence of bishop or presbyter. (Ménard u. s.) [C.]

**CONFIRMATION.** The rite now known by this name presents a singular instance of the continued use of a symbolic act in the midst of almost every possible diversity of practice, belief, and even terminology. The one common element throughout has been the imposition of hands, as the sign of the bestowal of some spiritual gift. In all other respects it will be seen there have been indefinite variations.

The history of the Apostolic Church brings before us two special instances of the ἐπίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν (Acts viii. 12–17, xix. 5, 6). In both it follows upon baptism, is administered by apostles, as distinguished from presbyters or deacons, and is followed by special supernatural manifestations of spiritual gifts, perhaps by their permanent possession. It was not directly connected with any appointment to any office in the Church, though office might follow upon the exercise of the gift bestowed. It was therefore distinct from the laying on of hands by which such offices were conveyed (Acts vi. 6, xiii. 3), as it was from that which was the medium of a miraculous healing power applied to the diseases of the body (Mark xvi. 18, Acts ix. 12, 17). The act referred to in 1 Tim. iv. 14, and 2 Tim. i. 6, seems to hover between the bestowal of a *charisma* and the appointment to an office. The position in which the "laying on of hands" meets us in Heb. vi. 2, leaves it open to take it in its most generic, or in either of its specific senses, with, perhaps, a slight balance in favour of connecting it with the act which always, or in some cases, supervened on baptism. The absence of any mention of it in the baptisms recorded in Acts ii. 41, xvi. 15, 33, and elsewhere receives a natural explanation in the fact that there the baptizer was an apostle, and that it was accordingly taken for granted.

Beyond this the N. T. gives us no information. The "unction" (χρίσμα) of 1 John ii. 27, the "anointing" of 2 Cor. i. 21, the "sealing" of 2 Cor. i. 22, Eph. i. 13, iv. 30, can hardly be thought of as referring to a ritual act, though such an act may at a very early period have been brought into use as a symbol of the thought which the words themselves expressed. Even then it remains doubtful whether the "seal" means baptism itself or some rite that followed it. A like uncertainty hangs over the use of the word "seal" in the story quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 23), from Clement of Alexandria, and in the Apostolical Constitutions (ii. c. 14).

When we pass to the age of Tertullian the case is different. A distinct mention is made (1) of anointing, (2) of the laying on of hands, as following so close upon baptism as to seem almost part of the same rite rather than a distinct one, the latter act being accompanied by a special prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit (Tertul-

*de Bapt. c. 7; de Resurr. Carn. c. 8*). Cyprian, in like manner, recognises the practice, contending that it follows rightly upon a valid baptism, but is not enough, in the case of heretical, and therefore invalid, baptism, to admit those who received it to full communion with the church. He applies to it, as to baptism, the word "sacramentum," but obviously not in the technical sense of a later theology (*Epist. 72, ad Stephan.*). In these passages, it will be observed, no distinction is drawn between the baptizer and the layer-on of hands. Both acts are spoken of as if they were performed at the same time and by the same person. In practice, of course, the usage of the 3rd, possibly of the 2nd, century, which fixed on Easter as the great baptismal season, allowing it at other times only in cases of urgent need, would make this combination ordinarily a very practicable one. It was necessary, however, to provide for the exceptions, and this was done accordingly by the Council of Elvira (c. 77), which ordered that, in the case of those who had been baptized by a deacon, "sine episcopo vel presbytero," the bishop "per benedictionem perficere debet." <sup>a</sup> Jerome, in like manner, but with a more rigid limitation of the act of imposition to the higher order, recognised it as a long-standing usage of the church. Bishops used to travel round their dioceses in order to lay their hands, "ad invocationem Sancti Spiritus," on those who had been baptized only by a presbyter or deacon (*c. Lucifer. c. 4*). One or two facts may be noted at this stage of expansion, (1) that immediate supernatural results are no longer looked upon as the ordinary sequel to the act of imposition, but that it is still connected, as in the apostolic age, with the thought of spiritual gifts of some kind; (2) that while it is still in theory a rite which may be administered immediately after even infant baptism, its limitation to the episcopal order tended to interpose an interval of uncertain length between the two. A Spanish council in A.D. 569 (*C. Lucens.*) recognises the fact that there were some churches which the bishop could not possibly visit every year. Gradually, especially in Western Europe, the negligence or the secular engagements of the bishop prolonged this interval. The East, however, with its characteristic reverence for antiquity, refused to separate what the primitive Church had joined, and infant baptism, infant confirmation, infant communion, follow, in its practice, in immediate sequence. Even in the Roman Church the sacramentaries of Gelasius and Gregory unite the first two ordinances. It was not, even in the judgment of eminent ritualists of that Church, till the 13th century, that the two ordinances were permanently separated, and a period of from seven to twelve years allowed to intervene. Of what may be called the modern, Protestant idea of confirmation, as the ratification by the baptized child, when he has attained an age capable of deliberate choice, of the promises made for him by his sponsors, there is not the slightest trace in Christian antiquity. <sup>b</sup>

A special aspect of confirmation presents itself in connection with the reception into the Church of those who had been baptized by heretics. With the exception, and that only for a time, of the African, that baptism, if formally complete, was recognised as valid. But the case was otherwise with the laying on of hands. Only in the Catholic Church could the gifts of the Spirit be thus imparted (*August. de Bapt. c. Donat. ii. 16*), and so, even if the heretical sect had its bishops, and they administered the rite, it was treated as null and void. When those who had been members of such a community returned to their allegiance to the Church, confirmation, including the anointing as well as the laying on of hands, was at once theoretically indispensable, in its sacramental aspect, and became practically conspicuous as the formal act of admission (*2 C. Constant. c. 7; 1 C. Araus. c. 8; Siricius, Epist. i. 1; Leo, Epist. 37, c. 2*). It follows, from all that has been said, that, according to the general practice, and yet more, the ideal, of the Church of the first six centuries, the office of confirming was pre-eminently an episcopal one. But it deserves to be noticed that it was not so exclusively. It did not depend for its validity upon episcopal administration. As baptism was valid, though administered by a layman, so the laying on of hands, in case of urgency, was valid, though administered by a priest. In the Apostolic Constitutions (vii. 22), at least one part of the rite, the anointing, is assigned to either priest or bishop, and the practice was retained by the whole Eastern Church. In the West, the exception was recognised as legitimate in cases of necessity, as *e. g.* in that of a possessed or dying person (*1 C. Araus. c. 2; Innocent, Epist. 1 ad Decent.; C. Epaon. c. 86*). In these instances, however, for the most part, a special delegation of authority was either required or implied. The letters of Leo (*Ep. 88 ad Gall.*) and Gelasius (*Epist. 9 ad Episc. Lucan.*), forbidding the practice, "per impositiones manuum fidelibus baptizandis, vel conversis ex haeresi Paracletum Sanctum Spiritum tradere" (*Leo l. c.*) may be received as evidence that the practice was becoming more or less common, even without that authority, and that it was necessary, in the interest of the episcopal order, to restrain it.

Lastly, it may be noticed, that a trace of the old combination at one time and place of the two ceremonies, baptism and the imposition of hands, which were afterwards separated, may be found in the fact that the anointing, which was originally the connecting link between the two, was, at a later period, attached to each. Innocent, in the letter already quoted (*ad Decent. c. 3*), marks out the limits within which the priest might act. In the absence, or even in the presence of the bishop, he might anoint the baptized child with the holy chrism, provided always that the chrism itself had been consecrated by a bishop, but he was not to sign him on the forehead. That was reserved for the bishops, when, by imposition of hands, they bestowed the gift of the Spirit. [E. H. P.]

<sup>a</sup> It is singular that the canon, strictly interpreted, seems to sanction the performance of the act implied in the "perficere" by a presbyter as well as by a bishop. But the decrees of councils will seldom bear interpretation with the minuteness of a special pleader.

<sup>b</sup> The Apostolic Constitutions, it is true, speak of the sacred chrism as βαπτισμὸς τῆς ἐκλογῆς (iii. 17); but it

is questionable whether this means, as Bingham asserts (xii. 3), a confirmation on man's part of the compact made with God in baptism. The analogous use of the word σφραγίς (*Const. Apost. vii. 22*) would seem to imply that it was the seal, the confirmation of God's promises





them to do so, and everywhere else they found the synagogues or churches made ready to their hands, needing no new consecration. Traces in the N. T. of a *fixed place* of worship as a feature of an organized church are presented by Prof. Blunt (*Parish Priest*, sect. ix. p. 281), who quotes Acts i. 13; St. Luke xxii. 12; St. John ix. 19, 26; Acts ii. 2; Rom. xvi. 3; 1 Cor. xi. 22, xvi. 19.

That the primitive Christians, *i.e.* before the time of Constantine, not only had churches to worship in, but regarded them as distinct in character from other buildings, has indeed been doubted or denied, but is allowed by even Hospinian (*de Origine et Progressu Consecrationum et Dedicationum Templorum*, Tiguri, 1603, fol.) and Augusti (*Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archäologie*, xi. 317, &c.), and has been sufficiently settled in the affirmative by Petrus Cluniacensis, A.D. 1147 (quoted in Hooker, *E. P.* v. 12, 5), Bona, Tillemont, Mede, Lewis, Chancellor Harington (*The Object, Importance, and Antiquity of the Rite of Consecration of Churches*, Rivingtons, 1847), and Professor Blunt. We dismiss spurious testimonies and dubious allegations; *e.g.* the affirmation of Radulphus adduced by Gavanti (*Thesaur.* tom. i. p. iv. tit. xvi.), that "dedication is of apostolic authority;" the Clementines (*Ep. ad Jacobum*) "Build churches in suitable places, which you ought to consecrate by divine prayers;" the Decretals, quoted from Linus, Cletus, Evaristus, Hyginus, &c. by Gratian and Goar (*Euchol.* p. 807); the assumption in Duranti and Cardinal Bona, as quoted in Bingham (*Antiq.* viii. 9, 2); and others given by Martene (*Rit. Eccl. Ant.* ii. 13). Yet we may collect from the very earliest times a succession of allusions and statements which warrant us in the conclusion that places and buildings, of whatever humble sort they might be, were always recognized and set apart for common worship, the *fact* of their consecration appearing first, and then the *accompaniments* and *rites* of it.

The very titles by which these buildings were known indicated this; *e.g.* *κυριακή*, *i.e.* *oikia*, Dominica, &c., discussed in Augusti (*Denkw.* xi. 320, &c.). St. Ambrose, in his letter to his sister Marcellina (*Ep.* 22), calls the rite of dedication of churches a most ancient and universal custom. St. Gregory Nazianzen in an oration (43) on the consecration of a new church, says, "that it was an old law, and very excellently constituted, to do honour to churches by the feasts of their dedication." And Daniel (*Col. Liturg.* i. 355) confirms the conclusion of Binterim (*Denkwürd.* iv. i. 27) that this ceremony is deeply rooted in the earliest age of the Church. Mede, and others after him, argue this existence of churches from passages in Clemens Romanus (*ad Cor.* i. 41; see Blunt's *Parish Priest*, lect. ix.); Ignatius (*Ep. ad Magnes.* 7); Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 67); Tertullian (*De Idolol.* 7); Cyprian (*de Op. et Eleem.* 12); Lucian (*Philop.* p. 1126); and many others. The Coenaculum at Jerusalem, to which, as to a known place, the disciples, after the ascension of the Lord, returned for common prayer, is said to have been adapted and dedicated to Christian service long before the time of Constantine. "The upper room," says Bede (tom. ix. *de Locis Sanctis*), "was enclosed afterwards with a

beautiful church, founded by the holy apostles, because in that place they had received the Holy Ghost." To this, as being already an acknowledged use, St. Cyril of Jerusalem refers (*Cat. lect.* xvi. 4): "Here, in Jerusalem, in the upper church of the apostles . . . the Holy Ghost came down from heaven. And, in truth, it is most fitting that . . . we should speak concerning the Holy Ghost in the upper church" (cf. Niceph. ii. 3).

"There exist," says Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* viii. 1), "the imperial edicts by which the churches were to be pulled down to the ground." These must have been actual edifices. [CHURCH.] Then came the persecution of Diocletian, when "the houses of prayer were pulled down from the top to the bottom, and their foundations overturned" (*ib.* viii. 2). "After these things a spectacle earnestly prayed for and much desired by us all appeared, viz. the solemnization of the festival of the dedication of churches throughout every city, and the consecration of the newly-built oratories. . . . Indeed, the ceremonies of the bishops were most entire, the presbyters' performance of service most exact, the rites of the Church decent and majestic. On the one hand was a place for the singers of psalms, and for the rest of the auditors of the expressions sent from God; on the other was a place for those who performed the divine and mystical services. There were also delivered the mystical symbols of our Saviour's passion. And now people of all ages and sexes, men and women, with the utmost vigour of their minds, with joyful hearts and souls, by prayer and thanksgiving, worshipped God, the Author of all good. All the prelates then present made public orations, every one as well as he was able, endeavouring to set forward the praises of those assembled" (*ib.* x. 3). In x. 5 Eusebius gives the decrees of Licinius and Constantius for restoring the churches to the Christians, as buildings not private, to which there had been an established title. Even the Magdeburg Centuriators, who are wont to disparage the importance of the ceremony of consecration, writing on the 4th century, admit that it had been in existence earlier: "Usitatae omnino magis quam superioribus saeculis templorum fuerunt dedicationes, seu consecrationes, et quidem festivae." The church of Tyre was one of those destroyed in the persecution of Diocletian, and rebuilt at the revival described above. From the panegyric spoken by Eusebius on the occasion to Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, we gather that the earlier church, a very noble one, had been consecrated before at its first erection, and that churches built on old foundations were consecrated again.

We owe to the courtly pages of Eusebius full accounts of the consecration of the churches built by Constantine at Jerusalem, Constantinople, and Antioch. He undertook to build a church over the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem (*Vit. Const.* iii. 25), called the "Martyrium," of which the beauty and several parts are described (*ib.* iii. 29). When all was ready, A.D. 335, he wrote a letter of invitation to the numerous bishops then assembled in council at Tyre, urging them that they should first compose their internal differences, because concord of priests befitted such a ceremony (*Vit. Const.* iv. 43;

Sozom. *Eccl. Hist.* i. 26). From all parts of the East, accordingly, eminent bishops assembled, followed by an innumerable company of people out of all the provinces. "But the ministers of God," proceeds Eusebius, "adorned the festival partly with their prayers, and partly with their discourses. For some of them with praises celebrated the benignity of the religious emperor towards the universal Saviour, and in their orations set forth the magnificence of the Martyrium; others entertained their hearers with theological discourses upon the divine *dogmata*, fitted to the present solemnity; others interpreted the lessons of the divine volumes, and disclosed the mystic meanings. But such as were unable to arrive at these things appeared the Deity with unbloody sacrifices and mystic immolations, humbly offering up their prayers to God. . . . At which place we ourselves also honoured the solemnity with various discourses uttered in public; sometimes making descriptions in writing of the stateliness and magnificence of the royal fabric; at others, explaining the meaning of the prophetic visions in a manner befitting the present symbols and figures. There was the feast of dedication celebrated with the greatest joy imaginable." One discourse by Eusebius (*de Laudibus Constantini*) is given in full (iv. 45), where it is observed that Constantine's churches were much larger and handsomer than those before. The consecration took place on Sept. 13th, a Saturday.

Theodoret (*Eccl. Hist.* i. 31) says that many churches of Constantine were dedicated by the assembled bishops at the same time.

To the dedication of the magnificent basilica at Antioch, called *Dominicum Aureum*, A.D. 341, begun by Constantine and finished by his son Constantius, there came ninety-seven bishops, on the invitation of Eusebius of Nicomedia, who had usurped the see of Constantinople (Socr. ii. 8; Sozom. iii. 5).

A synod of bishops (Socr. ii. 39) assembled at the dedication of St. Sophia in Constantinople, A.D. 360, thirty-four years after the foundation of the church by Constantine. Eudoxius had lately been inaugurated as archbishop. He "made sacred prayers" (Du Cange, *Constantinop. Christ.* iii. 2). "It was consecrated with prayers and votive offerings" (Niceph. viii. 26). Ciampini (*de Aedif. Constantini*, pp. 165 sqq.) gives a summary of the dedication of this celebrated church from the Alexandrian Chronicle. It is also referred to by the author of the Life of St. Athanasius in Photius (Du Cange, *u.s.*). As Constantine's church had been destroyed by earthquake, so was this of his son's burnt with fire, A.D. 404, and wholly destroyed in the sedition of A.D. 532.

Further light is thrown on the rite of consecration by a story of Athanasius. In his *Apology* to the emperor Constantine, A.D. 335, he defends himself from the serious charge of using an undedicated church. He allows the truth of the fact. He said they had certainly kept no day of dedication, which would have been unlawful to keep without orders from the emperor. The building was not yet complete. He grounds his apology on the great concourse of people in Lent, the grievous want of church room elsewhere, the pressure of all to hear

Athanasius, the increased mass of the crowd on Easter Day (when the undedicated church was used), the precedents of the Jews after the captivity, and of buildings so used in Alexandria, Treves, Aquileia, the reasonableness of worshipping in a building already called "the Lord's house" from the very time of laying the foundations (*Apol. ad Const.* 17-21). "There was no dedication, but only an assembly for the sake of prayer. You, at least, I am sure, as a lover of God, will approve of the people's zeal, and will pardon me for being unwilling to hinder the prayers of so great a multitude." "May you," he adds, "most religious Augustus, live through the course of many years to come, and celebrate the dedication of the church. The place is ready, having been already sanctified by the prayers which have been offered in it, and requires only the presence of your piety." (*ib.* 24, 25.)

The first dedication of a new church by Justinian is briefly described by Du Cange (*Constant. Chr.* iii. 5), who says, "The procession started from St. Anastasia, the patriarch Mennas sitting in the chariot of the emperor, and the emperor himself going among the common people." The "dedicationis apparatus et celebratio" is given in Codinus (*Orig. Constant.*), who says that Justinian went in solemn procession from the palace to the Augustaeum (a sort of large forum, or *πρωάτιον*, before the church of St. Sophia), together with the patriarch, to the church built by himself, and broke out into these words: "Glory to God, who has counted me worthy to fulfil so great a work. I have surpassed thee, O Solomon." A series of earthquakes destroyed the dome, altar, ambo, &c., and the same emperor, whose passion for building was the ruling feature of his life, celebrated the second consecration twenty-four years later, of which an account is given by Du Cange (*ib.* iii. 6) after Theophanes. "Nightly vigils preceded in the church of St. Plato; thence the procession advanced with prayers, the emperor himself being present; the patriarch Eutychius, borne in a chariot, and dressed in apostolical habit, holding the holy gospels in his hands; all the people chanting 'Lift up your heads,' &c. Then came the *θυρανοξία* and the *φωτοδρόμος*, i.e. that part of the ceremony of the Encaenia, where in the circuit of the building the lights are lighted on the walls, and twelve crosses are anointed with chrism by the bishop. Paul the Silentary, in his poem on the occasion, adds, "After thou hadst celebrated the festival, as was proper, forthwith the whole people, the senate, and the middle and better classes, demanded an extension of the days of celebration. Thou grantedst it: they flocked in: again they demanded: again thou grantedst it, which things being often repeated, thou celebratedst the festivity magnificently." Probably for seven days.

Of other churches in Constantinople, Du Cange (*ib.* iv. 5) relates the dedication of the Church of the Apostles. This church, after its demolition, was rebuilt by Justinian. The dedication is described as celebrated by the deposition in it of the relics of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy, which had been in the earlier church. Theophanes says, that the bishop Mennas, with the holy relics, sitting in the royal chariot, gilt and

studded with gems, carrying upon his knees the three shrines of the holy apostles, in such wise celebrated the dedication. Procopius speaks of the same particulars.

The last-named writer (*de Aedif. Justin.* i. v.) mentions the sacred buildings at Ephesus, Constantinople, Jerusalem, which Justinian dedicated (*ἀνέθηκε*).

We gather from Bede (*Eccl. Hist.* i. 6) that while Diocletian was persecuting in the East, Maximian was doing the same in the West, for ten years, by burning the churches, &c., and that after the cessation of the persecution the Britons renewed the churches which had been razed to the ground, and founded and finished basilicas to the holy martyrs (*ib.* i. 8). Later on, we read that Gregory instructed Augustine and his companions not to destroy the idol temples, but to destroy the idols in them, and then to prepare holy water, and sprinkle it, to build altars and deposit relics, and to make suitable provision for rendering the day of dedication attractive (*ib.* i. 30); that Augustine "consecrated a church in the name of the Saviour, our God and Lord Jesus Christ;" and Laurentius "consecrated the church of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul" (*ib.* i. 33); that the body of Augustine (after a very early custom) was laid near this church, as it was not yet dedicated, but as soon as it was dedicated it was brought in and laid in the north porch (*ib.* ii. 3); that, on Chad's visit to Northumbria, after being in East Anglia, the son of the king gave him land to build a monastery or church; to purify the spot he craved leave to spend the forty days of Lent (except the Lord's day) in prayer and fasting, as he said it was always the custom he had learned, first to consecrate the locality by prayer and fasting to the Lord. Then he built a monastery, and set it on foot according to the rites of the Lindisfarnians, with whom he was educated (*ib.* iii. 23); that the Abbot Ceolfrid sent to the king of the Picts, A.D. 710, architects to build for him a stone church after the manner of the Romans, he having promised to dedicate it in honour of the blessed chief of the apostles (*ib.* v. 21). Bede tells a story of Bishop John of Beverley, how, after having dedicated a church for the Earl Ælfric, he sent to his countess, who was bed-ridden, some of the holy water which he had consecrated for the dedication of the church by one of the brethren, charging him to give her some to taste, and that he should wash her with the same water wherever he learnt her pain was the greatest. The woman recovered (*ib.* v. 4). A detailed account is given of the consecration of the church of Ripon by St. Wilfred (A.D. 665) in his life. The 47th chapter of the *Penitential* of Archbishop Theodore, speaking of a building in which heathens had been buried, but now proposed for a church, adds: "If it seems fit for consecration, let the bodies be removed, and it shall be sanctified, if not consecrated before." In the same chapter mention is made of that part of the office of consecration in which it is said, "*Locus a Deo iste factus est.*"

2. *Canons and decrees which relate to the consecration of churches.*—The 4th canon of the General Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451 (Bruns's *Canons*, i. 26), provides that "no one shall any-

where build or establish a monastery, or house of prayer, without the consent of the local bishop." The canons of Felix IV. and Gregory I. (*de Consecr. distinct.* i. c. 17) are referred to by Gavanti (*Theaurus Sacr. Rit.* tom. i. p. iv. tit. xvi. p. 529). The 23rd canon of an Irish Council under Patrick, A.D. 450 (Bruns's *Can.* ii. 303), directs "that a presbyter, though he build a church, shall not offer the oblation in it before he brings his bishop to consecrate it, because this was regular and decent." Of Columbanus, however, though not a bishop, Walafrid Strabo writes (*Mart.* ii. 13, 6), "He ordered water to be brought, blessed it, sprinkled the temple with it, and while they went round singing, dedicated the church. Then he called on the Name of the Lord, anointed the altar, placed in it the relics of St. Aurelia, vested it, and said mass." The 1st Council of Orange, A.D. 441, can. 10 (Bruns's *Canones*, ii. 123), forbids a bishop to consecrate a church out of his own diocese, even if it has been built by himself. So the 2nd Council of Arles (about 451), can. 37. The 3rd Council of Orleans, A.D. 538, can. 15 (Bruns's *Can.* ii. 196), makes the same provision about altars. The 3rd canon of the 2nd Council of Saragossa, A.D. 592 (Bruns's *Can.* ii. 65), enacts that "if Arian bishops, who are converted, shall consecrate churches before they have received the benediction, such shall be consecrated anew by a Catholic bishop." The Theodosian Code prescribes how existing buildings should be claimed and dedicated for the service of the Christian religion: "*conlocatione venerandi religionis christianae signi expiari praecipimus*" (lib. xvi. tit. 10). The same rite was prescribed by Justinian at the beginning of any erection of a church (*Novell.* cxxxi., quoted by Bingham, *Antiq.* viii. 9, 5). See more instances in Augusti (*Denkw.* xi. 355). Avitus, bishop of Vienne in the 6th century, promises his brother Apollinaris to be present at the consecration of a church, and commands the gifts that were designed for the poor at the dedication feast. The 2nd Council of Nice, A.D. 787, can. 7, orders that no bishop should consecrate any church or altar, on pain of deposition, unless relics were placed under it, "*ut qui ecclesiasticas traditiones transgressus est.*" The famous Council of Cealchythe (i. e. Chelsea), presided over by Archbishop Wilfred, A.D. 816, can. 2, decrees, "when a church is built, let it be consecrated by a bishop of its own diocese: let the water be blessed, and sprinkled by himself, and all things fulfilled in order, according to the service book. Then let the Eucharist, which is consecrated by the bishop after the same form, be deposited with the other relics in a chest, and kept in the same church. And if he cannot bring other relics, at least he can do this chief thing, because it is the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. And we charge every bishop that he have it painted on the wall of the oratory, or on a table, as also on the altars, to what saints both of them are dedicated." The 141st of the *Excerpts* of Archbishop Egbert, circ. A.D. 750, provides when a church will need reconsecration. The Council of Worms, A.D. 868, forbids bishops to exact any fee or present for the consecration of a church, and also forbids them to consecrate any church except there be a writing under the hand of the founder confirming the foundation, and signifying

what endowment he has given for the ministers and for the lights.

A decree is quoted from Gelasius, A.D. 492 (cf. *Socr. Eccl. Hist.* ii. 8), to the effect that no bishop consecrate a church without the leave of the Apostolical see. Gregory the Great wrote official letters, whence we may gather the form in which, as bishop of Rome, he was accustomed to issue his license to his suffragans for dedication of a church or chapel, *e.g.*, that "they take good heed that no dead body were buried in the place" (*Epist.* i. 53; v. 22; xii. 10); "if a bishop consecrated an oratory in another diocese, what he had done was null and void" (*Epist.* xi. 2). He would not have a new church consecrated unless it were endowed with sufficient revenue for maintaining divine service and the clergy (see *Corp. Jur. Can.* i. 457-461). Martene allows that Gelasius and Gregory were both intending to prescribe for Italy alone.

3. *Ritual of Consecration.*—It was customary, as we have seen, to deliver *sermons* at the time of consecration. There is one extant by St. Ambrose, preached at the dedication of a church built by Vitalianus and Majanus, A.D. 380; the sermon is entitled "De Dedicatione Basilicæ," from the text in St. Luke, "He loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue." Gaudentius, bishop of Bresse in Italy, early in the 5th century, has left sermons "Die dedicationis basilicæ sanctorum quadraginta martyrum" (*Max. Bibl. Patrum*, tom. v.; Migne's *Patrol.* xx.). St. Augustine's works (tom. v.) contain sermons of the same class, *Serm.* 256, *de tempore*, al. 336-338, and in App. *Serm.* 229-231, considered to be those of Caesarius.

Of other rites and ceremonies we find occasional notices. Thus of the vigil kept the night preceding the dedication, St. Ambrose writes (*Ep.* 22) to his sister Marcellina and Gregory of Tours, *de Gloria Confessorum*; of the translation and deposition of relics, we read in the same epistle of St. Ambrose, "When I wished to dedicate the basilica, they began to interrupt me as it were with one mouth, saying, You should dedicate the basilica, as in the case of a Roman one. I answered, I will do so, if I find relics of martyrs." The same custom is mentioned by St. Basil, *Epist.* 49 (iii. 142), by St. Paulinus, *Epist. ad Severum* (*Max. Bibl. Patr.* tom. vi. 193, &c.), by St. Greg. M. lib. i. c. 10. See in Martene. The relics were often not the bodies themselves, but what had been simply in contact with them [BRANDEUM]. The custom was at first peculiar to Rome, and was then extended and made obligatory by the 2nd Nicene Council. Ancient forms, given by Martene, prescribe that "the Body of the Lord be deposited." On dedication, Hooker (*E. P.* v. 13) and Bingham (*Antiq.* viii. 9, 8) both quote St. Augustine (*de Civit. Dei*, viii. 27; xxii. 10; *contra Faust.* xx. 21; *contra Maxim.* i.; *de Vera Relig.* c. 55) as showing how, and with what interest and limitation, the original custom of dedicating churches to the Lord only was afterwards extended to their dedication under the name, or as memorials of saints and martyrs, or by the title of virtues, especially of *wisdom*, as was the case in the chief cities of the empire. Augustine in writing against Maximinus grounds an argument for the deity of the Holy Ghost upon this distinction: "that He must be God, because

temples were built and dedicated to Him, which it would be sacrilege to do to any other creature." The custom of lighting twelve candles is alluded to in the Pseudo-Augustine, *Serm.* 338 (al. 3), in *Dedic. Ecclesiae*. "This lesson occurs suitably, when the candelabra are blessed, that he who works is as a light placed on a candlestick." The very ancient rite of inscribing either the whole alphabets both Greek and Latin, or some letters of them, or one alphabet, is spoken of by Gregory in his *Liber Sacramentorum*: "Then let the bishop begin from the left-hand corner at the east, writing on the pavement with his pastoral staff A. B. C., to the right corner of the west; again beginning from the corner at the east he writes A. B. C. and so on to the left corner of the church." Gregory says that some bishops added the Hebrew alphabet. The inscription was called the A. B. C. darium. See more on the custom in Martene (ii. 13, who gives A.D. 980 as the inferior date for it), and in Maskell, *Monum. Rit.* i. 173 n.

It is difficult, however, from the few and scattered notices in primitive writers, to construct the probable course of the ritual of consecration in early times. We may say with Bingham, "that the manner and ceremony of doing this was not always exactly one and the same, therefore we are chiefly to regard the substance of the thing, which was the separation of any building from common use to a religious service. Whatever ceremony this was performed with, the first act of initiating and appropriating it to a divine use was its consecration; and therefore, in allusion to this, the first beginning of anything is many times called its dedication. Whether churches had any other ceremony besides this in their dedication for the first three ages is not certain, though it is highly probable they might have a solemn thanksgiving and prayer for a sanctified use of them also, over and besides the usual liturgy of the Church, because this was in use among the Jews" (*Antiq.* viii. 9, 1). So also Lewis (*Historical Essay*) remarks upon the difficulty of discovering the use of this rite in its particular parts, because the custom of those early times was obscure, yet "he hopes to shew some remains of the footsteps of this ceremony" (p. 29), and gathers them together (p. 105), as traced in the several instances above given.

Of the various forms printed from MSS., the *Ordo Romanus* for the building and consecration of a church, &c., said to be of the 8th century, is given in the *Max. Bibl. Patr.* (tom. xlii. p. 715, &c.). Goar (*Euch. Græcorum*) gives the customary order in laying the foundation of a church, and the prayer to be said on the occasion, which some call the cross-fixing; and the order for fixing the cross after the church is finished, by the patriarch, under which head there are certain prayers attributed to Callixtus on the dedication of a temple, and a very prolix *τάξις καὶ ἀκολουθία ἐπὶ καθιερώσει ναοῦ* (p. 606, &c., and p. 846). Martene (*Eccl. Rit.* ii. 13, p. 244 &c.) has printed eleven forms, of which the oldest are (1) from the Book of Gellone in Italy about A.D. 800, (2) from the pontifical of Egbert, archbishop of York, A.D. 750, (3) from the Anglican pontifical in the monastery of Jumièges, A.D. 800, (4) from the pontifical of St. Dunstan of Canterbury, (5) from a codex of St. Mary's, Rheims, A.D. 900, (6)



from a pontifical of the Church of Noyon, A.D. 900. Maskell prints from the *Sarum Pontifical* the Ordo "De Ecclesiae dedicatione, seu consecratione" (*Monumen. Rit.* i. 162-203), and has some remarks on the subject in his preliminary dissertation, pp. cclxv.-cclxxv. Daniel (*Cod. Liturg.* i. 355-384,) prints the rite "Ex Pontificali Romano," with notes of collation from other rituals. He holds that in the most ancient times it was not the mass only that was sufficient at the consecration of new churches (which Binterim had argued), but that it was the mass proper for dedication, together with additions of certain forms of benediction. Both these writers allow that the ritual of present use scarcely reaches the 8th century.

4. *Anniversaries* of consecrations of churches have their natural origin in the feast of dedication of the temple, attended by our Lord (St. John x. 22, 23) in conformity with 1 Macc. iv. 56-59; St. Gregory Nazian. (*Orat.* 43, εἰς τὴν κτιρίαν init.) speaks of it as an ancient custom "to honour churches by the feasts of their dedication; and that not for once only, but upon the annual return of the day of their consecrations, that good things become not forgotten through lapse of time." It is doubtful who initiated the custom. Some make it date from the consecration of the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, on Sept. 13 [ANASTASIS]. (See Sozom. *H. E.* i. 26; Niceph. viii. 50.) Felix IV., A.D. 526, put out a decree "that the solemnities of the dedications of churches are to be celebrated every year." Gregory the Great confirmed the practice, and it was adopted by Augustine in Britain, together with the custom of building booths round the church, and holding common festivities (Bede, *Eccl. Hist.* i. 30). The memory of the dedication of St. Sophia at Constantinople was kept up every Dec. 22 (Du Cange, *Const. Chr.* iii. 6). Gavanti (ii. 250, &c.), *de Communi Dedicationis Ecclesie*, has rules and remarks on this class of festival and its concurrence with others.

The *Symbolism* of the rite of consecration may be said to appear in the earliest titles given to churches (see above), and in the essential idea of consecration as expressed by Hooker, *E. P.* v. 12, 13; Bingham, *Antiq.* viii. 9, 8; Lewis, p. 98. Alcuin, *de Coena Domini*, says, "Churches are consecrated that the coming of angels into them may be invited, and that men entering into them may be restrained from mean thoughts." St. Thomas Aquin. (*Summa*, part iii. Quæst. 85, art. 3) says, "A church is consecrated because the Church is the spouse of Christ; and when the octave is celebrated for denoting the glorious resurrection of the Church which is to come." Remigius of Auxerre, in the 10th century, has a Treatise on the mystical signification of the whole rite. Cf. the reference to this and other writers in Maskell (*Monum. Rit.* i. 162, 3). The same subject is elaborately drawn out by Durandus, *Rationale Div. Off.*; St. Bruno Astensis, Episc. Signiensium (*Max. Bibl. Patr.* xx. 1725), of the 12th century, &c.

5. *Consecration of Altars*.—Bingham (*Ant.* viii. 9, 10) says that the consecration of altars seems to have begun first of all in the 6th century; he quotes the Council of Agde, A.D. 506, can. 14 (Bruns's *Can.* ii. 145), as enacting that "altars are to be consecrated not only by

the chrism, but with the sacerdotal benediction," and the Council of Epone, A.D. 517, can. 26 (*ib.* ii. 170), that "none but stone altars are to be consecrated with the unction of the chrism." Gregory of Tours, in the 6th century, in his *De Gloria Confessorum*, c. xx. (Migne, *Patrol.* 71, p. 542), describes the dedication of an oratory at Tours, a very beautiful cell, heretofore used as a salt cellar: "The altar was placed in its future position; the night was spent in vigil at the basilica; in the morning they went to the cell and consecrated the altar, then returned to the basilica, and thence took the relics. There were present a very large choir of priests and leacons, and a distinguished body of honourable citizens, with a large assembly of people. On arrival at the door a miracle of splendour took place," which Gregory describes.

LITERATURE.—Besides the several works and special treatises mentioned in the course of this article, reference may be made to Cardinal Bona, *de Reb. Liturg.* i. 19, 20 (Antwerp 1677, 4to); Fabricius (John), *de Templis Christianorum* (Helmstadii 1704, fol.); Augusti's *List of the Literature of Holy Places* (xi. 317). Schmid, *Liturgik, Kultus der Christ-Katholische Kirche* (vol. iii.), *Liber diurnus Pontif. Rom.* (Migne's *Patrol.* vol. 105), cap. v. p. 89, &c., "Index Generalis Materialium" in *Mac. Bibl. Patrum* (tom. i.) under the head "Ecclesia, 16, De Materiali Ecclesia, seu Templo, ejusque dedicatione," where some dedication sermons and mystical expositions and vindications of the rite of consecration may be found of the 12th and 13th centuries. [H. B.—y.]

6. *Summary*.—It will be seen in the instances given above that there are two distinct periods in the history of the consecration of churches. In the early ages, certainly as late as the time of Constantine, a church was inaugurated by solemn ceremonial, and dedicated to the service of God with prayer. Then, as churches built over the tombs of martyrs came to be regarded as endowed with peculiar sanctity, the possession of the relics of some saint came to be looked upon as absolutely essential to the sacredness of the building, and the deposition of such relics in or below the altar henceforward formed the central portion of the consecration-rite. All the essentials of such a rite are found in the description of the consecration of an oratory, quoted above from Gregory of Tours. [Compare ALTAR.]

To the second phase belong all the ancient rituals of consecration now extant, whether in East or West. We may take, as a summary of the rites above referred to, the service for the consecration of churches given in Egbert's *Pontifical* (pp. 26-58, ed. Surtees Soc.), which differs in no essential point from that of the Gregorian sacramentary.

The relics were to be watched the night before in some church already consecrated. In the morning the bishop and clergy came in procession to the church to be consecrated; candles are lighted, the clerks in procession pass round the church outside. The door of the church is opened with appropriate chants and ceremony. Prayer is said in the midst of the church, and the procession, with litany, solemnly approaches the altar with prostration. Then follows the A. B. C. darium (see above). Holy water is

blessed and sprinkled about the church and the altar; the altar is censured and anointed with oil and chrism; the slab is to be laid on the altar, the linen coverings, the fittings (ornamenta) of the church, and the vessels to be used in divine service are blessed. Then the relics are brought in solemn procession from the place where they had been deposited. When they come before the altar a curtain is drawn between the clerks and the people; the bishop makes the sign of the cross with chrism inside the CONFESSIO or cavity where the relics are to be placed, and at the four corners of the altar. After the relics have been placed in the confessio, the slab is laid on the top and fixed with mortar. The bishop says a prayer. The altar is then covered and decked, and the paten and chalice are blessed.

The clerks then enter the vestry and put on other vestments. Meantime the church is made ready, and the bishop and clergy on their return say the mass *In Dedicatione Ecclesiae*.

Forms are also given in the *Pontifical* (p. 57) for the "Reconciliation" of an altar or holy place where blood has been shed or homicide perpetrated.

For other ceremonies of dedication see FONT, CEMETERY.

7. *Inscriptions*.—Bianchini on the *Liber Pontif.* (s. 35, i. p. 74, ed. Migne) quotes the following inscription as proving the consecration of a church at Rome in the 4th century by Damasus or Damasius:—

T . I . X . N . EGO DAMASI  
VS VRB ROME EPS AN  
C DOMV COSECRAVI  
. . . N . R . Q . S . M . S . S . P A . S . P E .

i.e. *Titulus in Christi nomine. Ego Damasius urbis Romae Episcopus hanc domum consecravi*. The interpretation of the remaining portion of the inscription is doubtful, but S . P A . S . P E . seem to designate *Sanctus Paulus, Sanctus Petrus*. On the reverse of the stone is engraved,

[Hic re]QVIESCIT CAPVT  
SCI CRESCENTINI M.  
ET RELIQIE S . SVPANT .

The Abbé Martigny (*Dictionnaire*, p. 227) has acutely remarked, that the epithet *sanctus* is not known to be used in this way so early as the 4th century, and that the inscription is probably of a later date than the time of Pope Damasus. There is, in fact, probably no inscription testifying to the consecration of a church of so early a date as the time of St. Ambrose, when we know that a dedication-rite similar in essentials to that of later times was coming into use. [C.]

8. *Effect of Consecration*.—Churches and their sites, once consecrated, were to be reserved exclusively for the offices of religion. Eating and drinking in them was forbidden after the love-feasts had been abolished: and wearing arms in them was never allowed. In virtue of the 2nd of these rules they speedily became asylums or places of refuge for all threatened with violence: still they could only be used as such for a limited duration in virtue of the first. "Pateant summi Dei templa timentibus," said one law in the Theodosian code, not merely con-

firmiting this privilege, but extending it to the various surroundings of a church where meals might be taken and sleeping quarters established for any length of time; by another law, however, it was modified, by excluding public debtors, slaves, and Jews, from benefiting by it in future (lib. ix. tit. 49); and Justinian afterwards excluded malefactors (*Novel.* 17). Some interesting remarks on these constitutions may be read in a letter of Alcuin (*Ep.* clvii. ed. Migne) to his two disciples, Candidus and Nathanael: modified indeed by the important letter of Charlemagne which follows it; and in accordance with which the rights of sanctuary are upheld in the Frank capitularies of the 8th century.

Property given to the Church might never be alienated from it, except under special circumstances defined by the canons: much more therefore buildings that had been solemnly consecrated. The canons forbidding alienation are numerous from the 15th Ancyran, A.D. 315 downwards; and the 31st and three following, with the 65th Apostolical, may be still earlier. Justinian has numerous regulations to the same effect in his Code (lib. ii. tit. 2) and 7th Novel. In all these church property seems to be considered inalienable, rather as being in trust for others than upon higher grounds: at all events, none of them actually discuss consecrated sites and buildings as such. Charlemagne was more explicit in one of his capitularies (A.D. 802, c. 34, ed. Migne): "Ut loca quae semel Deo dedicata sunt ut monasteria sint, maneat perpetuo monasteria, nec possint ultra fieri saecularia habitacula." This was generalized subsequently, till it appeared as a maxim in the "Regulae Juris," appended to the 6th book of the Decretals, in these words: "Semel Deo dicatum non est ad usus humanos ulterius transferendum" (No. 51). Even the wood and stones used in building a church were considered to have shared its consecration, and could not afterwards be removed to subserve structures purely secular, though they might be burnt. Events in this respect have long since proved stronger than the Decretals: and there are some remarkable words on record of Jehovah Himself in taking possession of the first building ever dedicated to His service, shewing that His acceptance of it was conditional, and might not, under circumstances which actually took place, be permanent: "Now have I chosen and sanctified this house, that my name may be there for ever. . . . But if ye turn away and forsake my statutes and my commandments which I have set before you . . . this house which I have sanctified for my name will I cast out of my sight, and will make it to be a proverb and a by-word among all nations" (2 Chron. vii. 19, 20). Canonists have forgotten these words altogether in estimating the "effects of consecration." Comp. particularly Lequeux's Manual, *Tract. de Rebus Sacris*, l. xci. and cxxvi.-xxxix. A larger work is Gibert's *Corp. Jur. Canon.* vol. ii. *Tract. de Eccl.* tit. xv. [E. S. Ff.]

CONSECRATION (EUCCHARISTIC). (*Consecratio, Sanctificatio, ἀφιέρωσις, ἁγιασμός*.) For the distinction between consecration and benediction, see BENEDICTION. The general consideration of the doctrine of Eucharistic consecration belongs to theology, and the question is

considered here only in its relation to the Eucharist.

1. The principal formulae of consecration are given under CANON OF THE LITURGY. It will be seen in that article that the most noteworthy difference between the forms of consecration used in the Eastern and the Western churches respectively consists in this, that in the Eastern Church the Holy Spirit is invoked, after the recitation of the words of institution, to descend upon the elements, and make them the Body and Blood of Christ [EPICLESIS]; and this invocation is commonly thought to imply, that consecration would be imperfect without it. This seems also to be distinctly implied in the well-known passage of Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. Mystag.* v. c. 7), which speaks of the hallowing and changing influence of the Holy Spirit [CANON OF THE LITURGY, p. 269]. On the other hand, in the Western churches, the invocation of the Holy Spirit at this part of the liturgy is generally wanting, and the whole consecrating virtue is attributed by Western ritualists to the recitation of the words of institution, accompanied by the fitting gestures. In the Mozarabic liturgy, however, the variable prayer which follows the *Secreta* frequently contains an invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements; and such an invocation is almost certainly an ancient rite which the Latin Church has lost, not an innovation of the Orientals. Ample information on the points of difference in this respect between East and West may be found in Bona (*de Reb. Lit.* ii. c. 13, §§ 4, 5), Renaudot (*Lit. Orient.* i. 196), Touttée (note on Cyril, *Cat. Myst.* v. 7), Le Brun (*Cérém. de la Messe*, tom. iii.), and Neale (*Eastern Ch. Introd.* pp. 492 ff.).

2. In the *Ordo Romanus III.* c. 16, the following rubrical directions are given. "After the Pope has communicated of the cup, which is held by the archdeacon, the latter pours a portion of the remaining wine into the larger chalice from which the people is to communicate; for wine not consecrated but mingled with the Lord's Blood is completely sanctified (*sanctificatur per omnem modum*). The reason of this custom probably was that in a very large congregation it was difficult to consecrate exactly the quantity of wine required. A small quantity was therefore consecrated in the first instance, and amplified according to the number of communicants by pouring in fresh wine. The whole of the wine in the cup was held to be completely consecrated by mingling with that which had been originally consecrated. The same practice is enjoined in the *Ceremoniale* of St. Benignus at Dijon, in the Cistercian Statutes, in the Statutes of the Abbey of St. Victor at Paris, and in Lyndwood's *Constitut. Provinc.* See Mabillon (*Commun. Prævius in Ord. Rom.* pp. lxii. xcii.).

3. The placing a particle of the consecrated bread in the chalice is sometimes called "consecration." In the *Missa Illyrici* (Bona, *de Re. Lit.* p. 553) the petition occurs, "Fiat commistio et consecratio corporis et sanguinis D. N. I. C. omnibus accipientibus nobis in vitam æternam;" and the 17th canon of the 1st Council of Orange directs, "Cum calice et calix offerendus est, et admixtione eucharistiae consecrandus." Compare COMMISTIO.

4. On certain days it is an ancient custom not to consecrate the sacred elements. See PRÆ-SANCTIFIED, LITURGY OF.

to consecrate the sacred elements. See PRÆ-SANCTIFIED, LITURGY OF.

CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS [BISHOP: ORDINATION.]

CONSENT TO MARRIAGE. The marriage-law of all countries turns upon one or other of two principles. Either marriage is viewed as a union between persons, or as the disposal of a property. In the former case, the consent of the parties themselves is the main element in it; in the latter, that of some other person or persons. Still, in legislations founded upon the former principle, the element of consent by others comes in as a salutary check upon rash self-disposal by the young; in those founded upon the latter, the recognition of a right of self-sale in the adult may equally check the too authoritative interference of others.

The Jewish law is in its inception essentially personal. Christ needed but to refer to the first chapter of the Jewish Scriptures in order to bring out the full spirituality of the marriage relation (Matt. xix. 4; Mark x. 6). In Genesis, the woman is at once brought before us as the one "helpmeet" for the man. At the outset of the Adamic history, there is no question of selling or buying, no exercise of any third will between the two. God simply brings the woman to the man, who at once recognises her as bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh (c. ii. vv. 20, 22, 23). As the history proceeds, however, other elements develop themselves. Slavery makes its appearance, and the slave-owner is exhibited as giving the slave in marriage (Gen. xvi. 3; xxx. 4).

Throughout the patriarchal history (Gen. xxiv., xxix., xxxiv.; Ex. ii. 21), under the Law (Ex. xxi. 4, 7, 8; xxii. 17; Deut. xxii. 16), in the time of the Judges (Josh. xv. 16, 17; Judg. i. 12; xv. 1, 2; xxi. 1, 7, 8; Ruth iv. 10), under the Monarchy (1 Sam. xvii. 25; xviii. 19, 21, 27; 2 Sam. xiii. 13; 1 Kings ii. 17), after the Captivity (Nehem. xiii. 25), in our Lord's time (Matt. xxiv. 38; Luke xvii. 27), in the Apostolic Church (1 Cor. vii. 38), the right of the father to give his daughter in marriage, of the king to give one who was under his control, is either assumed or asserted.

It is nevertheless certain, as may be seen in Selden's treatise *de Uxore Ebraica*, and as has been stated above under the head BETROTHAL, that among the Jews the power of self-disposal in marriage was singularly wide for either sex, the man being held of full age, and capable of marrying at his will in the last day of his 15th year, the woman in the second half of her 12th, whilst if betrothed under that age by their fathers, girls could repudiate the engagement at ten. Yet, strange to say, the forms used in Jewish practice belong to the material, and not to the spiritual view of marriage. The prominence given to the ARRHA or earnest [see ARRHA], and the necessity for its being given to the woman herself either in money or money's worth, shew clearly that the grand spirituality of marriage, as exhibited in the second chapter of Genesis, had been lost sight of, that it had come to be viewed essentially as an act of wife-buying; and yet the fact that the woman, from earliest puberty, was reckoned as having the sole right of self-sale, preserved an amount of freedom in

the contract which would otherwise seem to belong only to that view of it which the practice contradicts.

The Roman law exhibits to us a precisely opposite development; it starts from the material view to grow more and more into the spiritual one. Originally the father's *potestas*, scarcely to be distinguished from absolute ownership, overshadows all the domestic relations, extending equally to the wife and to the children of both sexes. Eventually, so far as marriage is concerned, the *potestas* resolves itself simply into a right of consent. And consent is made the very essence of marriage. "Nuptias non concubitus, sed consensus facit," are the words of Ulpian (*Dig.* bk. i. t. xvii. l. 30). The validity of marriages contracted by mere consent was admitted in a constitution of Theodosius and Valentinian, A.D. 449, (*Code*, bk. v. t. xvii. l. 8).

This consent, moreover, must be at once that of the parties themselves, and of those in whose *potestas* they are (Paulus, *Dig.* bk. xxiii. t. ii. l. 2). As to slaves, indeed, unlike the Jewish law, the Roman law never recognised such a thing as their marriage, and the unions between men and women slaves, which might be permitted and even respected by their masters, were of no more legal value than the coupling of domestic animals, although, as may be seen hereafter, they might be recognised by the superior morality of the church. Where, indeed, a master gave away, or allowed another to give away, his slave girl in marriage to a freeman, or constituted a *dos* upon her, Justinian ruled (as will be further shewn hereafter under the head CONTRACT) that this should amount to an enfranchisement (*Code*, bk. vii. t. vi. l. 9; 22nd Nov. c. 11). But this of itself shows that marriage and slavery were held to be incompatible.

The principle of the freedom of marriage, and of its resting mainly on the consent of the parties, stands generally recognised in Justinian's Code, and is indeed further carried out in it. "None," says a constitution of Diocletian and Maximin, "can be compelled either to marry, or to be reconciled after divorce" (*Code*, bk. v. t. iv. l. 14; and see l. 12, as to the *filii familias*).

On the other hand, several enactments of Justinian's Code shew that the law looked rather upon marriage, from the woman's point of view, as the choice of a husband for her, and therefore held that in the determination of that choice, the counsel or even the judgment of third persons might be called in (*Code*, bk. v. t. iv. l. 1, 20).

The influx of the barbarian nations into the empire may be said to have in great measure restored, under other names, those stricter views of paternal authority which had belonged to Rome's earlier ages, at least as respects women. In the Edict of Theodoric we find a provision that "a father shall not be compelled against his will to give his family in marriage to any" (c. 93). In the Lombard laws the *mundium* recalls the Roman *potestas*, but under a purely pecuniary form, and instead of being confined to the ascending line, seems to have belonged to the nearest male relation. Thus by a law of Rotharis (638 or 643), if after two years' be-

trothal the man does not claim his bride, "the father or brother or he who has her *mundium*" may prosecute the surety till he pays her *meta* or jointure, after which "they may give her to another husband, being a freeman" (c. 178). A widow indeed has power, if she choose, to go to another husband, being a freeman (c. 182). And the woman's consent, whether girl or widow, has always great weight in the eyes of the law. Thus it takes account of the cases of a man marrying a girl or widow betrothed to another, "yet with her consent" (c. 190), and in like manner of his ravishing either with her consent—the term apparently meaning here, carrying away without marriage (c. 191). Where indeed a slave married a freewoman with her consent, her parents might kill her, or sell her out of the province (c. 222). The laws of Luitprand, A.D. 717, enact penalties against those who betroth to themselves, or marry, girls under twelve, but a father or brother may give or betroth his daughter or sister at any age (bk. ii. c. 6). And it seems to be admitted that a girl of twelve may "go to a husband" without the will of her parents (bk. vi. c. 61, and see c. 66; A.D. 724). The *mundium*, it may be observed, appears also in the law of the Alamans, latter half of 8th century.

Under the law of the Saxons, a man who wished to marry had to give 300 *solidi* to the girl's parents (t. iv. l. 1), but if he did so against the parent's will, she consenting, twice that amount (l. 2). If he wished to marry a widow, he must offer the price of her purchase to her guardian (apparently a Latinized expression for the *mundwald*, or *mundwold*, holder of the *mundium*), her relatives consenting thereto (t. vii. l. 3). If her guardian refused the money, he must turn to her next of kin, and by their consent he might have her, but he must have 300 *solidi* ready to give to the guardian (l. 4). Here a power of consent in the kinsmen generally, over and above the specific powers of the holder of the *mundium*, is clearly admitted.

The Burgundian law (originally of the beginning of the 6th century) recognizes also some freedom of choice in the woman, especially if a widow. Where a girl of her own accord has sought a man, he has to pay only three times the "price of marriage" (*nuptiale pretium*) instead of six times, which he would have to pay if he had carried her off against her will (t. xii. cc. 1, 3; see also t. cxc.). A widow wishing to remarry within the year of her husband's death, is said to have "free power" to do so (t. xlii. c. 2; law of A.D. 517). But in a later law, a power of consent in parents seems to be indicated (t. lii.).

The Visigothic law, which has always been held to bear peculiar marks of clerical inspiration, is especially restrictive of the woman's self disposal. A law of Receswind, allowing for the first time intermarriage between Goths and Romans, enacts that a freeman may marry a freewoman with the solemn consent of the ascendants ("prosapiae"), and the permission of the court (bk. iii. t. i. c. 1). If a man has betrothed to himself a girl "with the will of her father or the other near relatives to whom by law this power is given," the girl may not marry another against the will of her rela-



tives, but both she and her husband shall be handed over to the power of the man who had betrothed her "with the will of her relatives." The same course is to be followed if the father has settled for the marriage of his daughter, and agreed upon the price; and if the father dies before the marriage, the girl is to be given to him to whom she has been promised by her father "or her mother" (t. 2), the last words implying seemingly a power of consent throughout in the mother.

The consent of the parties is not, however, altogether overlooked, especially after betrothal, when neither can change his or her will if the other will not consent (c. 3; law of Chindaswinth). Where girls of full age are betrothed to male infants, if either party appears to object, the betrothal cannot stand good. Two years (as in the Roman law) is the period beyond which the fulfilment of the betrothal contract cannot be enforced, unless by the honest and proper consent of parents or relatives, or of the betrothed if of full age (c. 4). And a girl's actual marriage without her parents' consent holds good, though she forfeits her share in their succession (t. ii. c. 8; and see also t. iv. c. 7). And the law admits that a woman may be in a position to dispose of herself—in *suo arbitrio* (t. iv. c. 2).

The Salic law hardly shows with sufficient clearness the early Frankish view as to consent to marriage. Towards the latter half of the 6th century, however, a general constitution of King Clothar, recorded by Labbè and Mansi, apparently as possessing ecclesiastical authority (*Councils*, vol. ix. p. 761) enacts that "none by our authority shall presume to seek in marriage a widow or a girl without their own will." Two centuries later the Capitulary of Compiègne (A.D. 757) enacts in a particular case that "if any man have given his step-daughter, being a Frank, against her will and that of her mother and relatives as a freeman, slave, or cleric, and she will not have him and leaves him, her relatives have power to give her another husband" (c. 4). The implication contained in the above text, that marriage of a freewoman with a slave might by the woman's own consent hold good, will be remarked.

Substantially, with an exception to be presently noticed, the Church did little else than follow the municipal law on the subject of consent, eventually adopting the Roman civil law as the basis of her own. If we except a canon of doubtful authority, to be found in Gratian (12th century), attributed either to the 4th or 5th Council of Arles (A.D. 524 or 554), and enacting that widows, before professing continence, may marry whom they will,—that virgins may do the same,—and that none should be forced to accept a husband without the will of their parents,—the earliest Church enactments seem to belong to our own British Isles. An Irish synod of uncertain date, presided over by St. Patrick, speaks thus: "What the father wills, that let the girl do, for the head of the woman is the man. But the will of the girl is to be inquired of the father" (c. 27). In the so-called *Excerpta* of Egbert, archbishop of York, in the 8th century, it is written: "Parents ought to give women to be united to men in marriage, unless the woman absolutely refuse, in which case she may enter a

convent" (bk. ii. c. 20); not a very wide stretch of female freedom. Further on, a singular provision allows the husband whose wife has deserted him, and refused for five years to make peace with him, to marry another woman, "with the bishop's consent" (c. 26).

The Council of Friuli (A.D. 791) forbade the marriage of infants, requiring parity of age and mutual consent. The Carolingian capitularies, which have a sort of mixed clerical and civil authority, enact amongst other things that none shall marry a widow "without the consent of her priest" (bk. vi. l. 408); a provision which recalls one already noticed from the Visigothic law, that marriage shall not be lawful unless the wife be sought for at the hands of those who appear to have power over the woman, and under whose protection she is (bk. vii. l. 463); an enactment which is either the original or a slightly varied *replica* of a supposed letter by Pope Evarestus (A.D. 112–21), the spuriousness of which has been shown under the head BENEDICTION. It is however also enacted that women are not to be compelled to marry, under penalty of treble ban, and public penance; or, in default of means, of prison or banishment (l. 470). Lastly, it may be mentioned that the edict of Charlemagne in 814 required inquiry to be made, amongst other things, as to men who had wives "against the will of their parents."

On one point, indeed, we may trace from an early period a marked divergence between the practice of the Church and the Roman law. On the subject of slave-marriages, the Apostolical Constitutions breathe the spirit of the Jewish law, not of the Roman. Not only are slave-marriages recognized, but it is treated as an offence in a Christian master if he does not "give" a wife to his man-slave (bk. viii. c. 32; compare Exod. xxi. 4). Again, in a work which perhaps does not greatly differ in date from the later portions of the Apostolical Constitutions, St. Basil's first Canonical Epistle, addressed to Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, the writer, treating evidently of slave-marriages, says: "A woman who has given herself to a man against her master's will has committed adultery" (c. 40). And again more generally: "Marriages without the will of those who have authority (*ἀνευ τῶν κρατούντων*) are adulteries; and therefore during the life of the father or master (*δυσωρότου*) they cannot be free from impeachment until the assent of such" [termed here *κύριοι*, lords] "be obtained; for then does the marriage acquire firmness" (c. 42). Harsh as is the tone of these passages towards the victims of slavery, it is clear that for Basil the relation of the slave to the master is not the heathen one of the thing to its owner, but one exactly analogous to that of the child to its father. Father and master have indeed alike the quasi-sovereign power of a *κύριος*; the marriage of those under their authority is void without their assent, but it is firm (*βέβαιος*) with it.

Somewhat less than two centuries later (A.D. 541), the 24th canon of the Council of Orleans requires slaves who flee for sanctuary to churches in order to marry to be returned to their masters and separated, unless their parents and masters will let them marry. This is again a harsh-toned enactment, but one which really indicates a rise in the slave's condition. Hitherto the

master's consent has been the sole condition of validity for the slave's marriage; Basil himself assimilated his authority over the slave to that of a father. Now the existence of a parental authority is recognized in the slave himself towards his own offspring, and the slave-parent's consent is placed on a level with that of the master.

Towards the end of the 6th century, again (A.D. 581), a canon (10) of the 1st Council of Micon expressly enacts that if two slaves intermarry with their master's consent, after the enfranchisement of either the marriage is not dissolved, though the other be not redeemable; a step in advance of anything to be found in the records of American slavery in modern times. And in the Carolingian era, the marriage of slaves with the master's consent obtains civil as well as ecclesiastical validity. A capitulary annexed to the Lombard laws enacts "That the marriages of slaves be not dissolved, if they have had different masters, . . . but so nevertheless that the marriage itself be legal, and by the will of their masters" (c. 129). The 30th canon of the 2nd Council of Châlons, A.D. 813, is precisely to the same effect.

On the whole it may be said that, except so far as relates to the marriage of slaves, the rule of the Church in respect of the consents necessary to the validity of marriage became hardly settled during the period which occupies us. The necessity for the free consent of the parties themselves was never entirely lost sight of; but in outlying regions, and under the pressure of barbarian feelings in certain races, the authority of the father over a daughter was almost acknowledged as absolute; whilst elsewhere a claim of the family at large to interfere was at least tacitly admitted. Towards the end of the period, indeed, in two instances the priest or bishop himself was made a consenting party. In no instance however is marriage when actually contracted (except as between slaves) treated as void or voidable for want of the consent of a third person. As to consents to BETROTHAL, see that word. See also generally CONTRACT OF MARRIAGE. [J. M. L.]

**CONSIGNATORIUM.** To bless by the use of the sign of the cross, as in confirmation, is termed *consignare*; hence the word *consignatorium* is occasionally used to designate the place set apart for that rite. John the Deacon of Naples (*Chronicon Episc. Neap.*) says that Bishop John (about 616) erected a beautiful building, called *consignatorium ablutorum*, so arranged that the newly baptized should pass in on one side, be presented to the bishop who sat in the midst, and then pass out by the other side. This arrangement was probably somewhat peculiar; the Pseudo-Alcuin at least (*De Div. Off. c.* 19), describing the ceremonies of Easter-Eve, says that the newly baptized were confirmed in the sacrarium. (Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v. 'Consignatorium.') [C.]

**CONSISTENTES.** [PENITENCE.]

**CONSTANTIA**, martyr at Nuceria under Nero, Sept. 19 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*). [C.]

**CONSTANTINE**, bishop, deposition at Gap in France. April 12 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*). [C.]

**CONSTANTINE THE GREAT**, Emperor.

## CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF

Constantine and his mother Helena, *ἑκατόν-τοι*, are commemorated May 21 (*Cal. Byzant.*); June 18 (*Cal. Armen.*); Magabit 28 = March 24 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). Constantine is separately commemorated on Nov. 16 in the *Georgian Calendar*. [C.]

### CONSTANTINOPLE, COUNCILS OF.

(1) A.D. 336 (Mansi, ii. 1167-70) held by the Eusebians under Eusebius of Nicomedia, at which St. Athanasius was exiled to Treves, Marcellus of Ancyra, with several other bishops deposed, and Arius ordered to be received into communion by the Alexandrine Church. According to Rufinus (*Hist. i.* 12), it was convened by order of the emperor, viz., Constantine the Great, and according to Eusebius the historian (*cont. Mar. cl. i.* 4), it was exclusively gathered together from the upper provinces of Asia Minor, from Thrace, and the parts beyond it; in other words, the neighbourhood of the capital. It seems to have met in February, and not separated till the end of July, so that its proceedings spread over nearly six months.

(2) A.D. 339, or according to Pagi, 340, by order of the Emperor Constantius, to depose Paul, the newly elected bishop there, whose orthodoxy displeased him, and translate Eusebius, his favourite, from Nicomedia to the imperial see (Mansi, ii. 1275).

(3) A.D. 360 (Mansi, iii. 325-36), composed of deputies from the council of Seleucia, just over, with some bishops summoned from Bithynia, to meet them, about fifty in all (Soc. ii. 41 and seq.). Most of the former were partisans of the metropolitan of Caesarea, whose name was Acacius, and Semi-Arians. A creed was published by them, being the 9th, says Socrates, that had come out since that of Nicaea. It was, in fact, what had been rehearsed at Rimini, with the further declaration that neither substance nor hypostasis were permissible terms in speaking of God. The Son was pronounced to be like the Father according to the Scriptures, and Aetius, who maintained the contrary opinion, was condemned. A synodical epistle to George, bishop of Alexandria, whose presbyter he was, conveyed the sentence passed upon him and his followers. Several bishops were deposed at the same time; among whom were Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, Eleusius of Cyzicum, Basilus of Ancyra, and last, but not least, St. Cyril of Jerusalem—all for various causes. Ten bishops, who declined subscribing to these depositions, were to consider themselves deposed till they subscribed. Ulphilas, bishop of the Goths, who had hitherto professed the Nicene faith, was one of those present, and joined in their creed. Eudoxius managed to slip from Antioch into the vacancy created by the deposition of Macedonius. On the other hand, Eustathius of Sebaste was not allowed even a hearing, as having been previously deposed at the synod of Caesarea, in Asia Minor, under his own father, Eulalius.

(4) The 2nd general, met in May, A.D. 381, to re-assemble the following year, for reasons explained by the bishops in their synodical letter of that date (Mansi, iii. 583, note). Owing to this circumstance, and to the fact that its acts have been lost, its proceedings are not easy to unravel. Socrates begins his account of it by saying that the Emperor Theodosius convened a

council of bishops of the same faith as himself, in order that the faith settled at Nicaea might prevail, and a bishop be appointed to the see of Constantinople (v. 8). That the bishops met at his bidding is testified by themselves in their short address to him subsequently, to confirm what they had decreed (Mansi, *ib.* 557), to say nothing of other proofs, for which see Beveridge (*Synod.* ii. 89). Whether they re-assembled at his bidding we are not told. Of their number there has never been any dispute, this council having in fact gone by the name of that of "the 150 (*pr*) fathers" ever since. There were 36 bishops of the Macedonian party likewise invited, but they quitted Constantinople in a body when they found that it was the faith of the Nicene fathers to which they would be called upon to subscribe. Of those present, Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, St. Meletius of Antioch, who presided at first, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Ascholius, bishop of Thessalonica, St. Amphilochius of Iconium, with the two Gregories of Nazianzum and Nyssa, were the most considerable, Nectarius and Flavian being added to their number before they separated. Dionysius Exiguus (Mansi, iii. 568-72) has preserved the names of all who subscribed. Seven canons and a creed would appear at first sight to have been submitted to the emperor by the assembled fathers for confirmation at the close of their labours. John Scholasticus, however, the Greek collector of canons in the 6th century, contemporary with Dionysius Exiguus, reckons only six (*ap. Justell. Bibl. Jur. Canon.* ii. 502). Dionysius himself only three; but then he has appended the 4th to the 2nd. The creed follows in his version as in the Greek. Isidore Mercator makes six canons out of his three, and numbers the creed as a 7th. Another Latin version given in Mansi makes five canons out of his three, and omits the creed. The Arabic paraphrase (*ib.*) makes four in all, without the creed; but, in addition to his three, setting down as a fourth canon 6 of the Greek version. Whether any canons have been lost seems to admit of some doubt. Socrates, as is well known, speaks of the establishment of patriarchs as one of the things done by this council: and the Arabic paraphrase, under a separate heading, "concerning the order of the prelates, and their rank and place," explains this as follows: "Honour besides, and the primacy, was granted in this council to the bishop of Rome, and he was made first, the bishop of Constantinople second, the bishop of Alexandria third, the bishop of Antioch fourth, and the bishop of Jerusalem fifth"—which is the more remarkable as neither it nor Socrates omit the canon ordaining special prerogatives for new Rome. As Beveridge well remarks, it is one difficulty connected with these canons (*Synod.* ii. 98), that in all probability they were not all passed at the same council. This, and a good deal more bearing upon the history of the council, will come out as we examine them. Canon 1 confirms the doctrine of the 318 Nicene Fathers, condemning in particular the errors of the Eunomians or Anomaeans—in other words, the extreme Arians—the Eudoxians or Arians pure, and the Semi-Arians or Pneumatomachi—fighters against the Holy Spirit—with the followers of Sabellius, Marcellus, Photinus, and Apollinaris. Of these the Semi-Arians engaged most attention by

far here, from the further error into which they had fallen of late respecting the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. All, in short, that was ruled by this council on doctrine was directed against them exclusively. But, as such, they were more properly termed Macedonians than Semi-Arians, from Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, deposed at the synod held there A.D. 360, for various crimes, and afterwards founder of the sect called "Pneumatomachi." For obvious reasons they are not designated here from the name of their founder. What their errors were we shall see presently. Canon 2 confines each bishop to his own diocese, in particular the bishop of Alexandria is restricted to Egypt, the bishops of the East to the East alone, the privileges of the Church of Antioch, in conformity with the Nicene canons, being maintained: the bishops of Asia, that is, Asia Minor, to the South-West, Pontus and Thrace, similarly to their respective limits. By the word "diocese" is meant, as Beveridge shows (p. 93), a tract embracing several provinces. The events which had led to this enactment require some notice. Immediately on the death of Valens (Clinton's *Fasti R.* A.D. 379, col. 4), St. Gregory Nazianzen appeared at Constantinople, whither he was invited by the orthodox party refusing obedience to Demophilus, the Arian bishop in possession. He was consecrated by St. Meletius of Antioch, who thus went out of his diocese to ordain him. Peter, bishop of Alexandria—then reckoned the second see in the world after Rome—not to be outdone, nominated Maximus the cynic, as he was called from his philosophical antecedents, to the post, and deputed three bishops from Egypt to carry out his consecration on the spot. Maximus had previously seemed to take part with Gregory, and Theodosius rejected him, when he appeared as his rival (Clinton, *ib.* and Vales. ad Soz. vii. 9). This conflict of the two sees, however, terminated in the resignation of Gregory, soon after the meeting of the council, though he was declared bishop there, and all that related to Maximus annulled in a special canon—the 4th.

Most probably, the 3rd canon, ordaining that in future the see of Constantinople should take honorary precedence (*τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς*) next after Rome, was intended to prevent the bishops of Antioch and Alexandria from ever attempting to take such liberties with it again.

Another event had occurred meanwhile (Clinton, *ib.* col. 4), which may be supposed to account for the salvo to the privileges of the Church of Antioch, expressed in the 2nd canon. St. Meletius of Antioch had died "during the session between May and July." The funeral oration pronounced over him by St. Gregory of Nyssa is still extant, but it contains no historical allusions. There had been a compact entered into between his party and that of St. Paulinus at Antioch two years before—where they were rival bishops—that both parties, whenever either of the bishops died, should unite under the survivor of them. In spite of this understanding, Flavian, who had been one of the chief promoters of it among the supporters of St. Meletius, was unanimously appointed bishop in his stead by the council (Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 277 and 364). This act not merely re-opened the schism at Antioch, but produced heart-burnings elsewhere, the Western and Egyptian bishops pronouncing

more strongly than ever in favour of St. Paulinus, and the disapprobation shown for Flavian by St. Gregory, tending to alienate numbers of his own friends from him amongst the Easterns. It was, in fact, one of the principal causes of his retirement. The appointment of his successor, Nectarius, at the instance of the emperor, was probably the last act of the council of this year—and a strong act it was, as Nectarius had to be baptised before he could be consecrated (Soz. vii. 8). Dionysius Exiguus, as has been said, ends his canons of this council with the 4th. As Beveridge, too, remarks (*ib.* p. 98), traces of a new series commence with the 5th. It runs as follows:—"Concerning the tor *e* of the Westerns, we, too, have received those who professed their belief, at Antioch, in one Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." What was this tome of the Westerns? Beveridge considers it to have been the synodical epistle received from Pope Damasus by the Easterns at their second meeting, A.D. 382, to which they wrote their own in reply. De Marca, Cave, and others prefer to consider it a synodical letter of Pope Damasus, addressed to the synod of Antioch A.D. 378 or 9. Baronius, another of his to St. Paulinus of Antioch some years before. May it not be that the first tome of the kind was the letter sent by St. Athanasius in the name of his synod at Alexandria, A.D. 362, to the Church of Antioch, which he calls "a tome" himself, to which St. Paulinus is expressly said to have subscribed, and in which the indivisibility of the Holy Ghost from the substance both of the Father and the Son is as distinctly set forth as it ever was afterwards (Mansi, iii. 353-4). Through Eusebius of Vercelli, to whom it was addressed, and by whom it was in due time subscribed, it would find its way into the West and to Rome, as the rallying point of the orthodox, and a bond of union, under existing circumstances, between the sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome, whose acceptance of its doctrine can scarce have become known to each other before Macedonius, the ex-patriarch of Constantinople, commenced assailing the Divinity of the third person in the Godhead. On this, it would immediately give rise to, and be the foundation of, a series of "tomes" or epistles of the same kind between them, in which Constantinople, being in Arian hands, would take no part, nor Alexandria much, owing to the banishment of its orthodox prelate, Peter, from A.D. 373 to 378, under Valens. St. Meletius had also been driven from Antioch a year earlier; but then we are told expressly by Sozomen (vi. 7), his orthodox rival, St. Paulinus was allowed to remain; and this would account for the correspondence that went on between him and Pope Damasus uninterruptedly while St. Meletius was away, and of which the prominent topic was the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. Now, as Mansi points out (iii. 463-8), the synods of Antioch and Rome are confusedly given about this time. There are traces of a synod of Antioch, as well as of another at Rome, A.D. 372; but the acts of both have not hitherto been distinguished from those of two later synods at Rome, A.D. 377, and at Antioch, the year or two years following, under St. Meletius, on the return of the exiles. And one thing may well be thought to have been agreed upon at the first of *these* synods of Antioch, and possibly Rome too,

which was afterwards confirmed in the 2nd, and is evidently referred to by the Constantinopolitan fathers in their synodical letter, namely, the creed in its enlarged form. And for this reason—St. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, was another of the orthodox bishops who was not disturbed in his see; and his see, whether subject to Antioch or not, then, must have brought him into frequent communication with it, even if he had not been a personal friend of St. Paulinus, or was not present at the synod held there A.D. 372. Now, in c. 119 of his work called *Anchoratus*, of which he fixes the date himself in the next c., viz., A.D. 373, what was rehearsed afterwards at the council of Chalcedon as the creed of the 150 fathers, that is, of this council of Constantinople, is set down word for word, so far as its new clauses are concerned, and called that of Nicaea by him. Admit this form to have been agreed upon at the synod of Antioch, in conjunction, or not, with that of Rome, A.D. 372, and his own use of it the year following, as the authorised creed of the Church, is explained at once, nor is there any reason why St. Gregory Nyssen, if he composed it at all—as stated by Nicephorus alone (xii. 13)—should not have composed it there. But Valens coming to Antioch in April (Clinton, A.D. 372, col. 2), to persecute the orthodox, the probability would be that this synod was hastily broken up, and remained in abeyance till A.D. 378 or 9, when its proceedings were resumed under St. Meletius, and confirmed by 163 bishops, and with its proceedings this creed. All at the same time then and there subscribed to the Western tome or letter of Pope Damasus. Hence, both the language of the 5th Constantinopolitan canon above mentioned, and of the fathers who framed it, in their synodical letter, where they say that "this, their faith, which they had professed there summarily, might be learnt more fully by their Western brethren, on their being so good as to refer to 'the tome' that emanated from the synod of Antioch, and that set forth by the oecumenical council of Constantinople the year before, in which documents they had professed their faith at greater length." Now, what they had set forth themselves was their adherence to the Nicene faith and reprobation of the heresies enumerated in their first canon; what they had received from Antioch and accepted must have been the creed which has since gone by their name, but was certainly not their composition; and whatever else was confirmed there, A.D. 378, including the Western tome. Which of the letters of Pope Damasus is here specified comes out as plainly. His letter to St. Paulinus was written A.D. 372, when there was nobody left at Antioch but St. Paulinus to write to. The letter addressed in his own name and that of the 93 bishops with him, "to the Catholic bishops of the East," was "the tome" received by the synod at Antioch A.D. 378-9 (Mansi, *ib.* p. 459-62); to which they replied the same year (*ib.* p. 511-15). Both letters being on the same subject—as were the synods of 372 and 378-9—it was easy to confuse them. Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, held a synod and wrote on the same subject about the same time (*ib.* p. 503-8).

We are now in a position to deal with the synodical letter of the reassembled council



of Constantinople A.D. 382, and their proceedings generally. Finding there were still ecclesiastical matters of urgent importance to be settled, most of the bishops who had met at Constantinople A.D. 381, returned thither, as Theodoret relates, the following summer (Mansi ad Baron. A.D. 382, n. 3). One of their number, indeed, Ascholinus, bishop of Thessalonica, and SS. Epiphanius and Jerome with him, had gone meanwhile to Rome. Being at Constantinople, they received a synodical letter from the West, inviting them to Rome, where a large gathering was in contemplation. This letter having been lost, we can only guess at its contents from what they say in reply to it, coupled with their 5th canon, which was evidently framed in consequence. The affairs of the East being in imminent peril and confusion, they beg to be excused going away so far from their sees. They had come to Constantinople on account of what had been written by the West after the synod of Aquileia the year before to the Emperor Theodosius—evidently the letter in which the consecrations of Flavian and Nectarius are mentioned disapprovingly (Mansi, *ib.* p. 631-2)—but had made no preparations for going further from home. The most they could do would be to send deputies into the West. Cyriacus, Eusebius, and Priscian are named, to explain their proceedings, which they then epitomise, commencing with what has been anticipated above about their faith, and ending with the statement that Nectarius and Flavian had been appointed canonically to their respective sees, while St. Cyril was recognised by them as bishop of Jerusalem for the same reason. Thus this letter explains the framing of their 5th canon, and attests its date. The same date is assigned by Beveridge to canon 6, restricting the manner of instituting proceedings against bishops, and reprobating appeals to the secular power. But canon 7, prescribing the distinctions to be observed in admitting heretics into communion, is shown by him not to belong to this council at all. It is almost identical with the 95th Trullan canon (Bev. ad l.). Of the creed, little more need be added to what has been said. It was in existence A.D. 373, having been probably framed at Antioch, in conformity with the synodical letter of St. Athanasius, A.D. 372, where it was doubtless confirmed A.D. 378-9, and received more probably by the 5th canon of this council A.D. 382, than promulgated separately by the council of the year preceding. Possibly this may have been the creed called by Cassian (*De Incarn.* vi. 3 and 6) as late as A.D. 430, “peculiarly the creed of the city and Church of Antioch.” From the portion of it given by him it is as likely to have been this, as that of A.D. 363 (for which see Soc. iii. 25), or any other between them. That there is a family likeness between it and the creed of the Church of Jerusalem commented on by St. Cyril will be seen on comparing them (Heurtley's *De Fide et S.* p. 9-13). On this hypothesis alone we can understand why no notice should have been taken of it at the council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and in the African code, namely, because it had originated with a provincial, and only been as yet received by a general council. It was promulgated as identical with that of Nicaea for the first time by the fathers of the 4th council.

No more remains but to observe that the dogmatic professions of the council of 381 were confirmed by Theodosius in a constitution dated July 30 of the same year, and addressed to Antonius, proconsul of Asia, by which the churches are ordered to be handed over to the bishops in communion with Nectarius and others who composed it, the Eunomians, Arians, and Antians having been deprived of their churches by a constitution issued ten days earlier (*Cod. Theod.* xvi. tit. 1, l. 3, and tit. 5, l. 8). And it was received by Pope Damasus, and has been regarded in the West ever since, so far, as oecumenical. Its first four canons, in the same way, have been always admitted into Western collections. But what passed at the supplemental council of 382 never seems to have been confirmed or received equally. It was in declining to come to this last council that St. Gregory Nazianzen said, in his epistle to Procopius (cxxx. ed. Migne), “that he had come to the resolution of avoiding every meeting of bishops, for that he had never seen any synod end well, or assuage rather than aggravate disorders.” His celebrated oration (*ib.* xlii.), known as his “farewell” to the council of 381, is inspired by a very different spirit.

Lastly, there was a third meeting of bishops held at Constantinople, by command of Theodosius, A.D. 383, under Nectarius, to devise remedies for the confusion created by so many sees passing out of the hands of the heterodox into those of the orthodox party (Soc. v. 10). The Arian, Eunomian, and Macedonian bishops were required to attend there with confessions of their faith, which the emperor, after examining carefully, rejected in favour of Nicaea. The Novatians alone, receiving this, were placed by him upon equal terms with the orthodox. Of the heterodox professions, that of Eunomius is extant, and not without interest. It may be seen in Cave (*Hist. Lit.* i. 210). It is said to have been on this occasion that Amphilocheus, bishop of Iconium, on entering the palace, made the usual obeisance to Theodosius, but took no notice of Arcadius, his son, standing at his side. When the emperor reproved him for this, “You see, sire,” said the bishop, “how impatient you are that your own son should be slighted; much more will God punish those who refuse due honour to his only begotten Son” (*Theod.* v. 16).

(6) A.D. 394—reckoning that of 383 as the 5th. Among those present were Nectarius of Constantinople, Theophilus of Alexandria, Flavian of Antioch, &c. What called them together, in all probability, was the dedication of a new church in honour of SS. Peter and Paul: which done, they sat in judgment on a controversy between two rival bishops of Bostra, Bagadius, and Agapius; against the former of whom it was pleaded that he had been deposed by two bishops, since dead. The council decreed that, in future, not even three, much less two, bishops should have the power of deposing another, but that, in conformity with the apostolic canons (and this express reference to them in such an assemblage is most noteworthy), it should be held to belong to a larger synod, and the bishops of the province (Mansi, iii. 851-4).

(7) A.D. 399, of 22 bishops under St. Chrysostom, to enquire into seven capital charges brought against Antoninus, bishop of Ephesus.

As he died before the witnesses could be examined, St. Chrysostom, at the request of the Ephesine clergy, went over thither, and, at the head of 70 bishops, appointed Heraclides a deacon in his place, and deposed 6 bishops that had been simoniacally ordained by him. Their proceedings are of some interest, and contain a reference to the canons of the African Church (Mansi, iii. 991-6). Strictly speaking, this last was a synod of Ephesus.

(8) A.D. 404, to sit in judgment on St. Chrysostom, who had been recalled from exile by the emperor and retaken possession of his see, from which he had been deposed by "the Synod of the Oak." Theophilus of Alexandria was not present on this occasion, having had to fly Constantinople on the return of his rival. Still he was not unrepresented; and St. Chrysostom had by this time provoked another enemy (Clinton, A.D. 404, col. 4) in the Empress Eudoxia, whose statue he had denounced from the games and revels permitted to be held round it in offensive proximity to his church. At this synod he seems to have given attendance (vi. 18) when the question of his former deposition was argued. Thirty-six bishops had condemned him: but sixty-five bishops, he rejoined, had, by communicating with him, voted in his favour (Vales. ad l.). It is not implied in these words, as some seem to have supposed, that a synod was actually sitting in his favour now, any more than during the Synod of the Oak, the deputies from which found him surrounded, but not synodically, by forty bishops, in his own palace. The 4th or 12th canon of the Council of Antioch was alleged by his opponents: his defence was that it was framed by the Arians (Reading, *ib.*). As quoted by his opponents, indeed, it was differently worded from what either the 4th or 12th are now; so that possibly there may have been an Arian version of these canons, against which his objection held good. The synod, however, decided against him, and his banishment to Comana, on the Black Sea, says Socrates—to Cucusus, in Armenia, say others—followed, where he died.

(9) A.D. 426, on the last day of February, when Sisinnius was consecrated bishop there, in the room of Atticus. Afterwards, the errors of the Massalians, or Euchites, were condemned, at the instance of the Bishops of Iconium and Sida, as we learn from the 7th action of the Council of Ephesus. A severe sentence was passed on any charged with holding them after this denunciation (Mansi, iv. 541-2).

(10) A.D. 428, on the death of Sisinnius, when the well-known Nestorius was consecrated (Mansi, iv. 543-4).

(11) A.D. 431, October 25, four months after Nestorius had been deposed, to consecrate Maximian in his place (Mansi, v. 1045). This done, Maximian presided, and joined in a synodical letter, enclosing that of the Council of Ephesus, with its first six canons, as they are called, to the bishops of ancient Epirus, whom attempts had been made to detach from orthodoxy (*ib.* 257). Letters were written likewise by him and by the emperor to Pope Celestine, St. Cyril, and other bishops, to acquaint them with his elevation, at which all expressed themselves well pleased (*ib.* 257-92). Another synod appears to have been held by him the year following, for

restoring peace between his own Church and that of Antioch (*ib.* 1049-50).

(12) A.D. 443, probably (Mansi, vi. 463-6, comp. Cave, i. 479) to consider the case of Athanasius, bishop of Perrhe, on the Euphrates, afterwards deposed at Antioch under Domnus. Here he seems to have got letters in his favour from Proclus (comp. *Conc. Hierap.* A.D. 445).

(13) A.D. 448, November 8, under Flavian, to enquire into a dispute between Florentius, metropolitan of Sardis, and two of his suffragans: but while sitting, it was called upon by Eusebius, bishop of Dorylaeum, one of its members, and who had, as a layman, denounced Nestorius, to summon Eutyches, archimandrite of a convent of three hundred monks, and as resolute an opponent of Nestorius as himself, on a charge that he felt obliged to press against him. The charge was that he recognised but one nature in Christ. Messengers were despatched to invite Eutyches to peruse what Eusebius had alleged against him. Meanwhile, two letters of St. Cyril—his second to Nestorius, recited and approved at the Council of Ephesus, and his letter to John of Antioch, on their reconciliation—were read out, and pronounced orthodox by all. A reply was brought subsequently from Eutyches, that he refused to quit his monastery. A 2nd and 3rd citation followed in succession. Then he promised attendance within a week. While waiting for him, the council listened to some minutes of a conversation between him and the two presbyters charged with his 2nd citation, when they said he expressly denied two natures in Christ. At last he appeared, made profession of his faith, and was condemned—thirty-two bishops and twenty-three archimandrites subscribing to his deposition from the priesthood and monastic dignity. Proceedings occupied altogether seven sessions—the last of which was held November 22. Its acts were recited in a subsequent council of the year following at Constantinople; at Ephesus, also, the year following, under Dioscorus; and again, in the 1st session of the Council of Chalcedon, where they may be read still (Mansi, vi. 495-6, and then 649-754).

(14) A.D. 449, April 8, of thirty bishops under Thalassius, archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, held by order of the emperor, to re-consider the sentence passed on Eutyches by the council under Flavian, on a representation from the former that its acts had been falsified. This, however, was proved untrue. Another session was held April 27, on a second petition from Eutyches, to have the statement of Magnus—the official or silentary, who had accompanied him to the council under Flavian—taken down, which was done. This officer declared to having seen the instrument containing his deposition, before the session was held at which it was resolved on. The acts of this council are likewise preserved in the first session of that of Chalcedon (Mansi, vi. 503-4, and then 753-828).

(15) A.D. 450, at which Anatolius was ordained bishop; and then, some months afterwards, at the head of his suffragans and clergy, made profession of his faith and subscribed to the celebrated letter of St. Leo to his predecessor Flavian, in the presence of four legates from Rome, charged to obtain proofs of his orthodoxy (Mansi, vi. 509-14, with ep. lxi. of St. Leo *ib.* 83-5).

(16) A.D. 457, under Anatolius by order of the Emperor Leo, whom he had just crowned, to take cognisance of the petitions that had arrived from Alexandria for and against Timothy Aelurus, who, on the murder of St. Proterius, had been installed bishop there by the opponents of the Council of Chalcedon, and to consider what could be done to restore peace. The council anathematised Aelurus and his party (Mansi, vii. 521-2 & 869-70).

(17) A.D. 459, under Gennadius. Eighty-one bishops subscribed to its synodical letter still extant, in which the 2nd canon of the Council of Chalcedon is cited with approval against some simoniacal ordinations recently brought to light in Galatia (Mansi, vii. 911-20).

(18) A.D. 478, under Acacius, in which Peter, Bishop of Antioch, surnamed the Fuller, Paul of Ephesus, and John of Apamea, were condemned: and a letter addressed to Simplicius, bishop of Rome, to acquaint him with, and request him to concur in, their condemnation (Mansi, vii. 1017-22, comp. Vales. *Observ. in Evag.* i. 2). A letter was addressed at the same time by Acacius to Peter the Fuller himself, rebuking him for having introduced the clause "Who was crucified for us" into the Trisagion or hymn to the Trinity. Hitherto this letter has been printed as if it had issued from a synod five years later, when in fact there was no such synod (Mansi, *ib.* 1119-24).

(19) A.D. 492, under Euphemius: in favour of the Council of Chalcedon; but as he declined removing the name of his predecessor Acacius from the sacred diptychs, he was not recognised as bishop by popes Felix and Gelasius, to whom he transmitted its acts, though his orthodoxy was allowed (Mansi, vii. 1175-80).

(20) A.D. 496, by order of the Emperor Anastasius I., in which the Henoticon of Zeno was confirmed, Euphemius, bishop of Constantinople deposed; and Macedonius, the second of that name who had presided there, substituted for him (Mansi, viii. 186-7).

(21) A.D. 498, by order of the emperor Anastasius I., in which Flavian, the second bishop of Antioch of that name, and Philoxenus of Hierapolis, took the lead: condemning the Council of Chalcedon and all who opposed the Monophysite doctrine, or would not accept the interpolated clause "Who was crucified for us" in the Trisagion. But it seems probable that this council took place a year later; and that another had met a year earlier, under Macedonius, less hostile to the Council of Chalcedon than this, and of which this was the reaction (Mansi, viii. 197-200).

(22) A.D. 518, July 20, by order of the emperor Justin, at which the names of the Councils of Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon: of St. Leo of Rome, with Euphemius and Macedonius of Constantinople, were restored in the sacred diptychs: and Severus and all other opponents of the 4th council anathematised. Its synodical letter signed by forty bishops and addressed to the Constantinopolitan bishop, John II., praying his assent to its acts, is preserved in the 5th action of the council under Mennas, A.D. 536, as are his letters informing the Eastern bishops of what had been done there. Count Gratus was despatched to Rome by the emperor with letters from himself and the patriarch to pope

Hormisdas, hoping that peace might under these circumstances be restored between them. The answers of Hormisdas, his instructions to the legates despatched by him to Constantinople, their accounts of their reception there, the profession signed by the patriarch, and subsequent correspondence between him and the pope, may all be read amongst the epistles of the latter (Mansi, viii. 435-65). The Easterns had to anathematise Acacius of Constantinople by name, and to erase his, and the names of all others, Euphemius and Macedonius included, who had not erased his previously, from the sacred diptychs, before the pope would readmit them to his communion (*Ib.* 573-8).

(23) A.D. 531, under Epiphanius, who was then patriarch, to enquire into the consecration of Stephen, Metropolitan of Larissa, within the diocese of Thrace, which, contrary to the 28th canon of Chalcedon, had been made without consulting him. Stephen, having been deposed by him on these grounds, appealed to Rome; but the acts of the synod held there to consider his appeal are defective, so that it is not known with what success (Mansi, viii. 739-40).

(24) A.D. 536. According to some, three synods were held there this year: 1. in which pope Agapetus presided and deposed Anthimus, patriarch of Constantinople: but this, as Mansi shews (viii. 871-2), the emperor Justinian had already done, besides confirming the election of Mennas in his stead, at the instance of the clergy and people of the city. Agapetus, who had come thither on a mission from Theodatus, king of the Goths, having previously refused his communion, had unquestionably procured his ejection: and he afterwards consecrated Mennas, as Theophilus of Alexandria had St. John Chrysostom, at the request of the emperor. 2. in which a number of Eastern bishops met to draw up a petition to the pope requesting him to call upon Anthimus, subsequently to his deposition but previously to his going back to Trebizond from which he had been translated, for a retraction of his denial of two natures in Christ: but this can hardly be called a council; and the death of the pope stopped any definitive action on his part (*Ib.*). 3. under Mennas, after the death of the pope, consisting of five actions, the first of which took place, May 2, in a church dedicated to St. Mary near the great church, Mennas presiding, and having on his right, among others, five Italian bishops, who had come to Constantinople from the late pope, and remained there with him on his arrival. The first thing brought before the council was a petition from various monastic bodies in Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Mount Sinai to the emperor, begging that the sentence, stayed only by the death of the pope, against Anthimus, might be carried out; a general account of what had passed between them and the pope followed, their petition to him was produced by the Italian bishops present and recited; after it another petition to him from some Eastern bishops on the same subject; and his own letter to Peter, bishop of Jerusalem in reply. Desirous of following out his decision, the council sent deputies to acquaint Anthimus with its proceedings, and bid him appear there within three days. The second and third actions passed in sending him similar summonses, but all his hiding-places

having been searched repeatedly without finding him, his condemnation and deposition was at length decreed in the fourth action by the council and its president, and signed by seventy-two bishops or their representatives, and two deacons of the Roman Church. At the fifth and last action a number of documents were recited. 1. A petition of the bishop of Apamea and other Syrian bishops to the emperor against Anthimus, Severus, and others of the Monophysite party. 2. Another petition to him from some monks of Palestine and Syria to the same effect. 3. A similar petition from the same monks to this council. 4. Two letters of pope Hormisdas, one dated A.D. 518, and relating to the Constantinopolitan synod of that year; the other addressed to Epiphanius, patriarch of Constantinople three years later, requesting him to act, and directing him how to act, in his stead in receiving converts from the Monophysites. 5. A petition from the clergy and monks of Antioch to the patriarch John and synod of Constantinople, A.D. 518, against Severus. 6. An address of the same synod to the patriarch John. 7. A petition of the monastic bodies in Constantinople to the same synod, with a narrative of the acclamations amidst which its decisions had been carried out by John. 8. His letters to the patriarch of Jerusalem and bishop of Tyre thereon, and their replies to him, with another narrative showing how rapturously the church of Tyre had received them. 9. A similar letter from the bishops of Syria secunda to the same patriarch of Constantinople, with a narrative of proceedings against Peter, bishop of Apamea, for his Monophysite sayings: and a petition presented to them by the monks of his diocese against him and Severus. All which having been read, an anathema was passed upon him, Severus and Zoaras, one of their followers, by the council now sitting—this is inexcusably left by Mansi (viii. 1137–8) with its corrupt heading uncorrected, ascribing it to a former synod—and then by Mennas, its president; according to the order observed in the 4th action in passing sentence upon Anthimus. Eighty-eight bishops or their representatives, and two deacons of the Roman church as before, subscribed on this occasion. A constitution of the emperor addressed to Mennas confirmed their sentence (Mansi, viii. 869–1162).

(25) A.D. 538, says Valesius, 541 Cave, 543 Mansi, under Mennas by order of the emperor Justinian, in support of his edict against the errors of Origen, denounced to him in a petition from four monks of Jerusalem, placed in his hands, says Liberatus (*Brev.* 23) by Pelagius, a Roman envoy, whom he had sent thither on a different errand, with the express object of injuring Theodore, bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia, surnamed Ascidas, who defended Origen. His edict, which is in the form of a book against Origen and addressed to Mennas, is given at length by Mansi (ix. 487–588). It was communicated to the other patriarchs and to pope Vigilius. The council backed it by 15 anathemas against Origen and his errors, usually placed at the end of the acts of the 5th general council (Mansi, *ib.* 395–400) with which this council came to be subsequently confused, in consequence, says Cave, of their respective acts having formed one volume (Mansi, *ib.* 121–4; and also 703–8).

(26) A.D. 546, according to Garnier (*Diss. ad Liberat.* c. iv.) under Mennas to assent to the 1st edict, now lost, of the emperor Justinian against the three chapters the year before. Both Cave and Mansi pass over this council, and substitute for it another, supposed to have been held by pope Vigilius the year following, after his arrival in February (Clinton, A.D. 547, col. 4), at which it was decided to refer passing sentence upon the three chapters to the meeting of the general council about to take place (Mansi, ix. 125–8).

(27) A.D. 553, the 5th general, held by order of the Emperor Justinian, and composed of 165 bishops, with Eutychius, patriarch of Constantinople, for their president: Pope Vigilius being on the spot all the time, but declining to attend; indeed, he was not even represented there. As far back as his election, A.D. 537, according to Victor of Tunisi, he had been secretly pledged to the Empress Theodora, who favoured the Monophysite party, to assent to the condemnation of the three chapters (Garn. *ad Lib. Breviar.* c. 22); and this step, according to Liberatus (*ib.* c. 24), had been pressed upon the emperor all the more warmly since then, in consequence of the condemnation of the Origenists in a council under Mennas the year following. Theodore, bishop of Caesarea, a devoted Origenist and friend of the empress, pointed it out in fact as a means of bringing back a large section of the Monophysites to the church. Their opposition to the 4th general council, he averred, lay in the countenance supposed to be given by it to these writings—1. The works of Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia; 2. The letter of Ibas, bishop of Edessa, to Maris; and 3, what Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, had published against St. Cyril: the third, however, he forbore to name; all held to be tainted with Nestorianism. By condemning them, he seems to have calculated the authority of the council that had treated their authors at least so favourably, would be undermined. Justinian, acting on his advice, had already condemned them twice, A.D. 545 and 551 (Gieseler, i. 325; Cunningham's Tr., no date is assigned to the two pieces given in Mansi, ix. 537–82, and 589–646); and the first time had been followed by Vigilius, whose "Judicatum," published at Constantinople, A.D. 548, is quoted in part by the emperor in his address to this council (Mansi, ix. 178–86, and again, 582–8) on its assembling. But Vigilius had, A.D. 547, declared against coming to any decision on the subject till it had been discussed in a general council; and to this he went back on ascertaining what indignation his "Judicatum" had caused in Africa and in the West, and excommunicated Mennas and Theodore for having gone further (Mansi, *ib.* 58–61). Accordingly, the emperor decided on summoning this council to examine and pronounce upon them; and Eutychius, the Constantinopolitan patriarch, addressed a letter to Vigilius, which was read out at its first session, May 5, requesting him to come and preside over its deliberations. Vigilius assented to their joint examination by himself and the council, but was silent about his attendance. Three patriarchs and a number of bishops accosted him personally with no better success. At the 2nd session, or collation, a second interview with him was reported, in which he definitively declined attending; and even on a



message from the emperor he would not undertake to do more than examine the chapters by himself, and transmit his opinion on them, not to the council, but to him. This probably was contained in his *Constitutum* (Mansi, *ib.* p. 61 and seq.); the date assigned to which indicates that it came out between the 5th and 6th collations. Some bishops of Africa and Illyria excused themselves equally to the deputation sent to invite their attendance. At the 3rd collation the fathers commenced the real business for which they had been convened with a preface well worth remembering for its soundness and moderation. They pledged themselves to the exact doctrine and discipline laid down in the four general councils, each and all, preceding their own; one and the same confession of faith had sufficed for them in spite of all the heresies they had met to condemn, and should suffice now. All things in harmony with it should be received; and all things at variance with it rejected. Having thus pledged themselves to the 4th council among the rest, the fathers proceeded to the examination of the three chapters in their 4th collation. This was on May 12: extracts having accordingly been read out from various works of Theodore, both he and they were judged worthy of condemnation. The next day, or the 5th collation, passages for or against Theodore, for St. Cyril and others, were produced and weighed; and authorities, particularly St. Augustine, cited in favour of condemning heretics although dead. Enquiry having been made when the name of Theodore ceased to be commemorated in the sacred diptychs of his church, it was discovered that the name of St. Cyril had long been substituted there for his. At the close of the sitting, extracts from the writings of Theodoret against St. Cyril were recited; on which the fathers remarked that the 4th council had acted wisely in not receiving him till he had anathematised Nestorius. Six days intervened before the 6th collation took place, May 19. During this interval Vigilus issued his "*Constitutum*," dated May 14, in the form of a synodical letter addressed to the emperor (Mansi, ix. 61-106), answering and condemning a number of the positions of Theodore, but pleading for Theodoret and Ibas, as having been acquitted by the 4th council. However, the council at its 6th collation found the letter of Ibas in question contrary to the Chalcedonian definition, and anathematised it accordingly, the principal speaker against it being Theodore, bishop of Cappadocia; but its author escaped. At the 7th collation, May 26 or 30, for the reading is doubtful, a communication was read from the emperor in deprecation of the "*Constitutum*" addressed to him by the Pope, May 14, and on which there had been a good many messages between them in vain since. First, no less than six documents were recited proving Vigilus to have expressly condemned the three chapters as many times: 1, a letter from him to the emperor; 2, to the empress, in both which the words "*unam operationem*" were declared at the 6th council by the legates of Agatho to have been a later insertion of the Monothelite party (Baluz. ap. Mansi, ix. 163-72); 3, to his deacons, Rusticus and Sebastian, condemning them for the false stories they had spread about him; 4, to the bishop of Kiew, in

Russia; 5, to the bishop of Arles; and 6, a deposition signed by Theodore, bishop of Caesarea, and a lay dignitary, to the effect that Vigilus had sworn to the emperor in their presence to do all he could for the condemnation of the three chapters, and never say a word in their favour. Next, an enquiry, by order of the emperor, respecting a picture or statue of Theodoret said to have been carried about at Cyrus in procession, was reported. And, lastly, the imperial mandate, which ordained that the name of Vigilus should be removed from the sacred diptychs for his tergiversations on the subject of the three chapters, "*Non enim patiebamur, nec ab eo, nec ab alio quocunque,*" says the emperor, "*inviolatam communionem suscipere, qui non istam impietatem condemnat . . . ne eo modo inveniamur Nestorii et Theodori impietati communicantes*" (Mansi, *ib.* 366-7). Unity with the apostolic see would not, he adds, be thereby dissolved, inasmuch as neither Vigilus nor any other individual could, by his own change for the worse, mar the peace of the Church. To all which the council agreed. Finally, reviewing at its 8th collation, June 2, in a singularly well-written compendium all that it had done previously, and vindicating the course about to be pursued, it formally condemned the three chapters, and with them the author of the first of them—Theodore—promulgating its definitive sentence in 14 anathemas, almost identical with those of the emperor (Mansi, *ib.* 557-64), and in which the heresies and heresiarchs thus condemned are specified: Origen among the number in the eleventh, though not in the corresponding one of the emperor. He had been previously condemned in the council under Mennas, A.D. 538, as we have seen. Of these anathemas the Greek version is still extant: of almost every other record of its proceedings the Latin version alone remains. Vigilus, after taking some time to consider, announced his assent to them in two formal documents: the first a decretal epistle, dated Dec. 8 of the same year, and addressed to the Constantinopolitan patriarch (Mansi, *ib.* 413-32, with the notes of De Marca), in which, as he says, after the manner of St. Augustine, he retracts all that he had ever written differently; and the second, another *Constitutum* of great length, dated Feb. 23 of the year following (Clinton, A.D. 554, c. 4), but without any heading or subscription in its present form (Mansi, *ib.* 457-88). He died on his way home, and Pelagius, the Roman envoy who had been instrumental in condemning Origen, had thus, on becoming pope, to vindicate the condemnation of the three chapters by this council in the West, where they had been defended all but unanimously, and were upheld obstinately by more than three parts of Italy still. The 2nd Pelagius, twenty-five years later, in his third letter to the bishops of Istria, said to have been written by St. Gregory the Great, then his deacon (Mansi, *ib.* 433-54, and see Migne's ed.), apologised as follows for the conduct of his predecessors and his own therein. Referring to the occasion on which St. Peter was reproved by St. Paul (Gal. ii. 11), he asks, "*Nunquid Petro apostolorum principi sibi dissimilia docenti, debuit ad haec verba responderi?*" "*Haec quae dicis, audire non possumus, quia aliud ante praedicasti? Si igitur in trium capitulorum*

negotio, aliud cum veritas quaereretur, aliud autem inventa veritate, dictum est : cur mutatio sententiae huic sedi in crimine objicitur, quae a cuncta ecclesia humiliter in ejus auctore veneratur? Non enim mutatio sententiae, sed inconstantia sensus in culpa est." St. Gregory, when pope, settled the matter by affirming that he venerated the 5th council equally with the four preceding (Mansi, *ib.* 454). No canons seem to have been passed in it; but though two elaborate dissertations have been written on it (Garn. *ad Liberat.* and H. de Noris, *Op. P.* ii.), many points connected with it are still doubtful; and the documents published by Mansi (ix. 151–651) as belonging to it, greatly need re-arranging.

(28) A.D. 565, at which the emperor Justinian endeavoured to get the errors of Julian of Halicarnassus, a well-known Monophysite, who maintained the incorruptibility of the Body of Christ antecedently to his resurrection, approved, by banishing those who opposed them (Mansi, ix. 765–8).

(29) A.D. 587, at which a foul charge brought against Gregory, patriarch of Antioch, by a banker of his diocese, was examined. He was honourably acquitted and his accuser punished (Evang. vi. 7). Mansi thinks this must have been the synod summoned as a general one by the Constantinopolitan patriarch John, in virtue of his assumed title of oecumenical patriarch, and for which he was so severely taken to task by pope Pelagius II.—but for this no direct proof is adduced either by him or Pagi (ix. 971–4). It is supplied, however, in a letter of St. Gregory the Great to that patriarch (*ib.* 1217–18), and a further letter of his some time later, when Cyriacus was patriarch, whose plan of holding another synod for the same purpose he would seem to have anticipated (*ib.* x. 159). Mansi (*ib.* p. 481–2) conceives this synod to have been held A.D. 598.

(30) A.D. 626, under Sergius, to consider the question raised by Paul, a Monophysite of Phasis, in Lazica, and Cyrus, its metropolitan—afterwards translated to Alexandria—before the emperor Heraclius, whether one or two wills and operations were to be ascribed to Christ. Sergius, on the authority of a discourse ascribed by him to his well-known predecessor Mennas, and other testimonies which he abstains from naming, pronounced in favour of one operation and one will; thereby founding the heresy called Monothelism (Mansi, x. 585–8). Clinton (ii. 171) doubts whether the question did not originate with Athanasius, patriarch of the Jacobites in Syria, on his promotion to the see of Antioch by Heraclius four years later. The discourse which Sergius ascribed to Mennas was proved a forgery to the 6th council at its third session.

(31) A.D. 639, under Sergius, and continued—unless there were two distinct councils this year—under Pyrrhus, his successor, at which the "Ecthesis" or exposition of faith by the emperor Heraclius, favourable to Monothelism, was confirmed (Mansi, x. 673–4). Parts of its acts, with the ecthesis in full, were recited in the third sitting of the Lateran under Martin I. A.D. 649 (*ib.* 991–1004).

(32) A.D. 665, by order of the emperor Constant II., at which St. Maximus, the great opponent of the Monothelites, was condemned (Mansi, xi. 73–4).

(33) A.D. 686, under Peter, patriarch of Constantinople, and attended by Macedonius of Antioch and the vicar of the patriarch of Alexandria, at which St. Maximus was condemned a second time with his disciples (Mansi, xi. 73–6).

(34) The 6th general, held in the banqueting hall of the palace, called Trullus from its domed roof (Du Fresne, *Constant. Christ.* ii. 4, § 19–20), and lasting from November 7, A.D. 680, to September 16 of the ensuing year.

It was convened by the emperor Constantine Pogonatus, as stated in his epistle to Pope Donus, in consequence of a request made to him by the patriarchs of Constantinople to permit their removing from the sacred diptychs the name of Pope Vitalian, lately deceased, while they were for retaining that of Honorius (Mansi, xi. 199–200). In short, they wished to commemorate none of the popes after Honorius till some disputes that had arisen between their own sees and his had been settled, and some newly-coined words explained. The allusion is probably to the *μια θεωδρική ἐνέργεια* attributed to Christ by the Monothelite patriarch and synod of Alexandria, A.D. 633 (*ib.* 565), when Honorius was pope. Donus dying before this letter could reach Rome, it was complied with at once by his successor Agatho, who sent three bishops, on behalf of his synod, and two presbyters, and one deacon named John—who subsequently became pope as John V., in his own name—to Constantinople, "to bring about the union of the holy Churches of God," as it is said in his life (*ib.* 165). On hearing from the "oecumenical pope," as he styles him, to that effect, the Emperor issued his summons to George, patriarch of Constantinople—whom he styles oecumenical patriarch—and through him to the patriarch of Antioch, to get ready to come to the council with their respective bishops and metropolitans (*ib.* 201). Mansuetus, metropolitan of Milan, who had formed part of the Roman synod under Agatho, sent a synodical letter and profession of faith on behalf of his own synod (*ib.* 203–8), and Theodore, bishop or archbishop of Ravenna, who had formed part of the same synod, a presbyter, to represent him personally. The number of bishops actually present, according to Cave, was 289, though the extant subscriptions are under 180. Thirteen officers of the court were there likewise by command of the emperor, who attended in person, and were ranged round him—on his left were the representatives of the pope and his synod, of the archbishop of Ravenna, and of the patriarch of Jerusalem, then Basil, bishop of Gortyna, in Crete, and the remaining bishops "subject to Rome"—his right being occupied by the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch, a presbyter representing the patriarch of Alexandria, the bishop of Ephesus, and "the remaining bishops subject to Constantinople." The business of the council was concluded in 18 actions or sessions, as follows:—

1. The legates of Agatho having complained of the novel teaching of four patriarchs of Constantinople—Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter—of Cyrus, of Alexandria, and Theodore, bishop of Pharan, that had for 46 years or more troubled the whole Church, in attributing one will and operation to the Incarnate Word. Macarius, patriarch of Antioch, and two suffragan-

of the see of Constantinople favourable to this dogma, briefly replied that they had put out no new terms but only believed and taught what they had received from general councils and from the holy fathers on the point in question, particularly the patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria, named by their opponents, and Honorius, formerly pope of elder Rome. Whereupon the chartophylax, or keeper of the archives of the great Church, was ordered by the emperor to fetch the books of the oecumenical councils from the library of the patriarch. As nothing was said of the acts of the 1st and 2nd councils on this occasion, we must infer they had been lost previously. The chartophylax was told to produce what he had got; and immediately two volumes of the acts of the 3rd council were recited by Stephen, a presbyter of Antioch in waiting on Macarius, who forthwith contended that some of St. Cyril's expressions made for him.

2. Two volumes of the acts of the 4th council were read, when the legates of Agatho pointed out that two operations were attributed to Christ by St. Leo.

3. Two volumes of the acts of the 5th council were read, when the legates protested that two letters of Pope Vigilius, contained in the second volume, had been interpolated, and that a discourse attributed in the first to Mennas, patriarch of Constantinople, was spurious. This last having been proved on the spot from internal evidence, its recital was stopped, the emperor directing further enquiry to be made respecting the letters of the pope.

4. Two letters from Agatho were recited—one to the emperor, in his own name, the other to the council, in his own name and that of a synod of 125 bishops, with Wilfrid, bishop of York, among them, for Britain, assembled under him at Rome, previously to the departure of his legates. The burden of both is the same, namely, that what had been defined as of faith by the five general councils preceding, it was the summit of his ambition to keep inviolate—without change, diminution, or addition, either in word or thought (Mansi, *ib.* 235). Mr. Renouf, indeed, in his second pamphlet on "Pope Honorius" (p. 46-7), has pointed out several passages in the Latin version of these letters on the prerogatives of the Church of Rome, which are not found in the Greek. Either, therefore, they have been interpolated in the one, or suppressed in the other. The decree of the Council of Florence supplies a parallel of the same kind. But that Agatho wrote these letters in Greek, and that the Latin version of the entire acts of this council that we have cannot possibly be the one made by order of the next pope, soon after the council dispersed, are two points which Mr. R. seems to have assumed without proving.

5. Two papers were exhibited by Macarius, and recited: of which the first was headed "Testimonies from the holy Fathers confirmatory of there being one will in Christ, which is also that of the Father and the Holy Ghost."

6. A third paper from Macarius, to the same effect as the other two, having been read, the sealing of all three was commanded by the emperor, and entrusted to his own officials and those belonging to the sees of Rome and Con-

stantinople. On the legates affirming that the quotations contained in them had not been fairly made, authentic copies of the works cited were ordered to be brought from the patriarchal library to compare with them.

7. A paper headed "Testimonies from the holy Fathers demonstrating two wills and operations in Christ," was produced by the legates, and read. Appended to it were passages from the writings of heretics, in which but one will and operation was taught. This paper was ordered to be sealed, like those of Macarius, by the emperor.

8. The passages adduced by Agatho from the Fathers, and by his synod, in favour of two wills and operations, having been examined and confirmed, were pronounced conclusive by all present except Macarius; and the petition to have the name of Vitalian erased from the diptychs was withdrawn by George, the existing patriarch of Constantinople, amid great applause. Macarius being then called upon to make his profession, proved himself a Monothelite; and was convicted of having quoted unfairly from the Fathers in his papers to support his views.

9. Examination of the papers of Macarius having been completed, he and his presbyter Stephen were formally deposed as heretics by the council.

10. The paper exhibited by the legates was taken in hand: and after a most interesting comparison, passage by passage, between it and the authentic works in the patriarchal library, was declared thoroughly correct in its citations: a profession of faith was received from the bishop of Nicomedia and some others, in which Monothelism was abjured.

11. A long and remarkable profession of faith, contained in a synodical letter of Sophronius, late patriarch of Jerusalem, and the first to oppose Monothelism, was recited: and after it, at the request of the legates, some more writings of Macarius, since come to hand, that proved full of heresy.

12. Several more documents belonging to Macarius having been received from the emperor through one of his officers, which he professed not to have read himself, some were looked through and pronounced irrelevant, but three letters were recited at length: one from Sergius patriarch of Constantinople to Cyrus, then bishop of Phasis; another from him to Pope Honorius, the third being the answer of Honorius to him. Again the patriarchal archives were searched, and the two first of these letters compared with the authentic copies of them found there; while the original letter of Honorius in Latin having been brought from thence was compared by John bishop of Porto, the only delegate from the Roman synod then present, with the copy just read, and the genuineness of all three placed beyond doubt. A suggestion brought from the emperor that Macarius should be restored in the event of his recanting, was peremptorily declined by the council.

13. Both the letters of Sergius before mentioned and that of Honorius to him were declared heterodox; and he and his successors, Pyrrhus, Peter, and Paul, Cyrus of Alexandria, and Theodore, bishop of Pharan—on all of whom Agatho had passed sentence previously—with Honorius, whom Agatho had passed over, were

definitively cast out of the Church—the only sentence of the kind ever decreed against any pope. The letter of Sophronius, on the other hand, was pronounced orthodox. Finally, search having been made for all other works of the same kind in the archives, all that could be found were brought out and recited. The list included two letters from Cyrus to Sergius, the latest of them having been written from Alexandria, with a copy of the terms of agreement come to between him and the Theodosians, a Monophysite sect, enclosed in it; works by Theodore, bishop of Pharan, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, patriarchs of Constantinople; a second letter of Honorius to Sergius; and a dogmatic letter of Pyrrhus to Pope John IV., discovered in a volume of dogmatic letters by the Chartophylax, George. All these were pronounced heretical, and burnt as such. Letters of Thomas, John, and Constantine, patriarchs of Constantinople, were read likewise, but their orthodoxy was allowed.

14. Returning to the letters of Pope Vigilius that had been called in question, it was ascertained by curious enquiry that each of the volumes of the 5th council had been tampered with: in one case by inserting the paper attributed to Mennas, in the other by interpolating the letters of Vigilius, in support of heresy. The council ordered both falsifications to be cancelled, besides anathematising them and their authors. A sermon of St. Athanasius was produced by the bishops of Cyprus, in which the doctrine of two wills in Christ was clearly laid down. At this sitting Theophanes, the new patriarch of Antioch, is first named among those present.

15. Polychronius, a presbyter, undertaking to raise a dead man to life in support of his heretical views, and failing, was condemned as an impostor, and deposed.

16. Constantine, another presbyter, affecting to have devised some formula calculated to reconcile Monothelism with orthodoxy, was proved in agreement with Macarius, and similarly condemned. In conclusion, all who had been condemned were anathematised, one after the other by name, amidst cheers for the orthodox.

17. The previous acts of the council were read over; and its definition of faith published for the first time.

18. The definition having been once more published, was signed by all present; and received the assent of the emperor on the spot amid the usual acclamations and reprobations. It consisted of three parts:—I. An introduction proclaiming entire agreement on the part of the council with the five previous councils, and acceptance of the two creeds promulgated by them as one. II. Recital of the two creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople in their pristine forms. III. Its own definition, enumerating all previously condemned for Monothelism once more by name; and mentioning with approbation the declaration of pope Agatho and his synod against them, and in favour of the true doctrine, which it proceeded to unfold in course: then reiterating the decree passed by previous councils against the framers and upholders of a faith or creed other than the two forms already specified; and including finally in the same condemnation the

inventors and disseminators of any novel terms subversive of its own rulings.

Proceedings terminated in a remarkable address to the emperor on behalf of all present, which was read out, showing that the doctrine of the Trinity had been defined by the two first councils; and that of the Incarnation in the four next, of which this was the last: and a still more remarkable request was appended to it,—that he would forward the definition signed by himself to the five patriarchal sees of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; which we are told expressly was done (Mansi, *ib.* 681–4). In conclusion, a letter was despatched to the pope in the name of the council, informing him that he would receive a copy of its acts through his legates, and begging that he would confirm them in his reply. The emperor on his part exhorted all to receive them in a special edict; and as he had promised, addressed a letter in his own name to the Roman synod, dated Dec. 23, A.D. 681—Agatho dying, according to Cave, Dec. 1—and another to Leo II., soon after his accession, the year following, bespeaking their acceptance. This the new pope granted without hesitation in the fullest manner, even to the condemnation of Honorius as having betrayed the faith; all which he repeated to the bishops of Spain in sending them a Latin translation of the acts of this council (Mansi, *ib.* 1049–53). Solely from hence the genuineness of both epistles has been denied (comp. Mr. Renouf's *Pope Honorius*; Professor Botalla's reply to it; and Mr. R.'s rejoinder), and even the integrity of the acts of the council themselves in their present state was once questioned (Pagi ad Baron., A.D. 681, n. 9–12). Two versions of them are given by Mansi (xi. 189–922); in both the arrangement of the concluding documents is chronologically defective. It is admitted on all hands that no canons were passed. Several anecdotes of this council found their way into the West. Bede tells us, for instance (*De Temp. Rat.* A.D. 688), that such was the honour accorded there to the legates or Agatho that one of them, the bishop of Porto, celebrated the Eucharist in Latin on Low-Sunday, in the church of St. Sophia, before the emperor and patriarch. Cardinal Humbert asserts it was then explained to the emperor that unleavened bread was enjoined by the Latin rite (*ap. Canis. Thes.* p. 318). But the two striking incidents of this council were: 1. The arrangement of the “bishops subject to Rome,” and those “subject to Constantinople” on opposite sides; and, 2. The anathemas passed on pope and patriarch alike. Coming events are said to cast their shadows before them.

(35) A.D. 691, as Pagi shows (ad Baron. A.D. 692 n. 3–7) from the emended reading of the date given in its 3rd canon and rightly interpreted, in or not earlier than September. The fathers composing it, in their address to the emperor Justinian II. or Rhinotmetus, as he was afterwards surnamed from what befel him, say that they had met at his bidding to pass some canons that had long been needed, owing to the omission of the 5th and 6th councils, contrary to the precedent of the four first to pass any, whence this council has been commonly styled the quini-sext, or a supplement to both. It is indeed best known as the Trullan, from the hall



of the palace in which it was held, although the 6th council had met there no less. The number of bishops subscribing to its canons was 213, of whom 43 had been present at the 6th council (Mansi xi. 927); and at their head, instead of after them as at the 6th council, the emperor, who signs however differently from the rest, as accepting and assenting to merely what had been defined by them. A blank is left immediately after his name for that of the pope, showing clearly that the pope was not represented there; and blanks are subsequently left for the bishops of Thessalonica, Heraclea, Sardinia, Ravenna, and Corinth, who might, had they been present, have been supposed acting for him: Basil, indeed, bishop of Gortyna in Crete, is set down as subscribing on behalf of the whole synod of the Roman church; but then he is similarly set down among the subscriptions to the 6th council, not having been one of the three deputies sent thither from Rome (*ib.* pp. 642 and 70), and afterwards in the letter addressed to Agatho by the council, only signing for himself and his own synod (*ib.* p. 690). Hence there seems little ground for supposing him to have represented Rome there in any sense, though Pagi and others are willing to believe he may have been acting as apocrisarius at the time of the council (*ad Baron. ib.* n. 9-13). Certainly, Anastasius, in his life of Sergius I., who was then Pope, says that the legates of the apostolic see were present, and deluded into subscribing; but there is nothing else in the subscriptions to confirm this; and of the acts nothing further has been preserved. Great controversy prevails as to the extent to which this council has been received in the West: Oecumenical it has never been accounted there, in spite of its own claim to be so: and when its 102 canons were sent in six tomes to Sergius, himself a native of Antioch, for subscription, he said he would die sooner than assent to the erroneous innovations which they contained. John VII., the next pope but one, was requested by the emperor to confirm all that he could, and reject the rest; but he sent back the tomes untouched—Lupus (*Diss. de Syn. Trull., op. Tom.* iii. 168-73), whom Pagi (A.D. 710, n. 2) follows is of opinion that Constantine was the first pope to confirm any of them: but this is inferred solely from the honourable reception given to him at Constantinople by Justinian, which may have been dictated by other motives. What Adrian I. says in his epistle to St. Tarasius, read out at the 7th council, is explicit enough: "I too receive the same six holy councils with all the rules constitutionally and divinely promulgated by them; among which is contained" what turns out to be the 82nd of these canons, for he quotes it at full length. And the first canon of the 7th council confirmed by him is substantially to the same effect.

But the exact truth is probably told by Anastasius, the librarian, in the preface to his translation of the acts of the 7th council dedicated to John VIII., whom he credits with having accepted all the apostolical canons under the same reserve. "At the 7th council," he says, "the principal see so far admits the rules said by the Greeks to have been framed at the 6th council, as to reject in the same breath whichever of them should prove to be opposed to former canons, or the decrees of its own holy pontiffs,

or to good manners." All of them, indeed, he contends had been unknown to the Latins entirely till then, never having been translated: neither were they to be found even in the archives of the other patriarchal sees, where Greek was spoken, none of whose occupants had been present to concur or assist in their promulgation, although the Greeks attributed their promulgation to those fathers who formed the 6th council, a statement for which he avers they were unable to bring any decisive proof. This shows how little he liked these canons himself: nor can it be denied that some of them were dictated by a spirit hostile to the West. The 3rd and 13th, for instance, deliberately propose to alter what had been the law and practice of the Roman church for upwards of 300 years respecting those who became presbyters, deacons, or sub-deacons, as married men: and make the rule substituted for it in each case binding upon all. The 55th on the authority of one of the apostolical canons not received by Rome, interdicts the custom of fasting on Saturdays which had prevailed in the Roman church from time immemorial. And the 56th lays down a rule to be kept by all churches in observing the Lenten fast. Canons 32, 33, and 99 are specially levelled against the Armenians. Of the rest, canon 1 confirms the doctrine of the 6th general council preceding, and insists in the strongest terms upon its unalterableness. Canon 2 renews all the canons confirmed by them, with the Sardican and African in addition, besides the canons of SS. Dionysius and Peter of Alexandria; of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, St. Athanasius, St. Basil, and St. Gregory Nyssen; the canonical answers of Timothy with the canons of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria and two canonical letters of St. Cyril: the canon of Scripture by St. Gregory Nazianzen, and another by St. Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium in Lycaonia, with a circular of Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople, against simoniacal ordinations. In conclusion, it receives all the apostolical canons, eighty-five in number, though at that time but fifty were received in the Roman church, as we learn from Anastasius, but rejects the apostolical constitutions as having been interpolated, and containing many spurious things. By this canon accordingly the code of the Eastern church was authoratively settled, apart of course from the 102 canons now added to it, which were formally received themselves, as we have seen, by the 2nd Council of Nicaea, and reckoned ever afterwards as the canons of the 6th council. As such they are quoted by Photius in his *Syntagma canonum*, and his *Nomocanon* (Migne's *Pat. Gr.* civ. 431-1218), and continue to be quoted still (*Orthodox and Non-Jurors*, by Rev. G. Williams, p. 74). Their general character is thoroughly Oriental, but without disparagement to their practical value (Mansi, xi. 921-1024, and xii. 47-56; Bever. II. 126-64).

(36) A.D. 712, in the short-lived reign of Philippicus or Bardanes, and under the Monothelite patriarch of his appointment, John VI.; at which the 6th council was repudiated and condemned. The copy of its acts belonging to the palace was likewise burnt by his order, as we learn from the deacon who transcribed them; and the picture of it that hung there, removed. On the death of the tyrant indeed John addressed

a letter to Pope Constantine to apologise for what had been done; but its tone is not assuring. He testifies, however, to the authentic tomes of the 6th council being safe still in his archives (Mansi, xii. 187-208); and Pagi can see some excuse for his conduct (ad Baron. A.D. 712, n. 2-6).

(87) A.D. 715, Aug. 11, at which the translation of St. Germanus from the see of Cyricus to that of Constantinople was authorised. He had been a party to the Monothelite synod under John three years before; but immediately after his translation he held a synod—most probably this one continued—in which he condemned Monothelism (Mansi, xii. 255-8).

(88) A.D. 730, or rather a meeting in the imperial palace, at which the Emperor Leo III., better known as the Isaurian, called upon St. Germanus the aged patriarch to declare for the demolition of images, which he had just ordered himself in a second edict against them. The patriarch replied by resigning his pall (Mansi, xii. 269-70, and Pagi, ad Baron., A.D. 730, n. 1-4).

(89) A.D. 754, from Feb. 10 to Aug. 8, held by order of the Emperor Constantine Copronymus, and styling itself Oecumenical, or the 7th council, though its claim to both titles has since been set aside in favour of the second council of Nicaea, in which its decrees were reversed. Unfortunately, there is no record of its acts extant, but what is to be found in the 6th session of that council, where they were cited only to be condemned. As many as 338 bishops attended it, but the chief see represented there was that of Ephesus. Their proceedings are given in six tomes, as follows: 1. They deduce the origin of all creature-worship from the devil, to abolish which God sent His Son in the flesh; 2. Christianity being established, the devil, they say, was undone to bring about a combination between it and idolatry; but the emperors had opposed themselves to his designs. Already six councils had met, and the present one following in their steps declared all pictorial representations unlawful and subversive of the faith which they professed; 3. Two natures being united in Christ, no one picture or statue could represent Christ as He is, besides His only proper representation is in the Eucharistic sacrifice of His own institution; 4. There was no prayer in use for consecrating images, nor were representations of the saints to be tolerated any more than of Christ, for Holy Scripture was distinctly against both; 5. The fathers, beginning with St. Epiphanius, having been cited at some length to the same purpose, the council decreed unanimously that all likenesses of whatsoever colour and material were to be taken away, and utterly disused in Christian churches; 6. All clergy setting up or exhibiting reverence to images in church or at home were to be deposed; monks and laymen anathematised. Vessels and vestments belonging to the sanctuary were never to be turned to any purpose in connexion with them. A series of anathemas was directed against all who upheld them in any sense, or contravened the decrees of this council. St. Germanus, the late patriarch of Constantinople, George of Cyprus, and St. John of Damascus, or Mansur, as he was called by the Saracens, were specially denounced as image-worshippers. The usual acclamations to

the emperor followed. Before the council separated, Constantine the new patriarch was presented to it and approved. It was then sitting in the church of St. Mary, ad Blachernas, within the city; its earlier sittings had been held in a palace of the emperor, called Hieraeon, on the opposite shore (Mansi, xii. 575-8, and xiii. 203-356; Cave, i. 646-7). [E. S. F.]

CONSTANTINOPLE. (1) The birth (γενέθλια) of Constantinople is placed by the *Cal. Byzant.* on May 11. The dedication (ἐγκαίνια) is said to have been performed by the Holy Fathers of the 1st Council of Nicaea in the year 325.

(2) The Council of Constantinople is commemorated in the *Armenian Calendar* on Feb. 16. [C.]

CONTAKION (Κοντάκιον). A short ode or hymn which occurs in the Greek offices. The name has been variously derived. The explanation most generally received is that it signifies a short hymn, from the word κοντός, little; because it contains in a short space the praises of some saint or festival (Goar, not. 31 in off. Laud.). It has also been derived from κοντός, a dart or javelin; so that Contakion would mean an ejaculatory prayer, or a short pointed hymn after the model of an antiphon. Some, again, have considered the word to be a corruption of *Canticum*. Romaninus, a deacon of Emesa, who flourished about 500 A.D., is said to be the author of *Contakia*. They frequently occur in the canons and other parts of the office, and vary with the day. [CANON OF ODES.] In the list of the officials of the church of Constantinople we have ὁ ἄρχων τῶν κοντακίων, named among the offices appropriate to priests (τὰ ὁφείκια τοῖς ἱερεῦσι προσήκοντα).

The word "Contakion" is also used of the volume containing the liturgies of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and of the praesanctified alone, in distinction to the complete missal. In this sense the word is usually derived from κοντός, a dart, i.e. the wooden roll round which the MS. was rolled, "κοντάξ est parvus contus . . . . Inde et κοντάκιον, Scapus chartarum, vel volumen ad instar baculi" (Salmas. *Exerc. Plin.*). Goar, however, prefers the derivation from κονδύκιον, "quasi brevis codex." In the ordination of a priest, after the ceremonies of ordination are completed, the newly-ordained priest is directed to take his place among the other priests, ἀναγινώσκων τὸ κοντάκιον (i.e. his book of the liturgy). [H. J. H.]

CONTRA VOTUM. A formula frequent in epitaphs, expressing the regret of survivors at a loss suffered against their wishes and prayers. It is of pagan origin, and does not appear to have been adopted by Christians before the 5th century. The earliest example of the formula given by De Rossi is of the commencement of that century, and runs as follows: "PARENTIS POSVERUNT TETVLVM CONTRA VOTVM ET DOLO SVO." It is not confined, as has sometimes been supposed, to epitaphs placed by parents for their children; husbands use it of wives and wives of husbands, brothers and sisters of each other; and in fact it is very generally used to express the longing felt by the survivor for the departed. It is most common in Northern Italy. (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chret.* 175.) [C.]

CONTRACT OF MARRIAGE. This ex-

pression may be considered in two different senses, according as it refers to the agreement for marriage in the abstract, or, according to later continental usage, to its written evidence answering to our marriage settlement. We shall consider it separately under these two heads.

1. The law of the church on the subject of the contract of marriage is, as on many other points, compounded of the Jewish and Roman laws, under the influence of New Testament teaching. It is derived mainly, in its general features, from the latter system of legislation, especially in regard to the marriage of the laity; from the former mainly in regard to that of the clergy.

The validity of the marriage contract generally depends, it may be said, on two points, (1) the inherent capacity of the parties to enter into the contract; (2) the limitations which may be placed upon the exercise of that capacity.

1. Strictly speaking, the inherent capacity of the parties for marriage turns only upon three points, (a) sufficient age; (b) sufficient reason; (c) sufficient freedom of will. On the first point, it may be observed that the old Roman, like the old Jewish law, attached the capacity for marriage by age to the physical fact of puberty (*Inst.* bk. i. t. x. § 1); and the same principle is practically followed in all systems of legislation which take notice of age at all in this matter, although it is generally found convenient in the long run to fix an age of legal puberty, without reference to the specific fact. Thus already in the *Digest* it is provided that the marriage contract is only valid on the part of the wife when she has completed her 12th year, even though she be already married and living with her husband (bk. xxiii. t. ii. l. 4). And Justinian himself in his *Institutes* professes to have fixed, on grounds of decency, the age of puberty for the male at 14 (bk. i. t. xxii.); both which periods have very generally been adopted in modern legislation.

Strange as it may seem, the earlier Roman legislation seems to have even fixed an age beyond which a woman could not marry, since we find Justinian in the *Code* abolishing all prohibitions of the *Lex Julia vel Papia* against marriages between men and women above or below 60 and 50 (*Code*, bk. v. t. iv. l. 27; and see bk. vi. t. lviii. l. 12). Nothing of this kind is to be found in later systems of legislation, although disparity of age in marriage, as we shall presently see, has sometimes been sought to be suppressed.

It may here be observed that physical incapacity in persons of full age has never been held to produce actual inability to enter into the marriage contract, but simply to render the marriage voidable when the fact is ascertained (see *Code*, bk. v. t. xvii. l. 10; Nov. 22, c. 6; Nov. 117, c. 12). Nor is the fact one of importance in reference to the marriage relation, except where divorce is put under restrictions (see *Dig.* bk. xxiv. t. i. ll. 60, 61, 62).

(b.) As respects the second point: Defect of reason, it may be said, in reference to the marriage contract, acts inversely to defect of age. Thus, under the Roman law, followed generally by modern legislation, madness was fatal to the validity of the contract, but did not dissolve it when afterward supervening (*Dig.* bk. xxxii. t. ii. l. 16, § 2; and see Jul. Paul. *Recept. Sent.* bk.

ii. t. xix. § 4). (c.) The freedom of will of the parties, on the other hand, can only be testified by their consent to the marriage [as to which see CONSENT]; but it may also be indirectly secured by limitations of a protective character placed on the exercise of the capacity to contract marriage, which will be considered presently. It may be sufficient here to observe that according to the jurists of the *Digest* a man might marry a woman by letters or by proxy if she were brought to his house, but this privilege did not belong to the woman (bk. xxiii. t. ii. l. 5; and see Jul. Paul. *Recept. Sent.* bk. ii. t. xix. § 5).

There was, moreover, one large class of persons in whom there was held to be no freedom of will, and, consequently, no capacity to contract marriage. It is important to insist on this point, since Gibbon in the second chapter of his great work speaks of the Romans as having "in their numerous families, and particularly in their country estates . . . encouraged the marriage of their slaves." A falser statement was probably never put forth by a historian, unless for marriage we read, in plain English, breeding. Marriage is simply impossible where the persons of slaves of both sexes are subject, absolutely without limit, to the lusts, natural or unnatural, of a master (see, for instance, Horace, *Sat.* i. 2, 116). The slave, his master's thing, can have no will but his master's; in respect of the civil law properly so-called, i. e. the law made for citizens, he does not exist; (Ulpian, *Dig.* bk. i. t. xvii. l. 32), or as the same jurist in his grand language elsewhere expresses it, his condition is almost equivalent to death itself (*ibid.* l. 209). Thus, according to the logic of the Roman law, connections between slaves obtain not so much as a mention by either the jurists of the *Digest*, or the Emperors in the constitutions of the *Code*. Connections between slaves and serfs, i. e. the so-called *adscriptitii glebæ*, are indeed mentioned (*Code*, bk. xi. t. xlvii. c. 21), but without the name of marriage, and only to determine the condition of the offspring, which is fixed by that of the mother. *Rustici*, a class of peasants who seem to have been of higher status than the *adscriptitii*, could contract marriage *inter se*, and the 157th Novel is directed against the landowners of Mesopotamia and Osrhoene, who sought to forbid their peasants to marry out of their own estates, and if they did so, were in the habit of breaking up their marriages and families.

Wherever, therefore, we find slaves' marriages mentioned, we must seek another origin for the recognition of them than in the Roman law. That origin seems unquestionably to be in the Jewish law. Although only "Hebrew" servants are mentioned in the passage of Exodus on this subject (c. xxi. vv. 3, 4, 5, 6), it is clear that the Pentateuch recognized the marriage of persons in a servile condition. And with the sweeping away by the Christian dispensation of all distinction between Jew and Gentile it is but natural to suppose that the right of marriage would be extended from the Hebrew slave to the whole slave class. Such right, indeed, was not absolute, as will have been observed, but flowed from the master's will, and was subject to his rights. The master gave a wife to his slave; the wife and her children remained his, even when the slave himself obtained his freedom.

The Barbarian Codes do not materially vary from the Roman as respects the marriage contract, so far as respects the conditions of age and reason. It is clear, however, that, in Italy, especially under the Lombards, and under the Visigoths of Spain, habits of early marriage prevailed which had to be checked by law. A law of King Luitprand, A.D. 724, enacts that girls shall only be marriageable at the expiration of their 12th year (bk. vi. c. 59). An earlier law of the same king, A.D. 717, has been already referred to under the head BETROTHAL (bk. ii. c. 6). Although 18 was fixed as the age of majority for male infants, yet they might before this age contract either betrothal or marriage, and had full power of settling property (bk. vi. c. 64; A.D. 724). A Lombard capitulary of Charlemagne's (A.D. 779) prohibits generally the marrying of a boy or girl under the age of puberty, where there is disparity of age, but allows them to marry when of equal age and consenting (c. 145). The same prohibition is contained in the Capitulary of Tessino (Pertz), A.D. 801, also added to the Lombard law.

The Visigothic law seems less equal towards the sexes. A law of King Chindaswinth (bk. iii. t. 4) forbids on the one hand women of full age from marrying males under age, but on the other enacts that girls under age are only to marry husbands of full age. It is not however clear whether the age referred to is that of puberty or general majority.

As respects the marriage of slaves, we find a formula on the subject among those collected by Mabillon (No. 44). They appear clearly to have been recognized both by the state and the church in the reign of Charlemagne, as will be presently shewn.

2. If we turn now to what we may term the extrinsic conditions of the capacity for marriage, in other words to the limitations placed upon the exercise of that capacity, we find these to have been very various. Some are purely or mainly moral ones; the leading one of this class, that of the amount of consanguinity which the law of different nations has held to be a bar to the validity of the nuptial contract, will be found treated of under the heads of COUSINS-GERMAN, MARRIAGE. Another—singular, because exactly opposite feelings on the subject have prevailed in different countries—is to be found in the prohibition by the later Roman law of marriages between ravishers and their victims, under severe penalties, both for the parties themselves, and the parents who consented to it (Justinian, *Cod.* b. ix. t. xiii. § 1, *Nov.* 143, 150).

A directly contrary rule prevailed under Theodoric in the Ostrogothic kingdom. The 59th chapter of his Edict compels the ravisher of a free-born woman, if of suitable fortune and noble birth, as well as single, to marry her, and to endow her with 1-5th of his property. The Lombard law does not seem to provide expressly for the case; but the "Lex Romana" of the Roman population in Italy must have followed it in its departure from the legislation of the emperors, where, after enacting death as the penalty of rape, it provides that if no accusation be brought for five years, "the marriage will afterwards be valid and its issue legitimate" (bk. ix. t. xviii.). Death was also the punishment of rape among the Franks; but Marculf's

*formulas* show that marriages between ravisher and ravished were allowed (bk. ii. f. 16). A Lombard capitulary of Charlemagne's, however A.D. 779, forbids a ravished bride to marry her ravisher, even if her betrothed refuses to take her back (c. 124). The law of the Alamans (t. lii.) is to the same effect. The Saxon law on the contrary (t. x.) requires the ravisher to "buy" the woman for 300 solidi.

It seems doubtful whether a canon of the Council of Ilberis in 305, bearing that "virgins who have not kept their virginity, if they have married and kept as husbands their violators," are to be admitted to communion after a year without penance, applies really to what we should term violation, or to seduction only. But at any rate the Visigothic law is severest of all the barbaric codes against marriages between ravishers and ravished. Whilst enacting that the ravisher with all his property is to be handed over as a slave to the woman to whom he has done violence, and to receive 200 lashes publicly, it imposes the penalty of death on both if they intermarry, unless they should flee to the altar, when they are to be separated and given to the parents of the woman (bk. iii. t. iii. ll. 1, 2). Closely allied to these enactments is one of the Burgundian law, forbidding marriages between widows and their paramours (t. xlv.). It may perhaps be inferred from the above that the tendency of the barbarian races had originally been to favour such marriages, but that the influence of the opposite Roman feeling, kept up no doubt traditionally by the clergy, generally prevailed in the long run in the barbarian codes.

There were indeed certain moral enormities which in some legislations were made a bar to all subsequent marriage. By the Visigothic law, a freeman guilty of rape on a married woman, after receiving a hundred lashes, was to become slave to his victim, and never to marry again (bk. ii. t. iv. l. 14). But it is the Carolingian capitularies which apply most largely this kind of prohibition. By a capitulary of King Pepin at Vermerie, A.D. 753, if a man committed adultery with his step-daughter, with his step-mother, or with his wife's sister or cousin, neither could ever marry again (cc. 2, 10, 11, 12); nor a wife who had been dismissed by her husband for conspiring against his life (c. 5). The Capitulary of Compiègne, A.D. 757, extends the prohibition to a brother committing adultery with his sister-in-law, a father seducing his son's betrothed, and to their respective paramours (cc. 11, 13); to a man living in adultery with a mother and daughter, or with two sisters, but to the women, in such case, only if they were aware of the incestuous connexion (cc. 17, 18). A capitulary of the 7th book of the general collection forbids also a woman who has had connexion with two brothers ever to marry again (c. 381; and see bk. v. c. 168).

Another limitation on the marriage contract, which must be considered rather of a political nature, and which prevails more or less still in the military code of almost every modern nation, was that on the marriage of soldiers. Under the early Roman polity, marriage was absolutely forbidden to soldiers; but the Emperor Claudius allowed them the *jus connubii*, and it seems certain that there were married soldiers under Galba and Domitian (Mur. *Thes. Inscr.* i. p. 306; Gr



*Inscr. Antiq.* iii. p. 144). Severus seems however to have been the first to allow soldiers to live with their wives (*Herod.* iii. 229). The Philippi, on the other hand, seem to have restricted the *jus connubii* for soldiers to a first marriage (*Mur. Thes. Inscr.* i. 362). Under Justinian's Code, the marriage of soldiers and other persons in the *militia*, from the *caligatus miles* to the *protector*, was made free without solemnities of any sort, so long as the wife was free-born (*Constitution of Theodosius and Valentinian, Code*, bk. v. t. iv. l. 21). There having been no regular armies among the barbarian races, nothing answering to the prohibition is to be found in their codes.

We pass now to those restrictions on marriage which must be considered to be mainly of a protective character, and intended to secure the real freedom, as well as the wisdom of choice. To these, in the highest view of the subject, belong those which turn upon the consent of parents [see CONSENT]; although indeed this restriction seems generally to have had its historic origin in a much lower sphere of feeling,—that of the social dependence and slavery or quasi-slavery of children to their parents. Next come the interdictions placed by the Roman law on the marriage of guardians or curators, or their issue, with their female wards. This occupies a large space in the *Corpus Juris*; see *Dig.* bk. xxiii. t. ii. ll. 59, 60, 62, 64, 66, 67; *Code*, bk. v. t. vi.

Lastly come the interdictions on the marriage of officials within their jurisdictions, which, as Papinian remarks, are analogous in principle to those on the marriage of guardians with their wards (*Dig.* bk. xxiii. t. ii. l. 63). No official could marry (though he might betroth to himself) a wife born or domiciled within the province in which he held office, unless he had been betrothed to her before; and if he betrothed a woman, she could, after his giving up office, terminate the engagement, on returning the earnest-money; but he could give his daughters in marriage within the province (l. 38). The marriage of an official contracted against this interdiction seems to have been considered by Papinian absolutely void (l. 63).

Under the Code, a well-known constitution of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, A.D. 380, known by its title as "*Si rector Provinciae*" (referred to *supra* under ARRHAË), whilst depriving of all binding force betrothals between persons holding authority in any province, their kinsmen and dependents, and women of the province, allows the marriage nevertheless to be afterwards carried out with the consent of the betrothed women (bk. v. t. ii.). And a previous constitution of Gordian had provided that if the marriage were contracted against the law with the woman's consent, and after her husband laid down his office she remained of the same mind, the marriage became legal, and the issue legitimate (t. iv. l. 6). By another constitution, known as "*Si quacumque praeditus potestate*," a fine of 10 lbs. of gold was enacted against officials who should seek to coerce women into marriages, even though these should not be carried out (law of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, A.D. 380; *ib.* t. vii.).

We do not find anything answering to these provisions in the Barbarian Codes, but only in the work called the *Lex Romana* supposed to

have represented the personal law of the Romans under the Lombard kings. Here, in barbarous Latin, some of the provisions of the Code are reproduced, whilst others are widely departed from. For instance, in place of the protective provisions against the marriage of guardians with their wards, we have coarser ones providing against the seduction of wards by their guardians, under penalty of exile and confiscation (bk. ix. t. v.).

Another class of restrictions on marriage may be termed social ones, as depending chiefly on disparity of social condition. The most prominent disparity of condition in the whole ancient world, as it remains still in much of the modern world, was that between freeman and slave. According to the Roman law, there could be absolutely no marriage between the two, but only what was termed a *contubernium* (*Jul. Paul. Recept. Sent.* bk. ii. t. 19, § 3). Yet the sense of human equality was so strong, that a *senatus-consultum* had to be issued under the Emperor Claudius against the marriage of freewomen with slaves; reducing the former to slavery itself, if the act were done without the knowledge of the master,—to the condition of freedwomen if with his consent (*Tacitus, Ann.* bk. xii. c. 53; A.D. 53). Although this law does not appear in the *Corpus Juris*—perhaps because it might seem indirectly to recognize slaves' marriages—it is clear that neither under the Digest nor under the Code could there be any marriage between free and slave. "With slave-girls there can be no *connubium*," says a constitution of Constantine (bk. v. t. v. l. 3); "for from this *contubernium* slaves are born." It affords indeed a strange picture of the more than servile condition of the Roman municipal functionaries, even at this period of the Empire, that the avowed object of the constitution which opens with this enunciation of a principle, is to prevent decurions, through the passions of slave girls, finding a refuge in the bosom of the most powerful families. The secret marriage of a decurion with a slave was to be punished by sending the woman to the mines, the decurion himself to exile on some island, whilst his property passed, as if he were dead, to his family, or in default of such to the city of which he was a curial; local officials who were privy to the offence, or left it unpunished, were in like manner to be sent to the mines. If it took place in the country, by permission of the girl's master, the estate where it occurred, with all slaves and live and dead stock, was to be confiscated; if in a city the master forfeited the half of all his goods. That decurions, however, were not the only persons likely to marry slaves is evident from a constitution of Valentinian and Marcian, A.D. 428 (*ib.* l. 7), which enumerates "the slave-girl, the daughter of a slave-girl," first amongst those persons whom senators may not marry.

If any man married a slave, believing her to be free, the marriage was void *ab initio* (22nd Nov. c. 10). But if a master married his slave girl to a freeman, or constituted a *dos* upon her, which was considered to be the privilege of the free, a constitution of Justinian's enacted that this should not only enfranchise her, but confer on her the rights of Roman citizenship (*Code*, bk. vii. t. vi. l. 9). In the 22nd Novel (c. 11) the same emperor went further still and enacted,

that when a master either himself gave away his slave-girl in marriage, whether with or without dotal instruments, or knowingly allowed another to give her away, as a freewoman, to a man ignorant of her condition, this should amount to a tacit enfranchisement, and the marriage should be valid; and again (c. 12), *a fortiori*, that if a master had long deserted either a male or female slave in a state of bodily weakness (*lanquentes*), or shown no care to preserve his rights over them, they, as derelicts, resuming possession of themselves, were no longer to be troubled by him, so that the marriages of such as free men or women would be lawful. Finally, the 78th Novel provided that where a man had had children by his slave-girl, and constituted a *dos* upon her (which had the effect of marriage), this of itself had the effect of manumitting the issue born in slavery, and rendering them *liberi*, and no longer merely *filii*, to the father (c. 4).

Closely analogous to the condition of the slave was that of the *adscriptitius glebae*. The marriage of a freeman with an *adscriptitia* does not however seem to have been void, but the children retained their mother's condition. On the other hand, the marriage of a freewoman with an *adscriptitius* was declared to be absolutely void; they were to be separated, and the man punished (*Code*, bk. xi. t. xlvii. l. 24; 22nd Nov. c. 17; but see 54th Nov. preface). Nor do we find the same mitigations of the law in favour of an *adscriptitia* as of a slave (*supra*). As respects the next higher class, that of the *rustici*, we find that whilst marriages between them and free persons seem to have been recognized, the issue of such marriages was divided in point of condition, the first, third, fifth child, &c., following that of the mother ("quod impar est, habebit venter," 156th Novel).

The Barbarian Codes deal more frequently with the subject of these marriages, and in some of them we trace distinctly the threefold condition of freeman, serf or villain, and slave, the second becoming more and more superior to the third. The intermarriage of man or woman belonging to either of the first two classes involves, under the Lombard laws (A.D. 638) of Rotharis (c. 218), and Luitprand (A.D. 721) (bk. iv. c. 6), penalties of greater or less severity. In the *Lex Romana*, supposed to represent the personal law of the Roman population in Italy in Lombard times, we find a provision, that if a freewoman marries her own slave, she shall be put to death and the slave burnt alive (bk. ix. t. vi.).

Similar provisions are found in the Alamannic law (circ. A.D. 750) (c. 2, and foll.), in the Bavarian (Append. *de popul. leg.* c. 9) and the Frisian (t. xviii.), while the Visigothic is yet more cruelly severe, condemning all such unions, according to their varying circumstances, to the penalties of loss of freedom, scourging, death by burning (bk. iii. t. ii. c. 2).

Finally, a law of King Gaba is addressed to what seems to have been a peculiar form of semi-slavery in the service of the Church. Its title is, "That those who are enfranchised, retaining service to the Church, should not dare approach the marriage of free persons." It enacts that a church-slave absolutely freed may marry a freewoman; but if still bound to the *obsequium*, he is to receive three stripes and be separated from his wife; otherwise both are to be in slavery with

their issue, the property of the freewoman going to her heirs. And the same rule is enacted as to such women marrying freemen (bk. iv. c. 7).

Notwithstanding the harshness of many of the above enactments, it must be inferred from them that marriages between free and slaves were increasing in frequency. Indirectly, moreover, those which provide that a freewoman choosing to remain with her slave-husband becomes a slave herself, seem to imply, like the *senatus-consult* under Claudius before quoted, which was not admitted into the *Code*, a recognition of marriages between slaves, since the mere living with a slave would not (except under the Visigothic law) affect the condition of the freewoman. There is moreover evidence that, even in the latter class of cases, custom was often milder than the law. Marculf's *Formularies*, which are considered to have been put together about A.D. 660, contain a "charta de agnatione, si servus ingenuam trahit," by which a mistress grants the freedom of a freewoman's children by her slave (f. 29; and see Appendix, f. 18). The ultimate relaxations of the law itself under the Carolingians will be best treated of in connexion with the ecclesiastical history of the subject.

Vast as was the gap between free and slave in the ancient world, that between the free-born and the freed was still considerable,—especially as between male slaves enfranchised and their former mistresses, or the female relatives of a former master. According to the jurist Paul, a freedman aspiring to marriage with his *patrona*, or the wife or daughter of his *patronus*, was, according to the dignity of the person, to be punished either by being sent to the mines, or put upon public works (*Jul. Paul. Recept. Sentent.* bk. ii. t. xix. § 6); unless indeed the condition of the *patrona* was so low as to make such a marriage suitable for her (*Dig.* bk. xxiii. t. ii. l. 13). On the other hand, the *Lex Papia* allowed all freeborn males, except senators and their children (in which case the marriage was void), to marry freedwomen (ib. l. 23), from which class seem however to have been excepted those of brothel-keepers, probably as presumably being prostitutes themselves (*Ulpian's Fragments*, t. xiii. § 27). The marriage of a master with his freedwoman was by no means looked upon in the same light as that of a mistress with her freedman; and the *patronus* was restrained from marrying his freedwoman without her will (ib. l. 28).

The social restrictions on marriage were, in this as in other respects, relaxed by the later emperors. The marriage to a freedwoman of a man who afterwards became a senator was declared by Justinian to remain valid, as well as that of a private person's daughter to a freedman, when her father was raised to the senate (*Code*, bk. v. t. iv. l. 28). He removed the disability to marriage which seems to have been considered to exist between a man and a girl whom he had brought up (*alumna*) and enfranchised (l. 26). And by the 78th Novel he allowed persons "of whatever dignity" to marry freedwomen, provided "nuptial documents" were drawn up (c. 3).

There were moreover certain conditions of life which were assimilated by their ignominy to the servile one. A free-born man could not marry a procuress, a woman taken in adultery, one con-

damned by public judgment, or a stage-player; nor, according to Mauricianus, one condemned by the senate (Ulpian's *Fragments*, t. xiii.). A senator was subject to the same restrictions (*Dig.* bk. xxiii. t. ii. l. 44, § 8; and see l. 43, §§ 10, 12); the *Lex Julia et Papia* imposing, moreover, a special prohibition on the marriage of either senators or their issue with stage-players or the children of such (l. 44). Under Valentinian and Marcian, A.D. 454, the "low and abject" women who were forbidden to marry senators were declared to be slaves and their daughters, freedwomen and their daughters, players and their daughters, tavern-keepers and their daughters, the daughters of *lenones* and gladiators, and women who had publicly kept shops (*Code*, bk. v. t. v. l. 7). If indeed a senator's daughter should prostitute herself, go on the stage, or be condemned by public judgment, her dignity being lost, she might marry a freedman with impunity (*Dig.* bk. xxiii. t. ii. l. 47).

Thanks, no doubt, to Theodora's influence, much greater indulgence was shewn under Justinian to actresses. Such women, if they had left their calling and led a respectable life, were enabled to intermarry with persons of any rank, and their children were relieved from disabilities (bk. v. t. iv. l. 27, § 1). By another constitution (l. 29), women who had been forced to mount the stage, or who wished to abandon it, were rendered capable of marrying persons of the highest rank, without the imperial permission.

The jurists of the *Digest* had however gone beyond all specific restrictions on marriage. Modestinus had laid down that "in marriages one should not only consider what is lawful, but what is honourable." And generally there seems to have grown up a feeling against unequal marriages, such as is indicated in a before-quoted constitution of Valentinian and Marcian (*Code*, bk. v. t. v. l. 7; A.D. 454), which provides that "a woman is not to be deemed vile or abject who, although poor, is of free descent;" and declares lawful the marriage of such persons, however poor, with senators or persons of the highest rank. And as it seemed to have been inferred, from a constitution of Theodosius and Valentinian, A.D. 418, which abolished the necessity for all formalities between persons of equal condition (*Code*, bk. v. t. iv. l. 22), that without dotal instruments such marriages between persons of unequal condition were not valid, Justinian abolished all restrictions on unequal marriages, provided the wife were free and of free descent, and there was no suspicion of incest or aught nefarious (l. 23, § 7).

We do not find much in the barbarian codes on this branch of the subject. The Roman law against the intermarriage of freedmen or their issue with the posterity of their patrons reappears in the Visigothic code (bk. v. t. vii. c. 17), the penalty being reinslavement. Among the Visigoths there seems to have been an old law forbidding the intermarriage of Goths and Romans, which was repealed by Rueswinth (*Lex Wisig.* bk. iii. t. i.), who allowed any freedman to marry any freewoman, "with the solemn consent of her family, and the permission of the court." The same law must have prevailed in Italy under the Lombards, though we miss it from the Lombard code, since the *Lex Romana*

forbids intermarriage between Romans and Barbarians under pain of death (bk. iii. t. xiv.). This restriction is however one rather of a political nature.

Lastly, certain restrictions on the marriage contract are of a religious character, and will be best referred to when we consider the rules of the Church itself upon the subject, which we shall now proceed to do.

That marriage generally was a civil contract, subject to the laws of the state, seems to have been the received doctrine of the early Church; whilst at the same time it claimed also power to regulate it in the spirit of the Gospel, as is shewn, for instance, in the strictness of our Lord and His apostles against divorce, although freely allowed both by the Jewish and the Roman law. Hence Pagan betrothals and marriages were, as Selden observes, held valid by the Christians (*Uxor Ebraica*, bk. ii. c. 24). The validity of non-Christian marriages seems to be implied in such passages as 1 Cor. vii. 12-16, referring to the cases of a convert husband and an unconverted wife, a convert wife and an unconverted husband; in the latter of which cases at least the form of marriage must be supposed to have been one unsanctified by the Church; whilst both would seem to include the hypothesis of a conversion of either party after such a marriage. It must moreover be observed that, with one exception, the forms of marriage in use in the Roman world were purely civil ones. The only religious marriage was that by *confarreatio*, which remarkably enough was indissoluble, except perhaps by *disfarreatio*, a practice of which the reality is doubted. But it is clear from Tacitus (*Ann.* bk. iv. c. 16) that by the time of Tiberius, i.e. the beginning of the Christian era, the use of the ceremony had become very rare. When therefore the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews wrote that "marriage is honourable in all" (c. xiii. 4), and his Epistle was admitted as authoritative in the Gentile as well as the Jewish churches, the inference is that the honour he speaks of was felt to rest as well on the ordinary civil contract of the Gentile as on any form in use among the Jews. Again, the Apostolical Constitutions (with an exception as to the clergy to be hereafter noticed) speak simply of "lawful" and "unlawful" marriage. Thus, in a sort of summary of the faith contained in the 6th book (c. 11), it is said: "Every union which is against the law we abhor as iniquitous and unholy." Again: "Marriage should be lawful; for such a marriage is blameless" (ib. c. 14); the expression "lawful connexion" (*νόμιμος μίξις*) occurring repeatedly in later constitutions (bk. vi. cc. 27, 29). The only consideration which may cast a doubt upon the application of the idea of "law" in such passages as the above, as referring to the municipal law, arises from the circumstance, to be presently adverted to, that the same expressions are used in reference to unions which were not recognized by the Roman law. But the most valuable testimony to the feeling of the early Church on this subject as late as the 2nd and 3rd centuries, is supplied by Tertullian (A.D. 150-226), a writer whose Christian zeal ran always in the direction of ultra-strictness. In his treatise on Idolatry, distinguishing between those solemnities which a

Christian man may lawfully attend and those which he may not, he enumerates; marriage among such as are free from "any breath of idolatry," "pure by themselves." "The conjugal union," he says, does not flow "from the worship of any idol." "God no more forbids the solemnizing of marriages than the giving of a name" (c. 16).

As a rule, then, the Church has followed the municipal law in reference to the validity of the contract of marriage, and has thus not had occasion to dwell much in its legislation on the legal incidents of the contract. The validity of heathen marriage is implied in the judgments and decisions of various popes and councils (some perhaps antedated) as to pre-baptismal marriages, which, in spite of one or two weighty authorities to the contrary, were held binding, and on the express ground that the issue of such marriages were lawful (*liberi*). See the 2nd letter of Pope Innocent I., A.D. 402-17, to Victricius, c. 6; his 22nd letter, to the Macedonian bishops, c. 2; the 3rd Council of Rome, A.D. 531; and the letters of Leo to Anastasius and to the bishops of Illyricum. The alleged decree of Pope Fabian, A.D. 238-52, in Gratian, embodying the Roman law on the effect of madness on marriage, is a purely superfluous forgery. Ecgbert, archbishop of York, indeed, in the *Excerptions* attributed to him, seems to place the age of puberty somewhat later than the Roman law, since he says that a girl of 14 has power over her own body, a boy of 15 over his (bk. ii. c. 27). A canon of the Council of Friuli, A.D. 791 (c. 9), contains the like prohibition as a previous capitulary before referred to against marriages with children.

It has already been observed, under the head "CONSENT," that on one point indeed a marked divergence is to be traced between the practice of the Church and the Roman law. Slave-marriages are recognized, at least in the later portions of the Apostolical Constitutions. And masters who refused to sanction them were to be excommunicated (viii. 23). A free man, on the other hand, is to dismiss, not to marry, a slave-concubine with whom he may have lived. (*Ibid.*)

Consistent with the Apostolical Constitutions, the first canonical epistle of St. Basil (A.D. 326-379), to Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium, treats slave-marriages as adulterous when contracted without the master's will, but as "firm" when contracted with his consent; assimilating them to the marriages of minors, and using the same word (*κύριοι*) to express the authority both of the father and of the master. A work of doubtful character, which claims authorship from the Nicene fathers, the *Sanctiones et decreta alia*, which in the collection of councils by Labbé and Mansi will be found appended to the canons of the Council of Nicaea (vol. ii. p. 1029, and foll.), but which are evidently of much later date, declares that "marriage with slaves, male or female, is not allowed to Christians, unless after emancipation; which being done, let them contract by the law of marriage and freely, a *dos* being assigned, according to the constitution of the country which they inhabit" (bk. i. c. 4). One of the alleged canons of the Nicene council from the Arabic, on the other hand, implies the practice of intermarriage with slaves even

amongst the clergy, in condemning as bigamous those priests or deacons who having dismissed their wives, or even without dismissing them, marry others, whether free or slave (can. 66, or 71 of the Eulullensian version). But these canons are also evidently of much later date than that ascribed to them, though very likely representing the practice of the Arabian church. If we mention here two alleged decrees of Pope Julius I. A.D. 336-52, the one against separating slaves once married, the other allowing a master to marry his enfranchised slave-girl (Gratian, cc. 4, 10), it is only on account of their professed date.

There are indeed not wanting indications of a narrower spirit among the leaders of the Church. A letter of Pope Leo the Great (167), A.D. 458 or 9, addressed to Rusticus, bishop of Narbonne, seems to imply the nullity of slaves' marriages, and reproduces, on Old-Testament grounds, the strictest views of the Roman law against unequal marriage. "Every woman united to a man is not a wife, since neither is every son his father's heir. The bonds of marriage are lawful between the free and between equals; the Lord establishing this long before the commencement of the Roman law existed. Therefore a wife is one thing, a concubine another; as also a bondmaid is one thing, a freewoman another" (quoting Gen. xxi. 10). [CONCUBINES.] Suspicion is indeed cast upon this text by its use of the word *ingenuus*, free-born, as simply synonymous with *liber*, free, a mistake which never occurs in the *Code* or *Novels*, though nearly a century later in date, and (though it may be said that a pope was not bound to be strictly accurate in his law-language) it is not impossible that it may be a forgery of the Carolingian era, invented to support a capitulary to the same effect, to be presently noticed.

The 24th canon of the 4th Council of Orleans, A.D. 541, enacts that slaves fleeing to the precincts ("septa") of churches in order to marry are not to be allowed, nor are clerics to defend such unions, but they are to be returned to their masters and separated, unless their parents and masters will let them marry;—a remarkable enactment, as shewing a recognition of parental authority in a slave.

Another canon of the same Council, forbidding marriages between Jews and Christian slave-girls, seems to imply the intrinsic validity of marriages between free and slave (c. 31). Another is remarkable as repeating, with the severer penalty of excommunication, the enactments of the Roman law against the marriage of officials within their provinces (c. 22).

A case in which a slave-marriage is recognised occurs in a letter of Pope Pelagius (A.D. 555-66) to the sub-deacon Melleus. (Labbé and Mansi's *Councils*, vol. ix. p. 737.)

On the other hand, Gregory the Great implies the invalidity of a marriage between slave and free in a letter to Fortunatus, bishop of Naples (bk. vi. ep. 1), in favour of a woman whom her husband had dismissed as being of servile condition; but who, being now proved free, was without delay to be received back by him. The same pope however in another letter—to Moz-tana and Thomas, slaves whom he enfranchised with the privileges of Roman citizenship—implies the practice of slave-marriages, since he speaks



of the "betrothal gifts" (*sponsalia*) which the priest Gaudiusus had given in writing (*conscripterat*) to "thy mother" (bk. v. ep. 12).

The 1st Council of Mâcon, A.D. 581, declares indissoluble the intermarriage of two slaves with their master's consent, after the enfranchisement of either (c. 10). The 30th canon of the English council held under Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury, towards the end of the 7th century, bears that "the free (or free-born) must marry with the free." Pope Stephen (A.D. 754) in his replies to various consultations at Biez, follows Leo as to the dismissal of the ancillas and marrying a free woman. It seems difficult to ascribe a specific origin to a prescription found among some "*excerpta de libris Romanorum et Francorum*," appended to a collection of fresh canons, probably of the beginning of the 8th century, which bears that "if any one chooses to have his slave-girl in marriage, and has power over his property, if afterwards he would sell her, he cannot do so; he is himself to be condemned, and the woman handed over to the priest" (c. 60). Perhaps however we have only here a far-off echo of Exod. xxi. 8, or Deut. xxi. 14.

The subject indeed both of slave-marriages and of intermarriage between slave and free seems to have been greatly considered under the Carolingians; and both the civil and ecclesiastical law (which indeed at this period blend almost undistinguishably together) settle down into the recognition of such marriages and intermarriages as binding under certain conditions. As respects the former, King Pepin's capitulary of Vermerie, A.D. 753, enacts that if a slave husband and wife have been separated by sale, "they are to be exhorted so to remain, if we cannot reunite them" (c. 19); a text at least strongly tending to the indissolubility of such unions. A more singular one provides that if a slave have his slave-girl for concubine, he may dismiss her and accept "his compeer, his master's slave-girl (*comparem suam ancillam domini sui accipere*); but it is better that he keep his own slave-girl" (c. 7). In both texts we see already visibly the hand of the Church endeavouring to restrain the abuses of slavery. It is moreover enacted that if a *cartellarius*—apparently a slave freed by charter—on receiving his freedom dismisses his slave partner to take another woman, he must leave the latter (c. 20). Fifty years later, the validity of slave marriages is again implied in some "*Capitulum misso cuidam data*" of the year 803, published by Pertz, and to be presently referred to. And ten years later still, a capitulary added in some *Codes* to the Lombard law (c. 5), as well as the 30th canon of the 2nd Council of Châlons (both of A.D. 813), enact the indissolubleness of slaves' marriages, even when belonging to different masters, provided their marriage be legal, and by the will of their masters. Lastly, to the Carolingian period should also perhaps be referred the two alleged decrees in Gratian of Pope Julius I. (*supra*). It is almost needless to dwell on the momentous influence of the change of view indicated by the above enactments on the condition of the slave. Evidently, from the moment a slave could lawfully marry, he was no longer a thing, but a person. It might almost be said that from this period slavery properly so called exists no longer within the Carolingian world: serfdom, or a condition of dependence,

it might be absolute, of one man on another, has replaced it.

As respects inter-marriages between slave and free, King Pepin's capitulary of Vermerie, of A.D. 753, enacts that where a free-man knowingly marries a slave-girl, he shall always after live with her (c. 13). The king does not even treat such marriages as absolutely void, when contracted in ignorance, allowing the free person to leave his or her slave-partner and marry another only if such slave cannot be redeemed (c. 6). The contemporary Council of Vermerie recognized the validity of marriage between a freewoman and a slave, when contracted knowingly on her part, on the ground that there should be one law to the man and to the woman, and that "we have all one Father in the heavens." The capitulary of Compiègne, 757, enacts that if a freewoman marries a slave, knowing him to be such, he shall have her whilst he lives (c. 8). On the other hand, "if a Frankish man has taken a woman and hopes that she is free," and afterwards finds that she is not, he may dismiss her and take another; and so of a woman (c. 5, otherwise 7).

The validity of such unions is also implied in an enactment, placing marriage with a free-man, a slave, or a cleric, on exactly the same footing (c. 4). Similarly, a Bavarian council at Dilgelfind, 772, enacted that where a slave married a woman of noble birth who was ignorant of his condition, she should leave him and be free (c. 10). The same rule was enacted in the case of a freeborn Bavarian woman marrying a serf of the Church ("*de popularibus legibus*," c. 9).

Among the specially religious restrictions which were sought to be placed on the marriage contract in the early ages of the Church, the one which would first claim our attention is that on the marriage of Christians with Gentiles, or eventually also with Jews and heretics. This however will not be specially treated of here. The next is that connected with the monkish profession, which must be distinguished from the early vow of virginity in the female sex, and from the institution of the Church-virgins. The vow of virginity, which for many centuries now has been considered an essential prerequisite of the monastic profession, was not so by any means in the early heroic days of monachism. St. Basil in the 4th century, after dwelling upon the profession of virginity by women, says expressly: "As to professions of men, we know nothing of them, except that if any have joined themselves to the monastic order, they appear, without word spoken, to have thereby adopted celibacy" (2nd *Can. Ep.* c. 19). In the 5th century however, Pope Leo the Great treats the marriage of monks as a punishable offence, but not apparently as void in itself. Writing to Rusticus, bishop of Narbonne, about A.D. 458 or 459, he places on the same footing the entering by monks into the *militia* (a term probably equivalent at this time to the service of the state, whether military or civil) and their marriage. Those who, leaving the monastic profession, turn to the *militia* or to marriage, are to purge themselves by the satisfaction of public penance; for although the *militia* may be innocent and marriage honourable, to have abandoned the better choice is a transgression (*Ep.* 167, c. 14). The con-

temporary Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, in like manner excommunicated alike the monk and the virgin devoted to God who enter into marriage, but allows the local bishop to shew indulgence (c. 16). And the ecclesiastical validity of a monk's marriage at the beginning of the 6th century is implied in the 21st canon of the 2nd Council of Orleans, A.D. 511, which enacts that a monk who marries shall be incapable of holding any ecclesiastical office. Later still in the East (A.D. 535), the 6th *Novel* only forbids marriage to monks who have received the clerical ordination, reducing them to the rank of private persons (c. 8). In the West, however, the 2nd Council of Tours, A.D. 567, not only distinctly prohibited the marriage of monks under penalty of excommunication, but invoked the aid of "the judge" to separate them from their wives, under penalty of excommunication for himself if he refused it (c. 15); an evident attempt to enforce by spiritual terrors what the state still refused to erect into law.

This is indeed the period when monks, at first mere laymen, were beginning to be viewed, in the West at least, as partaking of the clerical character. The Council of Arles in 554 had decreed that monasteries both of men and women should be subjected to episcopal jurisdiction. So far as this view prevailed (for we must not forget that the monks themselves long struggled against it), the prohibition of the marriage of monks will have been considered as implied in that of the marriage of clerics generally, though such marriages are sometimes specifically referred to. Towards the end of the century, the 6th General Council, the 3rd of Constantinople, in *Trullo*, A.D. 692, enacted that a monk who should marry was to be punished as a fornicator (c. 44). In the West, in the first part of the 8th century, Gregory the 2nd, A.D. 714-750, in his letter to Bishop Boniface, going further than any of his predecessors, would not allow those who as children have been shut up by their parents in monasteries after puberty to leave such monasteries and marry (*Ep.* 13, c. 7). The marriage of monks was again condemned by Pope Zacharias, A.D. 741-51, in his 7th letter, addressed to Pepin as mayor of the palace (c. 26). About the same period the canons "de remediis peccatorum" of Egbert, archbishop of York, place the monk on the same footing as to marriage with the priest or deacon; requiring one of such who takes a wife to be "deposed" in *conscientiâ populi*, i. e. apparently, with the full knowledge of the people (c. 7). It may be added that the Council of Constantinople in 814 in like manner excommunicated a monk who should marry, and required him against his will to be clothed in the monastic robe and shut up in the monastery (c. 35). All such prohibitions indeed bear witness to the existence of the practices which they denounce; and indeed a letter of Pope Hadrian II. (A.D. 772-95) to Charlemagne contains a complaint against the marriage of monks—apparently in Lombardy—and asks the emperor to punish them.

It is somewhat difficult for a long time to distinguish in reference to this subject, so far as women are concerned, the woman under vow of virginity or celibacy (as to whom see *DEVOTA*), and the nun (see heading *NUN*). In France, a general constitution of King Clothar I. A.D. 560,

forbids (c. 8) all persons to marry "*sanctimonialis*." Another of King Clothar II., A.D. 614, forbids any even "by our precept" to marry religious girls and widows, or nuns who have vowed themselves to God, as well those who dwell in their own houses as those who are placed in monasteries. That such marriages however occurred in Italy still, is apparent from a letter of Pope Gregory I. the Great (A.D. 590-603) to Bishop Januarius (bk. iii. ep. 24). Distinguishing between "veiled virgins" and nuns, he says that as respects women who have gone from monasteries to lay life and married, "Those who have exceeded against such women" (i. e. their husbands), "and are now suspended from communion, if penitent, may be readmitted." It is difficult in many instances to define how far the meaning of the terms "*sacrae*" or "*sacrae virgines*" is to be extended or restricted. By the 8th century, indeed, the church-virgin and the private *devota* seem for all practical purposes to have merged in the nun. Indeed the *Excerpta* of Egbert, archbishop of York, treat a private vow of celibacy by man or woman as "foolish and impossible," and its breach by marriage as only to be punished by three winters' fasting (bk. ii. c. 19). The 1st Council of Rome in 721, "against illicit marriages," expressly anathematizes one who marries "*monacham quam Dei ancillam appellamus*" (c. 3). The before-quoted *Excerpta* of Egbert contain the like anathema, using the expression "*monialem, quae Dei sponsa vocatur*" (bk. ii. c. 18); the parties are to be separated, and condemned to perpetual penance. Among the "answers" of Pope Stephen II. from Bierzy to "various consultations" (A.D. 754) is one, that it is "not lawful for a virgin who has consecrated herself to God, likewise for a monk, to marry:" either is to be excommunicated; but the bishop "may shew humanity and mercy" (c. 7). The Synod of Metz, in 753, includes marriages with a woman consecrated to God among incests (c. 1); as does also the Council of Calchuyth (i. e. Chelsea), A.D. 787, using the term "*sanctimonialis*" (c. 15). See also similar prohibitions against the marriage of nuns by the Bavarian Council of Dingelfind, A.D. 772 (c. 4); and by the Council of Friuli, A.D. 791 (c. 11), which requires girls and widows who have vowed virginity or continence, and have been "emancipated to God," if afterwards they marry, to be subjected "by secular judgment to fit bodily chastisement" before undergoing their spiritual punishment.

The prohibition against the marriage of monks and religious women by degrees found its way into the civil law of several of the barbarian kingdoms besides France. Among the laws of King Luitprand of Lombardy, A.D. 721, or later, we find one of this kind as to women, in which their position when they have assumed the religious habit is assimilated to that of girls betrothed under the civil law, whose marriage entails a penalty of 500 *solidi* (bk. v. c. 1). In the Visigothic code, a law of Recarede inflicts "on incestuous marriages and adulteries, or on sacred virgins and widows and penitents, defiled with lay vesture or marriage" the penalties of exile, separation, and forfeiture of property (bk. iii. t. v. c. 2).

By the time of the Carolingians, the civil and

ecclesiastical law almost wholly coalesce. King Pepin's capitulary of Soissons in 744 forbids marriage with holy women together with incestuous marriages and bigamy (c. 9). In the 6th book of the Capitularies we find one (c. 411) almost in the same terms with the law of Recarede above quoted, declaring that marriage with a virgin devoted to God, a person under the religious habit, or professing the continence of widowhood, is not a true marriage, and requiring the parties to be separated by either the priest or the judge, without even any accusation being lodged with him, the penalty being still perpetual exile. (Comp. also Capit. 414, 424, bk. vii. c. 338.) In the East, on the contrary, about the end of the 8th century, it is noted as one of the features of Constantine Copronymus' tyranny, that he compelled monks to marry.

We shall now deal, though we do not propose to do so at full length in this place, with the contract of marriage as respects the clergy properly so called. It need hardly be observed that, so far as such contract might be recognized as valid, all the restraints upon it in the case of laymen would apply also to clerics. Sometimes indeed these had to be specifically enacted. Thus the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, provided that no cleric should take a heretic, Jew, or pagan, to wife, unless he should promise to convert her, under pain of canonical punishment (c. 14). But the Church had also restraints of its own in the latter instance. We have said that, as respects the clergy, the practice of the Church in respect to marriage was mainly founded on the Jewish law. The marriage of priests was by the Pentateuch surrounded with peculiar restrictions. The priest was not to marry a harlot or "profane" woman, or one divorced, or a widow, but a virgin only (Lev. xxi. 7, 13, 14). [According to Selden, indeed, the prohibition to take a widow or person who had lost her virginity only applied to the high-priest; but he was also held debarred from marriage with proselytes or freedwomen; *Uxor Hebraica*, bk. i. c. 7.] The Pastoral Epistles, in requiring bishops or deacons to be "husbands of one wife" (1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6), instead of being considered as substituting a new rule for existing Jewish prescriptions, seem only to have been viewed as adding to these a further one against DIGAMY. What will have to be said on this latter head need not here be anticipated. As a rule, however, we may say that wherever it is laid down that the bishop or deacon shall be the husband of one wife, it is also provided that such wife shall answer to the Levitical prescriptions. *E.g.* The *Apostolical Constitutions*, bk. ii. c. 2, require the bishop not only to be the husband of one woman once married, but to have, or to have had, a "respectable (*σεμνή*) and faithful wife;" in the 6th bk. c. 17 (a later constitution), both requires all the clergy to be monogamists, and forbids them all to marry either a harlot (the term seems rather too strong as a translation of the Greek *ἐταίρα*, albeit rendered *meretrix* in the Latin versions), a slave, a widow, or a divorced woman, "as the law also saith;" although the Pentateuch does not forbid the priest's marriage with a slave, and the restriction is one evidently borrowed from the Roman law. Lastly, the *Apostolical Canons* exclude from admission to the clergy those who have married "a widow, or divorced person, or

harlot, or slave, or one of those on the stage" (c. 14, otherwise reckoned 17 or 18); this last restriction being also adopted from the Roman law, as has been shewn already.

In respect of the marriage of the clergy indeed, the restraint which occupies most space in the church legislation of the period which occupies us is that on digamous or quasi-digamous marriages, which will be considered under the head of DIGAMY. Meanwhile however there was growing up a feeling against all marriage of the clergy whilst in orders, tending to their absolute celibacy, the history of which has been treated of under that head. [See CELIBACY.] The notices which occur of other restraints upon clerical marriages are comparatively few and unimportant.

The "Sanctions and Decrees" attributed to the Nicene fathers—which, though extant in Latin, seem evidently to embody Greek practice, though no doubt of a much later date than the one ascribed to them—require, with something of a plethora of words, the priest not to be one who has married a slave-girl, an adulteress or immodest woman (c. 14). The Council of Tarragona, A.D. 516, requires readers and *ostiarii* who wish to marry or live with adulterous women either to withdraw or to be held excluded from the clergy (c. 9). A letter of Gregory the Great (A.D. 590–603) to John, bishop of Palermo, implies the invalidity of a deacon's marriage with a woman who did not come to him a virgin (bk. xi. ep. 62). An alleged canon of the same Pope forbids the ordination, amongst others, of one who had married a harlot (c. 4). Yet the 4th Council of Toledo, A.D. 633, seems to imply that such marriages might be legalized by episcopal permission, since it excommunicates those clerks who, "without consulting their bishop, have married a widow, a divorced woman, or a harlot" (c. 44). And an "allocation of the priests to the people on unlawful marriages," appended to the records of the Council of Leptines in 743, provides that a *future* priest is not to marry a divorced woman, harlot, or widow.

To pass now from the ecclesiastical to the civil law, it must be observed that by the time of Justinian the Roman law professes only to follow the "sacred canons" as respects the marriage of the clergy, and gives force of law to the prohibitions contained in them. The children of clerics by women "to whom they cannot be united according to sacerdotal censures" are declared incapable of inheriting or receiving donations from their fathers (*Code*, bk. i. 7, iii. l. 45; A.D. 530). The 6th novel requires the bishop to be either a chaste unmarried man, or the husband of a woman who came to him a virgin, "not a widow, nor divorced, nor a concubine" (the last term apparently corresponding to the *ἐταίρα* of the *Apost. Constitutions*, and indicating a milder interpretation than that of the Latin translators); but requires the bishop not to live with his wife, and without inquiring into the position of those who have been already long married, forbids in future the episcopal ordination of married men. Taken in conjunction with this enactment, the 123rd novel may be considered as finally establishing as a rule of civil law that principle of episcopal celibacy, which still obtains in the Greek church. The same rules are substantially applied to the rest of the clergy (c. v.). The 123rd Novel forbids

the ordaining of a bishop who either does not live chastely, or has not had a "wife, his only and first, neither a widow, nor divorced from her husband, nor otherwise forbidden by the laws or the sacred canons" (c. l.). Other clerics may be ordained having a legitimate wife of the same description (c. xlii.). And the reader contracting a second marriage, or marrying any other than such a wife as above described, was not to rise to any higher office (c. xiv.). It hardly appears, however, that up to this period the contract of marriage itself was made void if entered into against the prohibitions of the law; unless the declaring their children bastards (*spurii*) may be taken to imply this (Code, bk. l. 7; li. l. 45). Among the barbarian codes, the only one which appears to prohibit clerical marriage is that of the Visigoths, drawn up under clerical influence. A law of Recaredo forbids the marriage or adultery of a priest, deacon, or sub-deacon, with a "widow vowed to God, a penitent, or any secular virgin or woman," under pain of separation and punishment according to the canon, the woman to receive 100 lashes (bk. ii. 7; iv. c. 18). Nor is it amiss to remark that in spite of various attempts by councils to enforce the absolute celibacy of the clergy, the validity of clerical marriage is recognized by the civil law under Charlemagne himself. In a capitulary, "De regulis clericorum" (bk. vii. c. 652), it is enacted that clerics "should also endeavour to preserve perpetually the chastity of an unspotted body, or certainly to be united in the bond of a single marriage."

II. We have now to say a few words on the subject of the contract of marriage in the sense in which the expression is still used in France ("contrat de mariage" = marriage settlement), of the written evidence of the contract itself as between the parties.

The marriage contract among the Romans was habitually certified in writing on waxen tablets, termed *nuptiales tabulae*, which, however, might also be used after marriage; e. g., on the birth of a child. The *tabulae* were signed both by the parties and by witnesses (Tac. Ann. bk. xi. c. 27; Juv. Sat. ii. v. 119; ix. vv. 75, 76), and the breaking of them was held to be at least a symbol of the dissolution of marriage, if it had not the actual effect of dissolving it; see Tacitus as to the bigamous marriage between Messalina and Silius (Ann. bk. xi. c. 30; and Juv. u. s.). Under the Code however, by a constitution of the Emperor Probus, the drawing up of such *tabulae* was enacted not to be necessary to establish the validity of the marriage, or the father's *patria potestas* over his offspring (bk. v. t. iv. l. 9). They were perhaps not necessarily, though usually, identical with the "dotal tablets" (*tabulae dotales*), "dotal instruments" (*instrumenta dotalia*), or "dotal documents" (*documenta dotalia*), specifically so-called (the expressions *nuptiales instrumenta*, *dotalia instrumenta*, seem to be used quite synonymously in the 70th Novel), but must have been comprised with them at least under the general terms *instrumenta* or *documenta*; as to which it is provided, by a constitution of Diocletian and Maximian (Code, bk. v. 7; iv. 7, iv. l. 13), that where there is no marriage, "instruments" made to prove marriage are invalid, but that where there are none, a marriage lawfully contracted is not void; nor

could the want of signature to such by the father invalidate his consent (ib. l. 3; law of Severus and Antonine). Nuptial instruments were by Justinian made necessary in the case of the marriage of acensors or stage-players (l. 39). Under the 74th novel, indeed, all persons occupying honourable offices, businessmen and professions, short of the highest functions in the state, were required, if they wished to marry without nuptial instruments, to appear in some "house of prayer and declare their intention before the *defensor Ecclesiae*," who in the presence of three or four of the clerks of the church was to draw up an attestation of the marriage, with names and dates, and this was then to be subscribed by the parties, the *defensor Ecclesiae* and the three others, or as many more as the parties wished, and if not required by them, to be laid up, so signed, by the *defensor* in the archives of the church, i. e. where the holy vases were kept; and without this the parties were not held to have come together *nuptiis affectu*. But this was only necessary where there was no document fixing a dowry or ante-nuptial donation; nor was it required as to agriculturalists, persons of mean condition, or common soldiers. It will be obvious that we have in the above the original of our marriage certificate. (See further ARTHUR, MARRIAGE.) [J. M. L.]

CONVERSAL. One of the many designations of monks. Just as, through a popular feeling of reverence for asceticism, the word "religio" came in the 3rd and 4th centuries to mean not Christianity but the life monastic, so "conversal," though applied also to those who embraced Christianity, or who took upon themselves any special obligations, as of celibacy or of ordination (Du Cange, s. v.), was ordinarily restricted to monks (Bened. Reg. c. 1; Fructuos. Reg. c. 13, Greg. M. Dial. ii. 18; Salv. Eccl. Cathol. iv.; Isidore De Conventu. cf. Bened. Anian. Conc. Reg. li.). But the "conversal" were properly those who became monks as adults, not those who were trained in a monastery from their tender years (Conc. Aurel. l. c. 2). About the 11th century, according to Mabillon, "conversal" came to mean the lay brothers, the "oblats" or "donati," the "frères convers," who from piety or for gain, or, probably, most often from mixed motives, attached themselves to monasteries, as "associates" (to use a modern phrase) and attended to the business of the monastery outside its wall. (Mab. Ann. iii. 8; Martene ad S. Bened. Reg. c. 3; Mab. Act. SS. O. S. B. Saec. III. l. 21). The "Conversal Barbat" are classed with monks rather than with the laity (Petr. Ven. Secret. 24). [L. G. S.]

COPE. (*Cappa* or *Cupa*; Fr. *Chape*.) From being used as an out-door dress for defence against rain, the cope was also called *Pluvialis*, whence It. *Piviale*; and from the cowl or hood with which it was furnished it was known as *Cuculla*. Such, probably, was the "cuculla villosa" spoken of by St. Benedict in his *Regula* (Migne, Patrol. lxxv. 777). "Vestimenta fratribus secundum locorum qualitatem . . . dentur. Mediocribus locus sufficere crudimus monachis per angulos cucullam et tunicaem; cucullam in hunc villosam, in arctate parum aut vestitam, et scapulare propter opera . . . Sufficit monacho duas tunicas et duas cucullas habere, propter



noctes et propter lavare ipsas res." So Smaragdus (†820) says expressly in his Commentary on the *Regula* of St. Benedict, apud Migne, *Patrol.* cii. "Cucullam dicit ille quod nos modo dicimus cappam." And to the same effect Theodemarus, writing from Italy to Charlemagne, and speaking of the dress worn by the monks of Monte Cassino (Ducange, in *voc.* Capa): "Illud indumentum, quod a Gallis monachis cuculla dicitur, nos capam vocamus." Like other garments originally designed for practical use rather than for ornament, the copes worn on occasions of state or by the higher clergy received greater enrichments from time to time, whether in regard of the materials or of accessory ornaments, particularly the "morse," or clasp by which they were fastened in front. From what we know to have been the shape of the cope in all later times we may infer that in the earlier period, up to 800 A.D., with which we are here primarily concerned, the cappa was shaped like a modern cloak, open in front, and attached only at the neck. For full details concerning the later copes of ecclesiastical use, see Bock, *Lit. Gew.* ii. 287; Rock, *Church of our Fathers*, ii. 23; Marriott, *Vestiarium Christianum*, p. 224; Pugin, *Glossary*, in *voc.* [W. B. M.]

**COPIATAE.** The name given by Constantine in the Theodosian Code, to certain Church officers whose business it was to take care of funerals and provide for the decent interment of the dead. The etymology of the name is doubtful—Gothofred derives it from *κωπάειν* to rest—others from *κωπεύς*, mourning: more generally, it is referred to *κώπος*, labour: whence they have sometimes been called *laborantes*. Another name for them is **FOSSARII**, or grave-diggers—and in Justinian's novels, they are mentioned as *lecticarii*—as carrying the corpse or bier at funerals. They are reckoned in the Theodosian Code among the inferior clerical orders, *c.g.* lib. 13. tit. 1. de Lustrali Collat. Leg. 1, "Clericos excipi tantum, qui Copiatae appellantur," &c.

The foundation of this Order is attributed to Constantine, before whose time the care of interring the dead was only a charitable office, for which every Christian made himself responsible as occasion required. The order of Copiatae, as first constituted by the emperor for this service in the city of Constantinople amounted to 1100 men, and from this example they probably took their rise in other populous cities. In Constantinople, however, they formed a collegium, with certain privileges and exemptions, which may not have been extended to the order in the less important Churches.

The office of the Copiatae was to take the whole care of funerals upon themselves, and to see that all persons had a decent and honourable interment. Especially they were obliged to perform this last office to the poorer sort, without charge to their relations. At Constantinople certain lands were set apart for their maintenance; but in other Churches it is more probable that they were supported partly out of the common funds of the Church, and partly by their own labour and traffic, which for their encouragement were generally exempted from paying custom or tribute (Bingham, B. iii. c. 8; Riddle; Martigny). [D. B.]

**COQUUS**, in the monastery. [HEBDOMA. DARIUS.]

**CORONA ECCLESIAE.** [ALMA.]

**CORDOVA, COUNCIL OF**, A.D. 348, under Hosius, to accept the determinations of the Council of Sardica (Labbe. *Conc.* ii. 98). [A. W. H.]

**CORN, ALLOWANCE OF.** This particular provision for the maintenance of the clergy deserves a special notice, from its connection with the early stages of the recognition of Christianity by the empire. Constantine, in his zeal for his new creed, ordered the magistrates of each province to supply an annual allowance of corn (*ἐρθρία σιτηρέσια*), not only to the clergy, but to the widows and virgins of the Church (Theodoret, i. 11). When Julian succeeded, he transferred the grant to the ministers of the heathen cultus which he revived (Sozom. v. 5; Philostorg. vii. 4). Jovian restored it, but on the lower scale of one-third of the amount fixed under Constantine. The payment continued, and was declared permanent by Justinian (*Cod.* i. tit. ii. de SS. Eccles.). [E. H. P.]

**CORN, EARS OF.** Corn is not so often used in early Christian art as might be supposed. [LOAVES.] The thoughts of early iconographers seem to have gone always to the Bread of Life with sacramental allusion, as Bottari, tav. clxiii. vol. iii. *et alibi*. In Bottari, vol. i. tav. xlviii., the corn and reaper are represented in a compartment of a vault in the cemetery of Pontianus. Again, in vol. ii. tav. lv., the harvest corn is opposed to the vine and cornucopia of fruit (Callixtine catacomb).

The more evidently religious use of the ears of corn is in various representations of the Fall of Man. On the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus (supp. A.D. 358), Bottari, vol. i. tav. xv. 9, Adam and Eve are carved; the former bearing the corn, in token of his labour on the earth, and the latter a lamb, indicating woman's work, spinning. The connection of this with Jack Cade's proverbial line, "When Adam delved and Eve span," seems probable. See again vol. ii. tav. lxxxix. Martigny gives a copy (s. v. "Dieu,") of a bas-relief in Bottari, vol. iii. tav. xxxvii., from the cemetery of St. Agnes, where two human forms, apparently both male, are standing before a sitting figure, whom Martigny supposes to represent the First Person of the Trinity. It may represent the offering of Cain and Abel; at all events the corn-ears and lamb are either being received or presented by the standing figures. See also Bottari, tavv. lxxxiv. lxxxvii. lxxxix. As these figures are of no more than mature (sometimes of youthful) appearance, the Second Person may be supposed to be intended by them.

[R. St. J. T.]

**CORNELIUS.** (1) The centurion, bishop of Caesarea, is commemorated Feb. 2 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi); Dec. 10 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(2) Pope, martyr at Rome under Decius, Sept. 14 (*Mart. Bedae, Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi). [C.]

**CORNU.** [ALTAR.]

**CORONA**, martyr in Syria, with VICTOR, under Antoninus, May 14 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Bedae, *Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi). [C.]

**CORONA.** [TONSURE.]

**CORONA LUCIS.** A lamp or chandelier. In the early ages of Christianity it was by no means unusual for sovereigns and other royal personages, following an instinct of natural piety of which we have examples in pre-Christian times (cf. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xvi. c. 4) to dedicate their crowns to the use of the Church. The gifts thus devoted were known as *Donaria*, and were suspended by chains attached to their upper rim, above an altar or shrine, or in some conspicuous part of the church. Other chains were attached to the lower rim, supporting a lamp, from which usually depended a jewelled cross. The crowned cross thus suspended above the altar was felt to be an appropriate symbol of the triumphs of Christianity, and its use became almost universal. We have several allusions to it in the writings of St. Paulinus of Nola in the fifth century, e.g.

"Crucem corona lucido cingit globo."

*Ep.* 23 ad Severum.

"Parva corona subest variis circumdata gemmis,  
Hæc quoque crux Domini tanquam diademate cincta  
Emicat."

*Nat.* xi. v. 679 sq.

"In cruce cunctarum sociæ compage coronæ."

*Id.* v. 682.


Beda (*de Locis Sanctis*, cap. 2) in his description of Calvary, specifies a large silver cross hanging above the Holy Grave, with a brass circlet and lamps "aenea rota cum lampadibus" attached to it. In this manner the crowns of Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, and of her second husband Agilulf, at the beginning of the 7th century, were dedicated to St. John the Baptist in the cathedral of Monza, as stated in the inscription borne by the latter before its destruction, and there is little reasonable doubt that the celebrated iron crown of Lombardy, preserved in the same cathedral, was at one time employed for the same purpose (Frisi, *Memor. della Chiesa Monzese*, Dissert. ii. p. 67; Paccaudi, *de Cult. Joann. Bapt.* Dissert. vi. cap. 10, p. 266). At a much earlier period, according to Constantine Porphyrogenitus and Nicetas, Constantine the Great had dedicated his crown to the service of the Church. In the time of these writers, a crown of remarkable beauty "præ cæteris et operis elegantia, et lapillorum pretio conspicua" (Ducange, *Constantinop. Christ.* iii. § 43), hanging with others above the Holy Table, was pointed out as having been offered to God by the first Christian emperor.\* With one of these votive crowns, the lamp and chains being removed, in the time of Const. Porphy., the new emperor of the East received his inauguration (Ducange, *Constant. Christ.* u. s.). According to the not very trustworthy catalogue preserved in Anastasius (*S. Sincet.* xxiv. § 36) the Lateran basilica and that of St. Peter's were also enriched by Constantine with large chandeliers of pure gold. Clovis also, at the suggestion of St. Remigius early in the 6th century, sent to St. Peter's "coronam auream cum gemmis, quæ Regnum appellari solet" (Hincmar, *Vit. S. Remig.*; Anastas. *S. Harmod.* liv. § 65). The very remarkable series of crowns discovered near Toledo (see below, CROWNS) were, as the inscriptions borne by some of them testify, a solemn offering

to some Spanish church, at the hands of the king and queen and royal family. No lamps were attached to them when they were discovered, but these appendages, as encumbrances of small value, may have been removed when the regalia were buried to conceal them from the Saracen spoiler.

This custom for sovereigns to dedicate their actual crowns to the Church's use led to the construction of imitative crowns, formed for votive purposes alone. Of this usage we find repeated notices in the *Liber Pontificalis*, which bears the name of Anastasius Bibliothecarius; as well as in ancient chronicles and documents. They are usually described as having been suspended over the altar, and very frequently mention is made of jewelled crosses appended to them. Small votive crowns of this nature are seen suspended over the altar in several ancient representations. One compartment of the celebrated *palaio* of the church of Sant' Ambrogio of Milan, which depicts the trance of St. Ambrose in which he celebrated mass at Tours, represents one such jewelled crown hanging over the altar at which



Female Crown from the "Palaio," St. Ambrogio, Milan.



Female Crown from the relief, Cathedral of Monza.

the saint is officiating (Ferrario, *Memorie di Sant' Ambrogio*). A bas-relief, now in the S. transept of Monza cathedral, representing a coronation, exhibits several crowns suspended over the altar. Another bas-relief in the tympanum of the west portal of the same cathedral, on which

\* Tradition ventured to assert that he had received it by the hands of an angel as a present from Heaven.

are carved the various gifts of Theodelinda to the church, shows us four crowns, three suspended, and the fourth being the calstrated iron crown. Macer in his *Historicon* refers to a similar representation in the church of San Clemente at Rome, to the left of the entrance.

Among the mosaic decorations of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna, we find above the upper tier of windows a succession of pictures of the coats of arms, in each of which a crown appears hanging by chains over the altar. These suspended crowns are exactly similar to those held by the female maids as votive offerings in the mosaic frieze below.



### Wanda M. Aulderson Myers, M.D.

The convenience of the form of these decorative crowns for the suspension of lamps doubtless gave rise to the custom of constructing large chandeliers after the same model. In these pendant luminaries the shape and character of the royal circle was preserved, but frequently in much larger proportions. Notices of the presentation of light-bearing circles of this nature occur repeatedly in Anastasius and other ancient authorities. Besides the more ordinary name of *corona*, the primary royal origin of these luminaries was indicated by the designation *regnum*, which is of constant occurrence (cf. *Anastas. Leo III. scribi.* § 393, "*fecit regnum aureum cum gemmis pretiosis; alius:*" *Leo IV. ev.* § 540, "*fecit . . . regnum ex auro purissimo cum annis pendens super altare majus, cum catenulis similiter aureis, sculptilem habens in medio crucem auream habentem gemmas quatuordecim, ex quibus quilibet in eadem cruce fixus, et alias qua ibidem pendens novem*").

Many of these coronas mentioned by Anastasius are described as having been adorned with dolphins (Anastas. *S. Silester* xxxiv. § 36, "coronas quatuor cum delphinis;" *ib.* § 38, "coronat auream cum delphinis quinquaginta," § 43; *Nt. Zachar.* xciii. § 219; *St. Adrian.* xcvi. § 348; *St. Leo.* iv. cv. § 531). Others were decorated with diminutive towers, and (as we see in the relief in the transept of Mouza) with fleurs-de-lis (Greg. *M. Ep. lib. i.* ep. 66, "Coronas cum delphinis duo, et de alia coronis bilis;" Anastas. *St. Hilar.* xlviii. § 70, "turrem argenteam cum delphinis.") Leo, cardinal of Ostia, in his *Chronicon Cassinense* thus describes a corona executed for that lover of art the abbot Desiderius: "He had a pharus made, that is a silver crown weighing 100 lbs. and 20 spans in circumference. On it were 12 towers, and 86 lamps hung from it." Bells were also sometimes suspended from the lower rim.

Other names by which these chandeliers were known in early writers are *Pharos*, *Pharoceutha*.

rus, *Spangolatum* = *επανκλαστική*, *Gothische*  
and *Rote*.

The name *Pharus*, though sometimes, as we have seen, used for a corona, was more properly a standing candelabrum supporting lamps or candles, which from their number of spreading branches were, according to Ducange, sometimes called *arbores, trees*. Pliny, *Hist. Nat. lib. xxiv. c. 3*, speaks of "lychnuchi—arborum modo malarum ferentium lucernas," and Pausanias Siliartius (*Descript. S. Soph. part 2*) thus describes candelabra in that building—

αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἔσονται ἀναγεγραμμένοι ἀπὸ τοῦ  
βιβλίου τῆς ζωῆς.

The most magnificent example of an aarcent corona, though long after our date, is that still to be seen suspended in the cathedral at Aix-la-Chapelle, over the crypt in which the body of Charlemagne was deposited. This corona was the offering of the emperor Frederick Barbarossa, by whom the tomb was opened in 1185. A very valuable treatise on this corona, embracing full details of the form, arrangements, and history of coronas generally, has been published by Dr. Fr. Bock (*Der Kronenmacher Kaisers Fried. Barbarossas zu Aachen*, Leipzig, Weigel, 1864). The *Mémoires d'Archéologie de Cahier and Martin*, Par. 1853, vol. iii. may be referred to, article *Couronne de lumière*, for representations of suspensory crowns from MSS. and painted glass. See also Clamplin, vol. ii. c. xii. p. 89 sq. Migne, *Encyclopædie Théol. Dictionnaire d'Orfèverie*, v. *Couronnes*. Justi Fontanini *Dissertatio de Corona Ferrea* (Rom. 1719, pp. 91-97). Macer, *Hierolicon*.

**CORONATI DIES. [FESTIVAL]**

**CORONATI QUATUOR** (LEGEND AND FESTIVAL OF). The above title is given to four martyrs, Severus, Severianus, Carpphorus, and Victorinus, who suffered martyrdom at Rome in the reign of Diocletian. The tradition respecting them is to the effect that they refused to sacrifice to idols, and were then at the command of the emperor beaten to death before the statue of Aesculapius with scourges loaded with lead (ictibus plumbatarum). The bodies having lain where they died for five days, were then deposited by pious Christians in a sandpit on the Via Laticana, three miles from the city, near the bodies of five who had suffered martyrdom on the same day two years before, Claudius, Nicostatus, Symphonianus,\* Castorius, and Simplicius. See, e.g. the Martyrology of Ado, November 8 (*Patrol.* cxliii. 382), who gives the legend more fully than others.

It is stated by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (*Vitae Pontificum, Honorius: Petrol. cxviii. 699*) that Pope Honorius I.<sup>st</sup> (ob. 638 A.D.) built a church in Rome in their honour ("eodem tem-

\* In the case of this name considerable diversity of spelling exists:—*Symphoricarum*, *Sivg. Macr.*; *Simphronaceae*, *Od. Rhen.*; *Simphorianum*, *Od. Sweddi* and *Neubridi*; *Sympronium*, *Mart. Ehren.*; *Symphronium*, *Cronardus*, and *Symphronium*, *Ada*.

Before this time, however, the Council Quorum had given their name to one of the *tituli* of the city of Rome: for in the subscriptions to sundry decrees of Gregory the Great the last signature is "Fortunatus (presbyter) tituli s. iv. Cos" (Gregorii Decret: *ed. Vat. Lat. VI. 1330*). Formerly *Ep. lib. v. tituli. 13. c. 44.* See also *Decretum Gregoriana* c. v. *titulum*.

pore fecit ecclesiam beatorum martyrum iv. Cor., quam et dedicavit et donum obtulit"). To this church the remains of the martyrs were subsequently transferred by Pope Leo IV. (ob. 855 A.D.), who had been its officiating priest (*op. cit.* Leo IV., *ib.* 1305), and who, finding it in a very ruinous condition on his accession to the pontificate, restored it with much splendour, and bestowed upon it many gifts (*ib.* 1315). This church was situated on the ridge of the Coelian hill, between the Coliseum and the Lateran; and on its site the present church of the *Santi Quattro Incoronati* was built by Pope Paschal II.

As to the appointment of the festival of these martyrs on November 8, which is said to be due to Pope Melchiades (ob. 314 A.D.), a curious difficulty has arisen. Thus in the notice of the festival in the editions of the Gregorian Sacramentary (for the words would appear to be wanting in MS. authority), the remark is made that it being found impossible to ascertain the natal day of the four martyrs ("quorum dies natalis per incuriam neglectus minime reperiri poterat"), it was appointed that in their church the natal day of the five other saints, near to whose bodies theirs had been buried, should be celebrated, that both might have their memory recorded together (*Patrol.* lxxviii. 147).

Others, however, make this forgetfulness to be of the names of the martyrs. Thus the *Martyrologium Romanum*, after speaking of Claudius, &c., proceeds: "Et ipso die iv. Coronatorum Severi, Severiani, Carpophori, Victorini, quorum festivitatem statuit Melchiades papa sub nominibus quinque martyrum celebrari, quia nomina eorum non reperiebantur, sed intercurrentibus annis cuidam sancto viro revelata sunt" (*Patrol.* cxxiii. 173). See also the Martyrology of Usuardus (*ib.* cxxiv. 669).

If however the institution of the festival be rightly assigned to Melchiades, who was pontiff during the reign of Diocletian, it is strange how this ignorance could have existed, seeing that many Christians must have been living who had known them personally. In Alcuin (*De Div. Off.* 31; *Patrol.* ci. 2230) this strange idea assumes still another form, in that the forgetfulness now includes both the day and the names: ("quorum nomina et dies natalis per incuriam neglectus." The look of the Latin however points strongly to the conclusion that the words *nomina et* are a later addition).

No trace however of this forgetfulness is to be found in the *Martyrologium Hieronymi*, where the notice is merely "vi. Id. Nov. Romae natalis Sanctorum Simplicii . . . et Sanctorum Quatuor Coronatorum Severi . . ." (*Patrol.* xxx. 481).

A difficulty of another sort is that Anastasius Bibliothecarius (*l. c.*) seems to distinguish the Coronati Quatuor from Severus, &c.; for after describing how Leo IV. restored their church at Rome, he adds "et ad laudem Dei eorum sacratissima corpora cum Claudio . . . , necnon Severo . . . quatuor fratribus collocavit." Doubtless however the last words are spurious. It will be observed also that Anastasius speaks of the Coronati as brothers, the only ancient authority, so far as we have observed, who does so.

Another curious point is that, in the Martyrology of Notker for July 7, the five saints, whom we have seen associated with the Coronati Quatuor, seem to be commemorated on that day:

"Romae, passio beatorum martyrum Ni ostrati primiscrinii, Claudii commentariensis, Castoris sive Castuli, Victorini, Symphoriani vel sic: in libro Sacramentorum continetur Semproniani; quorum natalem sexta die Iduum Novembris eatenus nos celebrari credidimus, donec venerabilis pater Ado alios et alios pro eis nobis honorandos insinualet: de quibus in suo loco vita comite commodius disseretur" (*Patrol.* cxxxi. 1115). We cannot tell however how this last promise was redeemed, for the Martyrology of Notker is wanting after Oct. 26. The Martyrology of Usuardus also connects with July 7 the names of the five above-mentioned saints (*Patrol.* cxxiv. 233, where see the note).

In the Martyrology of Rabanus Maurus all notice for Nov. 7 and 8 is wanting. In that of Wandelbert (*Patrol.* cxxi. 617), Nov. 8 is thus marked:—

"Senas ornantes idus merito atque cruore,  
Claudi Castori Simplici Symphoriane.  
Et Nicostrate pari fulgetis luce coronae;"

(*al.* Semproniane), where it will be seen that there is no allusion to the Coronati themselves, unless indeed there be an implied reference in the last word of the third line.

In the Martyrology of Bede the Coronati are mentioned, but under the names of the five saints; thus, "vi. Id. Nov. natale iv. Coronatorum, Cl., N., Symphoriani, Castoris, Simplicii" (*Patrol.* xciv. 1097).

We find the festival marked in the Leonine Calendar, "v. (vel vi.) Id. Nov. natale SS. iv. Coronatorum" (*ib.* lxxiv. 880); and the former day (Nov. 7) in the calendar of Bucherius (*ib.* 879) as "Clementis, Semproniani, Claudii, Nicostrati, in comitatum." We find the names again varied in the Gelasian Sacramentary (*ib.* 1179), which cites four of the names of the five saints: "In natal. SS. iv. Coronatorum, Costiani, Claudii, Castori, Semproniani."

We have already referred to the presence of this festival in the Gregorian Sacramentary; see also the Antiphonary (*Patrol.* lxxviii. 707). The collect in the Sacramentary runs thus: "Praesta quaesumus omnipotens Deus ut qui gloriosos martyres Claudium, Nicostratum . . . , fortes in sua confessione cognovimus, pios apud te in nostra intercessione sentiamus;" where it will be noticed that only the names of the five saints, and not of the Coronati, are given.

The Mozarabic Missal mentions the festival (*Patrol.* lxxxv. 898); but has no special office for it, employing for this day as well as for others a *missa plurimorum martyrum*. This would appear to point to the fact of the festival being a late addition to the Missal.

It may be added that several ancient calendars mark Nov. 8 as the festival of the four Coronati; but except the first, which is English, they are all Italian (*Patrol.* lxxii. 624, lxxx. 420, ci. 826, cxxviii. 1188, 1192, 1202, 1208, &c.). Doubtless therefore the festival is to be viewed as essentially one of the Italian church, and as one which never gained any special notoriety beyond the bounds of that church. There are *Acta* of the *Coronati Quatuor*, not apparently of any special value, which were published in Mombritius' *Sanctuarium*, vol. i. ff. 162, sqq.

In addition to authorities cited in this article, special reference should be made to



McDonald's notes to the Gregorian Sacramentary  
(in inc.) [R. S.]

**CORONATION.** The Coronation of kings and emperors, the most august ceremony of Christian national life, affords a striking example of the manner in which Christianity breathed a new spirit into already existing ceremonies, and elevated them to a higher and purer atmosphere. Under her inspiration a new life animated the old form: heathen accompaniments gradually dropped off; fresh and appropriate observances were developed; and the whole ceremonial assumed a character in harmony with the changed faith of those who were its subjects.

It has been remarked by Dana Stanley (*Memorials of West Abbey*, p. 43) that the rite of coronation, as it appears in the later part of the period to which our investigation is limited, represents two opposite aspects of European monarchy. It was (1) a symbol of the ancient usage of the choice of the leaders by popular election, and of the emperor by the Imperial Guard, derived from the practice of the Gaulish and Teutonic nations, and (2) a solemn consecration of the new sovereign to his office by unction with holy oil, and the placing of a crown or diadem on his head by one of the chief ministers of religion, after the example of the ancient Jewish Church.

These two parts of the ceremonial, though united in the same ritual, have a different origin, and it will be convenient to treat them separately.

121.) Among the Teutonic and Gothic tribes the custom prevailed of elevating the chief or king on whom the popular election had fallen on a large shield or buckler, borne by the leading men of the tribe. Standing on this he was exposed to the view of the soldiers and people, who by their acclamations testified their joy at his accession, and accepted him as their sovereign and head. The "chairing," or carrying round through the assembled crowd, "gyzatic," usually three times repeated, followed. Tacitus describes this ceremonial in the case of Brinnio, chief of the Batavian tribe of Canninefates "impositus acuto, more gentis, et sustinentium humera vibratus, dux deligitur" (*Hist. iv. 15*). The German soldiers of the Imperial Guard introduced this custom to the Romans, and we find the later emperors inaugurated in this manner. Thus Gordian the younger A.D. 238 was "lifted up" as emperor by the Praetorian Guards: "retractus, elevatus est et imperatorem se appellari permittit" (*Capitolinus in Gordiano*; *Herodian, lib. viii. c. 21*). Julian, when before the death of Constantius the enthusiasm of his troops forced him at Paris unwillingly to assume the imperial dignity (April A.D. 360), submitted to the same ceremonial, "impositus acuto pedestri et sublatius eminus Augustus constatuatur" (*Amm. Marcell. lib. xx. c. 4*); *et tunc deosibus peritimpus spures deosibus to Nestore Abrenphrope* (*Zosimus, lib. iii. 9. 4*). Valentinian was desired to name a colleague A.D. 364, *non abire the deosdeposus dei res deosibus* (*Philostorg. viii. 8*), to which Nicéphorus significantly adds, *de flos*. The poet Claudian, writing of the inauguration of the young Honorius as Augustus A.D. 393, refers to the same custom—

• And your own online sales in your basement.\*

So completely was this custom identified with the inauguration of a sovereign that the verb *trahere* came into use as the regular term for the recognition of a new emperor. Thus we find Euseb. *Epistola* temp. of Marcian A.D. 450, *ab ipso rei publicae Imperatoris Absquever*, and of Maximus A.D. 455 (cf. Buidas *ad voce trahere*). Zonaras, writing of Hypatius set up by a coalition as a rival to Justinian, says *rei publicae imperatoris Imperatoris Imperatoris Imperatoris* (Zonar. xiv. 6). It took its place as a recognized portion of the ritual of a coronation in the Eastern Empire; e.g. the coronation of Justin the younger in St. Sophia's as described by Corippus, *de Laudibus Justinii Augusti Minoris* (lib. ii. 137-178). A shield was held up by four young men. On this the emperor stood erect, like the letter I, with which his name and that of his two immediate predecessors commenced.

"Quatuor ingentem clypeo sublimis ornam  
Attollant larti juvenes, manebantque levatum,  
Ipse ministrorum super stulti, ut sua rectis  
Edidit, quas signo sublimi non fecitque unquam  
Herminia morata tristem."

We also find it in the elaborate rituals drawn up by Joannes Cantacrazenus (c. 1330; *Hist.* i. c. 41, printed by Mariette ii. 304; and Habertus *Pontific. Græc.* p. 604 sq.) and Georgius Codinus, *Cerapoteles* (c. 1480; *de Officio et Functionibus Aulæ Constantin.* c. 17). The only change is that the emperor no longer stands on the slippery surface of the buckler, but adopts the much safer position of sitting, "suscitans." The risk of a dangerous and indecorous fall during the ceremony of "gyratio," is proved by the example of Gunbald, king of Burgundy (A.D. 500), who on his third circuit "cum tertio gyravit" fell, and was with difficulty held up by the people (*Orega. Taronum. Hist. lib. vii. c. 10*). According to George Codinus, who may be taken as a probable evidence of the ritual prevailing several centuries before his time in the unchanging East, this "levatio" took place outside the Church of St. Sophia, into which the new emperor was borne to receive the sacred rites of unction and crowning at the hands of the patriarch. It was the rule that the shield should be supported in front by the emperor (when the choice of a successor was made in his lifetime), the father of the newly crowned monarch if alive, and the patriarch, the other highest dignitaries of the State supporting it behind.

The origin of this custom being Teutonic, it was naturally continued by the sovereigns of the Frankish race. The long-haired Pharamond was thus inaugurated A.D. 420: "levaverunt super eum regem crinitum" (*Gesta Regum Francorum* apud Dom. Bouquet, li. 543). Clovis received his recognition as king by the same token, "clipeo impositum super se Regem constituent" A.D. 506 (Gregor. Turon. lib. ii. c. 40). Sigebert, son of Clotaire I. A.D. 575, when "more gentis, impositus clipeo rex constitutus" (*Adonis Chronica*; Gregor. Tur. *Hist. Frnca.* iv. c. 52) was stabbed by the assassins of Queen Fredegond. A century later, A.D. 744, we read of Hildebrand, grandson of Luitprend king of the Lombards, "in regem levaverunt" (*Paulus Diaconus*, vi. 55), of Pippin (A.D. 751 "rex elevatus est" *Ann. d. Quæf. &c.*). And to clear the series, Otto "sublimatus est" at Milan A.D. 961. [*Cf. Grimm, Rechtsalterthümer*, p. 214.]


The ceremonial is depicted in an illumination of the 10th century engraved by Montfaucon (*Monumens*, tom. i. p. xvi.)<sup>a</sup> representing the proclamation of David as king. He stands on a round shield, borne aloft by four young men.

From a passage in Constant. Porphy. (*de Administ. Imper.* c. 38) this custom appears to have prevailed among the Turks. It is not found in the early Spanish annals, but it was certainly in use in the kingdom of Arragon at a later period (Ambros. Morales, lib. xiii. c. 11), and traces of it are found in that of Castile, in *Legibus Partitarum*, leg. iii. tit. xxii. part. iii. There is no evidence of its ever having been adopted in England.

Among the Frankish and Lombard nations an additional ceremony was the delivery of a spear to the newly-made monarch. We find this in the case of Hildebrand A.D. 744 (Paul. Diac. vi. 55); Childeric A.D. 456 (Chifletius in Anastas. cvii. p. 96); Childebert II. A.D. 585 (Greg. Turon. vii. 33; Aimionus, ii. 69). Martene (*de Rit.* ii. 212) writes of the Frankish kings "tradita in manum hasta pro sceptro, excelso in solio honorifice imponunt."

(2) The second aspect in which a coronation was viewed was the religious one. As soon as the Bible became known, the practice of the Jewish nation to consecrate their kings to their high office by the hands of the chief minister of religion became an authority from which there was no appeal. Of the two ceremonies specially characterizing the Jewish rite, unction and the imposition of a crown, the former alone was strange to the Western nations. From a very early period, as we shall see, the crown or diadem was known as the symbol of royalty. The only change was that of the person by whose hands it was placed on the monarch's head. Uction appears to have been entirely unknown as a part of the ritual, and to have come into use with the conversion of the emperors to the Christian faith.


(a) To speak first of the imposition of the



Diadem, from Clamplni.

crown or diadem. For the sake of clearness, while referring to dictionaries of classical antiquities for fuller details, it may be desirable to remind our readers that the crown, corona, στέφανος, was a head circlet, wreath, or garland of leaves, flowers, twigs, grass, &c., and, as luxury increased, of the precious metals, chiefly gold; while the diadem, δίδημα, "taenia" or "fascia" (Q. Curtius, iii. 3), as its name implies, was originally nothing more than a linen band or silken ribbon, tied round the temples, with the loose ends hanging down behind. This ribbon Eastern magnificence afterwards adorned with pearls and precious stones. The nature of the diadem may be illus-

trated from some historical facts. Thus Alexander took off his diadem to bind up the wound of Lysimachus (Justin, lib. xv. c. 3). Pompey's enemies made it a charge against him that he had bound up an ulcer on his leg with a white cloth like a diadem, it mattering not on what part of the body the royal insignia was placed



Diadem, from Clamplni.

(Amm. Marcell. xvii.). Monima, the wife of Mithridates, attempted to hang herself with her diadem (Plutarch, *Lucullus*. c. 18).

Though the words *corona* and *diadema* have not unfrequently been used interchangeably, the distinction between them is very precise.<sup>b</sup> "However" (writes Selden, *Titles of Honour*, c. 8, § 2), "these names have been from antient times confounded, yet the diadem strictly was a very different thing from what a crown now is or was; and it was no other then than only a fillet of silk, linen, or some such thing. Nor appears it that any other kind of crown was used for a royal ensign, except only in some kingdoms of Asia, but this kind of fillet, until the beginning of Christianity in the Roman empire." The "diadema," not the "corona" was the emblem and sign of royalty. It is styled by Lucian βασιλείας γνῶρισμα (Pisc. 35; cf. Xenoph. *Cyr.* viii. 3. 13); and περιθεῖναι δίδημα is of frequent use to indicate the assumption of royal dignity (Polyb. v. 57. 4; Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 10. 1); as in Latin "diadema" is identified by Tacitus with the "insigne regium" (*Annal.* xv. 29). The diadem was of Eastern origin, and was introduced to the Romans through their Oriental campaigns and intercourse with Asiatic nations. When first seen at Rome it caused great offence. Though they submitted to the reality of sovereign power, their susceptible minds could not endure its outward symbols. The golden "corona" had raised no alarm. Caligula and Domitian wore it at the public games without objection, and it appears on their coins. Augustus, Claudius, Trajan, and many others are represented with rayed or "stellate" crowns, imitating the majesty of the sun. Julius Caesar, rightly interpreting public opinion, refused the tempting offer of a diadem at Antony's hands, though half-veiled in a laurel wreath (δίδημα στεφάνῳ δάφνης περιπεπλεγμένον) and had it laid up in the Capitol (Plutarch, *J. Caes.* 61; Sueton. i. § 79). Caligula when about to assume the diadem was warned by friendly counsellors of the danger of thus exceeding "principum et regum fastigium" (Sueton. iv. c. 22). Titus provoked suspicion of affecting the throne of the East by wearing the diadem, though according to the established ritual, when consecrating the Apis ox at Memphis (Sueton. xi. c. 5). The effe-

<sup>a</sup> "Discours préliminaire, de l'inauguration des premiers rois de France."

<sup>b</sup> "Alud est corona, aliud diadema. Corona simplex est circulus aureus quo utuntur reges in minoribus solemnitatibus. Diadema est quasi duplex corona quum ipsi coronae quasi alius circulus gemmis superpositus super additur."—Peter of Blois, *Sermo*. xix. vol. iii. p. 11.

minate Elagabalus advanced a step further and wore it in private, "diadema gemmato usus est domi" (Lampridius); and Aurelian, who had been familiar with its use in his Eastern campaign, and the attire of his captive Zenobia (Trebell. Poll. c. xxix.), first ventured to present himself to the public gaze with his temples adorned with this badge of sovereignty, and his person glittering with magnificent attire A.D. 270: "Iste primus apud Romanos diadema capiti innexuit, gemmisque et aurata omni veste, quod adhuc fere incognitum Romanis moribus visabatur, usus est" (Aurel. Vict. *Epitom.* c. xxxv.). The diadem once introduced was never dropped, and became a recognized mark of imperial dignity; but it seems to have been chiefly worn on state occasions. Constantine was the first to adopt it as a portion of his ordinary attire—"caput exornans perpetuo diadema" (Aurel. Vict. *Epit.* cxli.), and his successors continued the usage. As soon as the emperors had become Christian, it naturally followed that their inauguration to sovereignty should be accompanied by sacred rites, and receive the blessing of the chief minister of religion, who speedily became also the recognized agent in setting apart the sovereign to his regal office by the ceremonies of the imposition of the crown, and at a later period, of unction, borrowed from the rites of the Jewish Church. Originally the crown was put on by those who had the power of giving it. The Imperial Guard who chose the emperor crowned him. When Julian had been suddenly chosen by his troops as their emperor at Paris (April A.D. 360), and had been raised on the shield by the soldiers, it was they who forcibly put the token of power on his unwilling head: *ἐπέθεσαν σὺν βίᾳ τὸ διάδημα τῇ κεφαλῇ* (Zosim. *Hist.* iii. 9. 4). The circumstances of this coronation deserve mention from their picturesqueness. There being no real diadem at hand, the troops demanded that he should use his wife's head-ribbon. Julian refused, deeming a woman's ornament unworthy of the imperial dignity. Still more peremptorily did he reject the horse's headband they then proposed. At last one of his standard-bearers took off the gold torque from his neck, and with that Julian was crowned (Amm. Marcell. xx. 4). This mean crown "vilis corona" was laid aside at Vienne for a more ambitious diadem, glittering with jewels—"ambitioso diadema utebatur lapidum fulgore distincto" (Amm. Marcell. xxi. 1; Zonaras, xiii. 10). His successor Jovian was also proclaimed king, crowned and vested in the royal robe by the army who chose him A.D. 363, *τὴν ἀλουργίδα ἐνδύς καὶ τὸ διάδημα περιθέμενος* (Zosim. iii. 30; Theodoret, iv. 1; Theophan. p. 36); and Valentinian A.D. 364, "principali habitu circumdatus et coronatus, Augustusque nuncupatus" (Amm. Marc. xxvi. 2). When Valentinian associated his son Gratian with him in the empire, he invested him with the purple and crown (Amm. Marcell. xxvii. 7). In none of these cases is there any reference to a bishop or minister of religion as performing the ceremony of coronation; nor can we say with any certainty when this custom arose. The first hint at such a custom that we meet with is in the dream of Theodosius before his admission to a share of the imperial dignity, c. 379 (?), in which he saw Meletius, bishop of Antioch, putting on him a crown and the royal robe (Theodoret, *H. E.* v. 6).

It has been erroneously asserted by Martene (*de Ritibus*, ii. 201-237, ed. Bassano 1788) and Ménard (*Notes to the Sacramentary of St. Gregory*, p. 397 sq.), and repeated by Catalani and many subsequent writers, including Maskell, that Theodosius II. (A.D. 439) is the first whom we know to have been crowned by a bishop. Theophanes (p. 59) informs us that Theodosius the younger sent crowns, *στεφάνους βασιλικούς*, to Valentinian II. at Rome, c. 383, but nothing is anywhere said of his own coronation. The passage quoted by Martene from Theodorus Lector, (lib. ii. c. 65,) speaks of the coronation, not of Theodosius II. but of Leo I., A.D. 457, by Anatolius the patriarch: *στεφθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πατριάρχου*. In this case the new emperor, a rude Thracian soldier, had been a military tribune and chief steward of the household of Aspar, the Arian patrician, by whose influence he was raised to the throne. It is not improbable that episcopal benediction might be regarded as a valuable support to a feeble title, and that Leo felt a special satisfaction in having the imperial crown imposed on his brows by the head of the Byzantine hierarchy. But previous allusions to coronation at the hands of a bishop would lead us to question the accuracy of Gibbon's assertion (chap. xxxvi.) that "this appears to be the first origin of a ceremony which all the Christian princes of the world have since adopted," and it would certainly be very unsafe to assert that it was the first time that this ceremony was performed by episcopal hands. The next recorded instance of episcopal coronation is that of Justin I. This emperor was crowned twice: first by John II., patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 518 (Theophan. *Chronograph.* p. 162; cf. the patriarch's letter to Pope Hormisdas, apud Baronii *Annal.* anno 519, no. lx.: "Ideo coronam (*aliter cornu*) gratiae super eum coelitus declinavit, ut affluenter in sacrum ejus caput misericordia funderetur: omnique annuntiationis ejus tempore cum magna voce Deum omnium principem glorificaverunt quoniam talem verticem meis manibus tali corona decoravit"); and secondly, "pietatis ergo," by Pope John II. on his visit to Constantinople, A.D. 525 (Anastas. *Bibliothec.* p. 95, ed. Blanchini, Rom. 1718; Aimionus, lib. ii. c. 1). His successor Justinian received the diadem primarily from his uncle's hands (Zonaras lib. xiv. c. 5), in compliance with a practice subsequently prevailing in the Eastern empire, by which the symbol of royalty was originally bestowed by the emperor himself on those whom he wished to succeed him; the ceremony being probably repeated by the bishop or patriarch. Thus Verina crowned her brother Basiliscus, A.D. 474. Tiberius II. his wife Anastasia, A.D. 578 (Theophanes, *Chron.*). But the sanction of religion had become essential to the recognition of a new sovereign by his subjects, and Justinian was inaugurated by the imposition of the hands of the patriarch Epiphanius (Cyril. *Scythopol. Vita S. Sabae Archimandritae*). From this time coronation at the hands of the patriarch was an established rule. Justin II., A.D. 565, was crowned by John Scholasticus; Tiberius II. by Eutychius, Sept. 26, 578, ten days before Justin's death and by his order. His successor Maurice and his wife were crowned by John the Faster, A.D. 582, on the day of their marriage (Theophyl. *Simo-catta*, lib. i. c. 10), and their son Theodosius,

when four years old (Theophan. p. 179). Heraclius, with his wife Eudocia, was crowned by Sergius, Oct. 7, 610, and in the third year of his reign his son Heraclius and his daughter Euphania were also crowned. It is unnecessary to give later examples. In the time of Justinian's successor Justin II. the ceremonial of coronation seems to have received the form and religious sanction it maintained, on the whole, till the fall of the empire. The ritual is elaborately described by Corippus. The ceremony took place at break of day. After his elevation on the shield (see above), the emperor was carried into St. Sophia's, where he received the patriarch's benediction, and the imperial diadem was imposed by his hands. He was then recognized as emperor by acclamation first of the "patres" and then of the "clientes." Wearing his diadem he took his seat on the throne, and after making the sign of the cross he made an harangue to his assembled subjects:—

"Postquam cuncta videt ritu perfecta priorum,  
Pontificum summus plenaque aetate venustus,  
Adstantem benedixit eum, caelique potentem  
Exorans Dominum sacro diademate jussit  
Augustum sancire caput, summoque coronam  
Imponens apti 'Feliciter accipe' dixit."

*Corippus de Laud. Justin. ii. 9, v. 179 sq.*

With the addition of the important ceremony of *unction*, and a considerable elaboration of ritual, the coronation office, as given by Joannes Cantacuzenus, afterwards emperor (c. 1330), and a century later, by Georgius Codinus (d. 1453), corresponds with that described by Corippus in all essential particulars.

Of the Occidental use we know little or nothing. We may reasonably suppose that there was no essential difference between it and the Eastern ritual. But the Western empire had ceased before the earliest record of any religious ceremony accompanying the rite in the East, and when it revived in the person of the emperor Charles the Great, coronation at the hands of a bishop had long been a recognized custom among the Frankish nations. Martene (ii. 212) acknowledges that the coronation of Pippin, the father of Charles, is the earliest example he can discover. Pippin was crowned twice—first by St. Boniface, archbishop of Mentz, papal legate, at Soissons, A.D. 752; secondly, together with his sons Charles and Carlomann and his wife Bertha, by Pope Stephen at St. Denis, Sunday, July 28, 754 (Pagius, *Brev. Gesta Rom. Pont.*). Charles the Great was also crowned episcopally more than once. In addition to his boyish coronation he was solemnly crowned in St. Peter's at Rome by Pope Leo. This coronation took place on Christmas Day, A.D. 800. It forms one of the great epochs in history, as by this the Frankish king was recognized by the Vicar of Christ as the representative of the emperors of Rome and inheritor of their rights and privileges.

The ceremony is thus described by Const. Maussas in *Chron. Synops.*:—

ἐντεῦθεν ἀμειβόμενος Κάρολλον ὁ Λέων  
ἀναγορεύει κράτορα τῆς παλαιότερας Ῥώμης  
καὶ στέφανος περιτίθῃσιν ὡς οἱ Ῥωμαίων νόμοι.

It has been repeatedly asserted that, previous to his coronation at Rome, Charles had been crowned with the so-called iron crown at Monza: but the fact is not recorded in any early authorities, and it is probably a story of later growth.

His infant son Pippin was crowned king of Italy by Adrian I. on Easter Day, 801, the day after his birth.<sup>c</sup>

One of the very earliest instances on record of a royal coronation by an ecclesiastic in Western Europe is that of Aidan, king of Scotland, by St. Columba in Iona, A.D. 574.<sup>d</sup> It may perhaps be reasonably questioned whether this picturesque narrative is to be received as historical. But it is accepted by some of the latest and best authorities (*e.g.* Montalembert and Burton); and the kernel of the story is probably authentic. According to the tale, an angel was sent to command Columba to consecrate Aidan. He reminded the saint that "he had in his hands the crystal-covered book of the Ordination of Kings;" which, be it remarked, presupposes the existence of such a ceremony. St. Columba hesitated, preferring for sovereign Aidan's brother Iogen. The angelic messenger appeared again and again, becoming more and more peremptory, until on the third visit he struck the refractory saint with a scourge, leaving a weal which remained on his side all the rest of his life. On this Columba consented, and Aidan was made king by him by imposition of hands. The words of Adamnan are simply, "in regem ordinavit imponensque manum super caput ejus ordinans benedixit." No mention is made either of the crown or unction. The whole story of the Stone of Destiny, transferred by Edward I., as a symbol of conquest, from Scone to Westminster, is, as regards the earlier stages of its supposed history, a baseless myth. (Adamnanus, *de S. Columb. Scoto Confessore*, t. iii. c. 5; Montalembert, *Monks of the West*; T. Hill Burton, *Hist. of Scotland*, i. 319.) Almost contemporaneous with this are the records of the same rite in Spain. Leovigild, king of the Visigoths, A.D. 572, according to Isidore, *Hist. Gothorum*, vii. 124, was the first of those sovereigns to assume the crown, sceptre, and royal robe: "Nam ante eum et habitus et consessus communis ut genti ita et regibus erat." Of Recared also, Leovigild's successor, A.D. 586, we read, "regno est coronatus" (*ib.*).

(b) Another essential portion of the coronation of a Christian monarch was *unction* at the hands of a bishop or other chief minister. This rite clothed the person of the king with inviolable sanctity. It was considered to partake of the nature of a sacrament (August. *adv. Petilium*, lib. ii. c. 112), and to be indelible; to convey spiritual jurisdiction, as the delivery of the crown conferred temporal power; and it gave the chief significance to the formula "Rex Dei gratia," which according to Selden (*Titles of Honour*, p. 92) could not from

<sup>c</sup> The notion, once so widely received, that the Western emperors were crowned in three different places, with crowns of three different materials—gold at Rome denoting excellence, silver at Aix-la-Chapelle denoting purity, and iron at Monza or Milan denoting strength—is a mere myth of an editor of the *Portifical Romanum*, deservedly ridiculed by Aeneas Sylvius (Pope Julius II.), *Hist. Aust.* lib. iv., and refuted by Muratori, *de Cor. Ferr.* p. 9.

<sup>d</sup> It is stated in the Introduction to the Roxburgh Club edition of the "Liber Regalis," 1871, that "the earliest coronation of a Christian prince within the limits of Great Britain and Ireland is generally supposed to be that of Dermot or Diarmid, supreme monarch of Ireland, by his relative, Columba," circa 560: but this is merely an inference from the close relation between the two parties, not an ascertained historical fact.



its sacred character, be applied to any other lay person. Thus Gregory the Great writes, "quia ipsa unctio sacramentum est, is qui promovetur foris ungitur si intus virtute sacramenti roboretur" (*Expus. lib. i. Regum, c. x.*). "Rex unctus non mera persona laica sed mixta" (Lyndwood, lib. iii. tit. 2). Anointing, it is well known, was the chief and divinely appointed ceremony by which the kings among the chosen people of God were inaugurated to their office. As early as the time of the Judges the idea was familiar; for in Jotham's parable the trees propose to anoint a king over them. This shews that it must have been in use among other nations with whom the Jewish people had intercourse, and that St. Augustine goes too far in asserting that it was a rite peculiar to the people of God, and was never adopted by heathen nations. "Nec in aliquo alibi ungebantur reges et sacerdotes nisi in illo regno ubi Christus prophetabatur et ungebatur et unde venturus erat Christi nomen. Nusquam alibi omnino in nulla gente, in nullo regno" (*Enarrat. in Ps. xlv. § 10*).

The earliest authentic instances of the ceremony of unction forming an essential element in Christian coronations appear in the annals of the Spanish kingdoms. The rite is mentioned in the Acts of the 6th Council of Toledo, A.D. 636. Wamba on his coronation (A.D. 673) was anointed by Quirigo, archbishop of Toledo: "Deinde curvatis genibus oleum benedictionis per sacri Quirici pontificis manus vertici ejus infunditur" (Julius Toletanus, § 4; cf. Rodericus Santius, quoted by Selden, *Titles of Honour*, p. 155). But the rite was evidently anterior to this. The language used evidences that the unction was an established custom, and that it took place at Toledo. Wamba's is simply the first unction on record. This is confirmed by the Acts of the 12th Council of Toledo, which state of Hervigius, Wamba's successor, A.D. 680, that he "regnandi per sacrosanctam unctionem succeperit potestatem" (Labbe, *Conc.* vi. 1225, canon i.).

Passing by the language of Gildas (*de Excid. Brit.* § 21), "ungebantur reges et non per Deum, &c.," as more oratorical than historical, and the uncertain reference to unction in Ina's designation of himself, "by God's grace, king of the West Saxons," in the opening sentence of his laws A.D. 690, we come down to the form of coronation contained in the *Pontificale* of Egbert, archbishop of York A.D. 732-767, of which Mr. Maskell says, "it is probably not only the most ancient English use, but the most ancient extant in the world" (*Monum. Rit.* iii. 74-81). The ritual, together with other ceremonies, expressly includes the anointing of the king's head with oil. "Benedictio super regem noviter electum. Hic verget oleum cum cornu super caput ipsius cum antiphona 'unxerunt Salomonem' et Psalmo 'Domine in virtute tua.' Unus ex pontificibus dicat orationem et alii unguant."

The 12th canon of the Council of Cealcyth A.D. 787, "de ordinatione et honore regum," contains a valuable incidental mention of unction as an essential element of the kingly office, in the words, "Nec Christus Domini esse valet nec rex totius regni qui ex legitimo non fuerit concubio generatus." Of Egferth, son of Offa, who was crowned at this council as his father's colleague, the language of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, in which this is the earliest coronation men-

tioned, "hallowed to king" (*to cypinge gehalgod*) can only be interpreted of unction, and so William of Malinesbury has understood it, "in regem inunctum." Eardwulf, king of Northumberland, is recorded to have been consecrated (*gebletsod*) and elevated to his throne (*to his cinstole ahofen*) by Archbishop Eanbald and three bishops (*Anglo-Sax. Chron.* A.D. 795). And finally of Alfred, the same chronicle says, A.D. 854, that when Pope Leo IV. heard of the death of Ethelwulf he consecrated him king (*bletsode Alured to cinwe*). The rhyming Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester, quoted by Selden (*Titles of Honour*, p. 150), in describing this coronation uses the remarkable phrase "he oiled (*elcde*) him to be king:—

"Erst he adde at Rome ybe, and vor is gret wisdom  
The pope Leon him blessed, tho he thuder come,  
And the king is croune of this lond, y<sup>e</sup> in this lond  
yat is:  
And elede him to be king, ere he were king ywis.  
And he was king of Engeland, of all that there come  
That verst thus yeled was of the Pope of Rome.  
And suthe other after him of the erch-bisshop echon,  
So that bluore him thur king was ther non."

From England the custom of unction seems to have passed into France, where Pippin's anointing by Boniface, archbishop of Mentz, at Soissons A.D. 752, is acknowledged by Martene (*de Rit. Eccl.* ii. 212; cf. Selden, *u. s.* p. 113) to have been the first regal unction the testimony for which is worthy of credit.\* According to Chiffletius, p. 30 (apud Maskell *u. s.*), the rite was more than once repeated: "Pipinus omnium Franciae regum primus, imitatus Judaeorum reges, ut se sacra unctione venerabiliorum augustioremque faceret, semel atque iterum ungi voluit." This second unction is probably that mentioned by Baronius, July 28, A.D. 754, when Pippin received anointing from Stephen II. together with his sons Charles and Carlomann.

The custom of unction was firmly established in the West by the close of the 8th century. When Charles the Great was crowned in Rome by Leo I. he was anointed with oil from head to foot:—

καὶ μὴν ἀλλὰ χρησάμενος καὶ νόμοις Ἰουδαίων,  
ἐκ κεφαλῆς μέχρι ποδῶν ἐλαίῳ τοῦτον χρίει.

Const. Manass. in *Chron. Synops.*

The East followed the West in the adoption of unction. It has been carried back to the time of Justin and Justinian, i. e. to the middle of the 6th century (Onuphrius, *de Comit. Imperator.* c. 2); but Goar (*Eucholog.* p. 928) affirms that "the emperors of the East were not anointed before that Charles the Great was crowned in the West" (cf. Selden, *u. s.* p. 146).

In the earliest ritual anointing on the head alone sufficed. That of the whole person, adopted in the case of Charles the Great, was quite exceptional. The unction is thus limited in the *Pontificale* of Egbert. In the Greek ritual, given by Codinus, the head was anointed in the shape of the cross (*σταυροειδῶς*). The mediaeval English rite is peculiar in anointing the head, breast, and

\* The ridiculous fable of the *sancta ampulla*, conveyed from heaven by an angel with oil for the coronation rites of Clovis, A.D. 481, was not heard of till four hundred years after the date of the supposed event, and then in connexion with his baptism and confirmation. (Hincmar, *Vita S. Remi.* ap. Suriani, Jan. 13.)

arms, denoting glory, sanctity, and strength. The kings of France were anointed in nine places—the head, breast, between the shoulders, the shoulders themselves, the arms, and the hands. But this was a later development of the rite. The head alone was anointed in three places, the right ear, the forehead round to the left ear, and the crown of the head, when Charles the Bald was crowned by Hincmar, A.D. 809 (Hincmar, *Opera*, i. 745).

(c) The delivery of the sceptre and staff, which appears in the English ritual of the *Pontificale* of Egbert, is evidently derived from the custom prevailing among the Lombards, Franks, and other early nations, to which we have already referred, of delivering a spear to the newly elected sovereign.

(d) The profession of faith, which in later times formed part of the ritual of an imperial coronation, preceding the episcopal benediction, is not mentioned in the more ancient authorities. The instances given by Martene (*de Ritibus*) in proof of its early date are quite inconclusive. Jovian's declaration of Christian faith on his election as emperor by the soldiers of his army, was evidently entirely voluntary (Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 1). The demand made of Anastasius (A.D. 491) by the patriarch of Constantinople, Euphemius, that as the price of the episcopal sanction to his election to the imperial dignity, he would sign a document declaring his adhesion to the orthodox faith, was quite exceptional (Evagr. *H. E.* iii. 32; Theod. *Lect.* iii.), while the profession of orthodoxy required by Cyriac of Phocas A.D. 602, and unhesitatingly given by that base and sanguinary usurper to purchase the patriarch's recognition, can scarcely be pressed into a precedent. In the Gothic kingdom of Spain an oath that he would defend the Catholic faith, and preserve the realm from the contamination of Jewish unbelievers, was very early exacted of the sovereign. Such a pledge is declared essential in the Acts of the 6th Council of Toledo, A.D. 636 (act iii. Labbe, *Concil.* v. p. 1743), and in the later councils held at the same place. It is expressly declared of Wamba A.D. 673 that before the ceremony of unction and after the assumption of the royal attire, "regio jam cultu conspicuus ante altare divinum consistens ex more fidem populis reddidit" (Jul. Tolet. § 4). The oath of King Egica is given in the Acts of the 15th Council of Toledo A.D. 688. No such oath or profession of faith appears in the form of coronation in the *Pontificale* of Egbert. We are unable to state when it was introduced into the ritual of the Eastern empire. But according to Georgius Codinus (cap. xvii. §§ 1-7), the newly recognized emperor had to give a written profession of faith before his coronation, to be publicly read in St. Sophia's.

(e) Leontius (*Vita Sancti Joan. Alex. Episc.* c. 17) mentions a remarkable custom prevailing in the coronations of the Eastern empire in the 6th century as an admonition of the transitoriness of all earthly greatness. After his coronation the architects of the imperial monuments approached the emperor and presented specimens of four or five marbles of different colours, with the inquiry which he would choose for the construction of his own monument. The analogous ceremony described by Peter Damianus (*Litt.* lib. i. 17),

though belonging to a later period, may be mentioned here. The emperor having taken his seat on his throne, with his diadem on his head and his sceptre in his hand, and his nobles standing around, was approached by a man carrying a box full of dead men's bones and dust in one hand, and in the other a wisp of flax which—as in the papal enthronization—was lighted and burnt before his eyes.

(f) This article may be fittingly closed by an epitome of the ritual prescribed in the *Pontificale* of Egbert, A.D. 732-767, already repeatedly referred to as the earliest extant form of coronation.

The title of this coronation service is "Missa pro regibus in die Benedictionis ejus." It commences with the Antiphon "Justus es Domine, &c." (Ps. cxix. 137), and the Psalm "Beati immaculati (Ps. cxix. 1). Then succeeds a Lesson from Leviticus, "Hæc dicit Dominus" (Lev. xxvi. 6-9); the gradual, "Salvum fac, &c.," and the verse, "Auribus percipe" and "Alleluia," the Psalm "Magnus Dominus" (Ps. xlviii.), or "Domine in virtute" (Ps. xxi.), and a sequence from St. Matthew, "In illo tempore" (Matt. xxii. 15). Then follows the "Benedictio super regem noviter electum," and three collects, "Te invocamus Domine sancte," "Deus qui populis tuis" (both of which are found in the *Liber Regalis*), and "In diebus ejus oriatur omnibus aequitas." The unction follows, according to the form already given. After the collect, "Deus electorum fortitudo," succeeds the delivery of the sceptre. The rubric is, "Hic omnes pontifices cum principibus dant ei sceptrum in manu." Fifteen *Proces* follow. After this there is the delivery of the staff ("Hic datur ei baculum in manu sua"), with the prayer, "Omnipotens det tibi Deus de rore coeli," &c., and imposition of the crown (the rubric is, "Hic omnes pontifices sumant galerum et ponant super caput ipsius"), with the prayer, "Benedic Domine fortitudinem regis principis, &c." This is succeeded by the recognition of the people, and the kiss. The rubric runs, "Et dicat omnis populus tribus vicibus cum episcopis et presbyteris Vivat rex N. in sempiternum. Tunc confirmabitur cum benedictione omnis populus" (Leofric Missal, "omni populo in solio regni") "et osculandum principem in sempiternum dicit. Amen, Amen, Amen." The seventh "oratio" is said over the king, and the mass follows, with appropriate *Offertory*, *Preface*, &c. The whole terminates with the three royal precepts, to preserve the peace of the Church, to restrain all rapacity and injustice, and to maintain justice and mercy in all judicial proceedings.

*Authorities.*—Maskell, *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, iii. 1-142. Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, ii. 201-237. Selden, *Titles of Honour*, part i. ch. vii. Habertus, *Pontific. Graec.* pp. 627 sq. Catalani, *Comment. in Pontific. Roman.* i. 369-418. Menin, *Traité du Sacre et Couronnement des Rois et Reines de France*. Goar, *Euchologium*, pp. 924-930. Ménard, *Notes to Sacramentary of Gregory*, p. 397. Arthur Taylor, *Glory of Regality*. Montfaucon, *Monumens de l'Histoire de France*, tom. i. p. xvi. sq. *Discours préliminaire de l'inauguration des premiers Rois de France*. Codinus Curopalata, *De Officiis et Officialibus Curiae et Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, c. xvii. Grimm, *Lochtsalterthümer*, p. 234 sq.

**CORPORAL** (*Corporale, Palla Corporalis, Palla Dominica*). The cloth on which the elements are consecrated in the Eucharist.

It is probable from the nature of the case that from the most ancient times the table on which the Lord's Supper was celebrated was covered with a cloth. [See ALTAR-CLOTHS.] In process of time, the cloth which ordinarily covered the table was itself covered, when the sacred elements were to be consecrated, by another cloth called a *Corporal*. The *Liber Pontificalis* (p. 105, ed. Muratori) asserts that Pope Sylvester († 335) decreed that the sacrifice of the altar should be consecrated not on silk or on any kind of dyed cloth, but only on pure white linen, as the Lord's Body was buried in linen. The decrees of popes of that age lie, as is well known, under a good deal of suspicion; but at a somewhat later date Isidore of Pelusium (*Epist.* i. 123) lays down precisely the same rule as that attributed to Sylvester. Germanus of Paris (*Expositio Brevis*, p. 93, Migne) also lays down that the corporal must be of linen, for the same reason as that alleged by the preceding authorities, and adds that it should be woven throughout, like the seamless coat of the Lord. Regino (*De Discip. Eccl.* c. 118) quotes a council of Rheims to the following effect. The corporal on which the immolation is made must be of the finest and purest linen, without admixture of any other material whatever. It must not remain on the altar except in time of mass, but must either be placed in the sacramentary or shut up with the chalice and paten in a place kept delicately clean. When it is washed, it must first be rinsed in the church itself, and in a vessel kept for the purpose by a priest, deacon, or subdeacon.

The corporal appears anciently to have covered the whole surface of the altar. Hence, according to the *Ordo Romanus II.* c. 9, it required the services of two deacons to spread and refold it. So the *Ordo Rom.* I. c. 11. It was necessary, in fact, that it should be sufficiently large to admit of the bread for a great number of communicants being placed upon it, and to allow a portion to be turned up so as to cover the elements. But when, about the 11th century, it ceased to be usual for the people to communicate, and the bread came to be made in the wafer form, the corporal was made smaller, and a separate cloth or covering was placed over the chalice (Innocent III. *De Myst. Missae*, ii. 56). This was often stiffened with rich material. Many churches, however, especially those of the Carthusians, retained the more ancient use of the corporal even in modern times, as we are informed by De Mauleon in his *Iter Liturg.* pp. 57, 60, 200, 268. (Krazer, *De Liturgiis*, pp. 175 ff.)

For the corporals of the Eastern Church, see **ANTIMENSUM**. [C.]

**CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.** Corporal punishment in almost every form was evidently allowed by the *lex talionis* of the Pentateuch: "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe" (Exod. xxi. 24, 25). It was also allowed to be used by the master upon his slave to an almost unlimited extent; if indeed he smote his servant or his maid with a

rod, and they died under his hand, he was to be punished, but not if they "continued a day or two" (*ib.*, 20, 21); the slave, however, obtaining his freedom if his master blinded him of an eye, or knocked a tooth out (vv. 26, 27). The judicial bastinado (*i. e.* for a freeman) was not to exceed 40 stripes, lest "thy brother should seem vile unto thee" (Deut. xxv. 3). That the use of personal chastisement remained prevalent, is evident from the whole of the Old Testament, and especially from the Book of Proverbs; though it is somewhat difficult to see by whose hand the "rod" or "stripes" which Solomon so zealously eulogises as the due reward of fools could well be applied. Not less zealously, it is well known, does he inculcate the use of them for the instruction of children.

It seems hardly necessary to point out how much milder is the tone of the New Testament in these respects. Fathers were not to "provoke their children to wrath" (Eph. vi. 4, and see Col. iii. 21); masters were to "forbear threatening" with their slaves (Eph. vi. 9). At the same time the judicial use of corporal punishment is frequently mentioned, and only indirectly censured when in violation of an established privilege. By the old Roman law indeed a citizen could only be beaten with a vine-branch, not with rods (*fustes*) or with the scourge (*flagellum*), which privilege was extended by Caius Gracchus to the Latins; hence St. Paul's twice-recorded protest (Acts xvi. 37; xxii. 25) against being "beaten" or "scourged," being "a Roman." It is certain however that in the Roman army a terrible punishment existed, called *fustuarium*, beginning with a stroke of the centurion's vine-branch (the symbol of his authority), and seldom ending but with death. And as the status of the freeman became gradually lowered, it is clear that the use of the rod became more prevalent, till we find the jurists of the period extending from Severus to the Gordians, such as Callistratus and Macer (end of the 2nd to nearly middle of the 3rd century), speaking of the *fustes* as the punishment of the free, in cases where the slave would be flogged with the *flagellum*, or terming the application of the former a mere "admonition," but that of the latter a castigation (*Dig.* bk. xlviii. t. xix. ll. 10, 7).

A constitution of Severus and Antonine forbade the chastising with the *fustes* either decemvirs or their sons (*Code*, bk. ii. tit. xii. l. 5. A.D. 199); The ignominy, however, arose from the sentence, if for an offence deserving by law such punishment, not from the mere act; *e. g.* if inflicted by way of torture, before sentence, it did not dishonour (*Dig.* bk. iii. t. ii. l. 22; *Code*, bk. ii. t. xii. l. 14; law of Gordian, A.D. 239); though the torturing of decemvirs under any circumstances was eventually forbidden (bk. x. t. xxxi. l. 33; Const. of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, A.D. 381). But a man was infamous after being whipped and told by the *praeco*, "Thou hast calumniated" (bk. ii. l. 16, A.D. 241). An extract from the jurist Callistratus in the *Digest* (bk. i. t. ii. l. 12) brings out in a striking way the conflict between the old civic pride of Rome and the debasement of municipal government during her decay. Traders, he says, though liable to be flogged by the aediles, are not to be set aside as vile. They are not forbidden to solicit the decurionate or other

honours in the city of their birthplace. But it does not seem to him honourable to admit to the decurion order persons who have been subject to such chastisement, especially in those cities which have an abundance of honourable men, for it is the paucity of those who should fulfil municipal offices which necessarily invites such persons, if wealthy, to municipal honours. And the 45th Novel, whilst subjecting Jews, Samaritans, and heretics, to all the charges of the decurionate, deprived them of its privileges, "as that of not being scourged."

It will thus be seen that during the five centuries which separate Justinian from St. Paul, the idea of corporal punishment under its most usual forms as a social degradation subsisted, yet the liability to it had been greatly extended. The equality before the law which might have been reached through the extension of Roman citizenship itself had been by no means attained, but the character of that citizenship itself had become debased, and the exemption from corporal punishment which still fluttered, like a last rag of the *toxa*, on the shoulders of the civic officers, had been already blown off for some. There were decurions who had been flogged, and decurions who could be flogged. Such exemption was indeed growing to be a privilege attached to the mere possession of wealth. Thus delation if proved false, or where the delator did not persevere, should he be of mean fortune, which he did not care to lose, was to be punished with the sharpest flogging (*gravissimis verberibus*, *Code*, bk. x. t. xi. l. 7; law of Gratian, Valentinian and Theodosius, end of 4th century).

Among the offences which entailed corporal punishment, besides the one last mentioned, may be named false witness (*Code*, bk. iv. t. xx. l. 13, constitution of Zeno, end of 5th century). The use of it multiplied indeed as the character of the people became lowered, and the Novels are comparatively full of it. The 8th enacts flogging and torture against the taking of money by judges (c. 8); the 123rd punishes with "bodily torments" those persons, especially stage-players and harlots, who should assume the monastic dress, or imitate or make a mock of Church usages (c. 44); the 134th enacts corporal punishment against those who detained debtors' children as responsible for their father's debt (c. 7), or who abetted illegal divorces (c. 11), and requires the adulterous wife to be scourged to the quick—so we must probably understand the words "competentibus vulneribus subactam" (c. 10; and see c. 12). On the other hand, a husband chastising his wife with either the *fustes* or *flagellum*, otherwise than for conduct for which he might lawfully divorce her, was by the 117th Novel made liable to pay to her, during coverture, the amount of 1-3rd of the ante-nuptial gift (c. 14). The last chapter of the 134th Novel indeed (*De poenarum omnium moderatione*, c. 13) professes to inculcate moderation in punishment, and enacts that from henceforth there shall be no other penal mutilation than the cutting off of one hand, and that thieves shall only be flogged. Already under Constantine it had been enacted (*Code*, bk. ix. t. xlvii. l. 17, A.D. 315) that branding should not be in the face, as figuring "the heavenly beauty,"—a law in which the influence of Christian feeling upon the first Christian emperor is strikingly displayed.

Passing from the legislation of the East to that of the West, we find on the whole a very similar course of things. Among the ancient Germans, according to the account of Tacitus, corporal punishment was rare. He notes as a singularity that in war none but the priest was allowed to punish, bind, or even strike (*ne verberare quidem*) a soldier (*De Mor. Germ.* c. vii.). A husband might indeed flog his adulterous wife naked through the streets (c. xix.); but otherwise even slaves were rarely beaten (c. xxv.).

In the barbaric codes, corporal punishment is in like manner primarily a social degradation. We find it inflicted on a slave, as an alternative for compensation. Under the Salic law, a slave stealing to the value of 2 *denarii* was to receive 120 blows (*ictus*) or to pay three *solidi* (*Pactus vulgod. antiq.* t. xiii.), the *solidus* being equivalent to 40 *denarii*. The same punishment was inflicted on a slave committing adultery with a slave-girl (rape indeed seems meant) where she did not die of it (t. xxix.). Where a slave was accused of theft, corporal punishment was applied by way of torture. Stretched on a bench (*super scamnum tensus*) as the really older but so-called *recentior* text has it, he received 120 blows (*ictus*, or as the other text has it, 121 *colaphos*). If he confessed under torture, as already mentioned under the head "Mutilation of the BODY," the penalty was castration if a male, but for a woman 240 strokes with a scourge, or 6 *solidi*. A Constitution of King Childebert (middle of 6th century), contained in Labbé and Mansi's *Councils*, enacts in certain cases of sacrilege that a "servile person" shall receive 100 lashes. Under the Burgundian law (in force from the beginning of the 6th until at least 813, when it was still recognised) bodily punishment without the option of composition was enacted for the slave, where the freeman might compound. Thus for the theft of a hog, sheep, goat, or of bees, the slave received 300 strokes with the rod, and fustigation is in the like manner enacted for other offences by slaves (t. v. &c.). A Lombard law of A.D. 724 (bk. vi. c. 88) has a singular enactment, punishing with shaving and whipping those women whom their husbands send out upon men of small courage (*super homines qui minorem habebant virtutem*), a text which gives a high idea of the vigour of Lombard women.

The Visigothic laws exhibit to us before any others the breaking down of the previous freeman's privilege (analogous to that of the Roman citizen) of exemption from corporal punishment. The corrupt or unjust judge, if unable to make due restitution and amends was to receive 50 strokes with the scourge publicly (*publice extensus*, Bk. ii. c. 20). The use (or abuse) of corporal punishment is indeed most conspicuous in this code. If a free woman married or committed adultery with her own slave or freedman, the punishment was death, after the public flagellation of both (bk. iii. t. ii. l. 2). If she committed adultery with another's slave, each was to receive 100 lashes (l. 3). A ravisher being a freeman, besides being handed over as a slave to the ravished, was to receive 200 lashes in the sight of all (bk. iii. t. iii. l. 1). The brother who forced a sister to marry against her will was to receive 50 lashes (*ibid.* l. 4). The slave ravishing a freewoman received 300 lashes,



with decalvation, i.e. according to the meaning of the word at this period, scalping; 200 and decalvation for ravishing a slave-woman. Accessories to rape, if free, 50 lashes, if slaves, 100 (ll. 8-12). So again for the various grades of adultery. A freeman committing adultery with a goodly (*idonea*) slave-girl in her master's house was to receive 100 strokes without infamy (apparently inflicted in private, and with a stick only),—if with an inferior one, 50 only; a slave receiving for the like offence 150 lashes, and the punishment increasing if violence were used (t. iv. ll. 14-16). By a law of Recared (*ib.* 17), public flogging was also made the punishment for prostitution, with some remarkable provisions; thus when practised by a freewoman with the knowledge or for the benefit of her parents, each was to receive 100 lashes; and when by a slave for her master's benefit, he was to receive the same number of lashes as were to be given to her, and 50 in any case where after being flogged and "decalvated" she returned to the streets. And 100 lashes awaited the woman, religious or secular, who either married or committed adultery with a priest (l. 18, also of Recared). By a law of Chindasuinth (t. vi. l. 2) a husband remarrying after divorce was to receive 200 lashes publicly, with decalvation. Another law of the same king (bk. iv. t. v.) enacted 50 lashes against a child striking a parent or in various other ways misbehaving against him. Flogging, with or without decalvation is again the punishment for consulting a soothsayer on the health of a man (bk. vi. t. ii. l. 1),—that of sorcerers, storm-raisers, invokers of and sacrificers to demons and those who consult them (l. 3); of judges or others who consult diviners or apply themselves to auguries (l. 5); of slave-women and slaves causing abortion (t. iii. ll. 1, 5, 6); generally for wounds and personal injuries by slaves, and to some extent by freemen (t. iv.); for thefts, either of goods or slaves (bk. vii. t. ii. t. iii.), with again the remarkable provisions that if a master stole with his slave, or the slave by his master's order, the master was to receive 100 lashes (besides compounding), the slave to be exempt from punishment (t. ii. l. 5, t. iii. l. 5); for certain forgeries (t. v. l. 2); for gathering a crowd to commit murder (bk. viii. t. i. l. 3); for violently shutting up a person within his house (l. 4); for soliciting others to rob or robbing on the line of march, the offence in the two latter cases being however for freemen alternative with composition (ll. 6, 9, 10, 11); for setting fire to woods (t. ii. l. 2); in the case of persons of inferior condition, for destroying crops (t. iii. l. 6), sending animals into crops or vines (l. 10); also for breaking mills or dams and leaving them unrepaired for 30 days (l. 30), &c. &c. Nowhere however is the abuse of corporal punishment more terrible than in the case of offences against religion. Blasphemers of the Trinity, Jews withdrawing themselves, their children or servants from baptism, celebrating the Passover, observing the Sabbath or other festivals of their creed, working on the Lord's day and on Christian feast days, making distinctions of meats, marrying within the 6th degree, reading Jewish books against the faith, &c., were to receive 100 lashes with decalvation, and with or without exile and slavery (bk. xii. t. iii. ll. 2, 8, 11). For marrying without priestly benediction, or in anywise

exceeding the law as to dowry, the Jewish husband, his wife and her parents, were to receive 100 lashes, or compound with 100 *solidi*. A law of Recared confirming the Council of Toledo punished with 50 blows (without infamy) any person who disobeyed the enactments of the Council and had no money to lose (t. i. l. 3).

In the ferocity of punishment under this Code, we must not however lose sight of the fact already pointed out elsewhere in these pages [BODY, MUTILATION OF THE], that the enactment of any fixed punishment constitutes an enormous step in advance on the mere composition of the earlier barbaric Codes, whilst in various of the enactments, such as those exempting slaves from punishment where they only act as the tools of their masters, we find a striving towards a higher and more discriminating standard of justice than that which measures other contemporary legislation, which equally bears testimony to the influence of the clergy on Wisigothic legislation—an influence, indeed, of which we see the darker side in the atrocious laws against the Jews.

Amongst our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, corporal punishment seems in general to have been confined to slaves, as an alternative for compensation, wherewith the slave "redeemed" or "paid the price of his skin," as it is expressed; e.g. for sacrificing to devils (laws of Wihtred, Kent, A.D. 691-725), for working on Sundays (laws of Ina, A.D. 688-728, iii.). In certain cases of theft the accuser himself was allowed to flog the culprit (xxviii.). A foreigner or stranger wandering out of the way through the woods, who neither shouted nor blew the horn, was to be deemed a thief, and to be flogged or redeem himself (xviii.).

Capital punishment is again prominent in the Capitularies. The first Capitulary of Carloman, A.D. 742 (c. 6), imposes two years' imprisonment on a fornicating priest, after he has been scourged to the quick (*flagellatus et scorticatus*). The Capitulary of Metz, 755, following a synod held at the same place, enacts that for incest a slave or freedman shall be beaten with many stripes, as also any "minor" cleric guilty of the like offence. The same enactment, confined to the case of marrying a cousin, and in slightly different language, occurs elsewhere in the general collection. A savage one on conspiracies (A.D. 805, c. 10) is added to the Salic law, enacting that where conspiracies have been made with an oath—the principals suffering death—the accessories are to flog each other and cut each other's noses off; even if no mischief shall have been done, to shave and flog each other. For conspiracies, without an oath, the slave only was to be flogged, the freeman clearing himself by oath or compounding. The same law occurs in the General Capitularies (bk. iii. 9). Another law of the 7th book (c. 123) enacts public flagellation and decalvation for the slave marrying within the 7th degree of consanguinity, and the 4th Addition embodies much of the rigorous Wisigothic Code as towards the Jews, who are to be decalvated and receive 100 lashes publicly if they marry within the prohibited degrees (c. 2). And the Wisigothic provision against marrying without priestly benedictions, or exceeding in anywise the laws as to dowry, is by this extended to Jews as well as Christians.

There remains only to shew corporal punishment as either the subject or as forming part of

the discipline of the church itself. Here, indeed, we find at first a much higher standard than that of the civil law. Among the persons whose offerings the Apostolic Constitutions require to be rejected are such as "use their slaves wickedly, with stripes, or hunger, or hard service" (bk. iv. c. 6). Soon however a harsher law must have prevailed. The Council of Eliberis, A.D. 305, enacted (c. 5) that if a mistress, inflamed by jealousy, should so flog her handmaid that she should die within three days, she is only to be admitted to communion after seven years' penance (unless in case of dangerous illness) if the act were done wilfully, or after fine if death were not intended—a provision which speaks volumes indeed of the bitterness of Spanish slavery at this period, but which nevertheless shews the church taking cognizance of the slave-owner's excesses, and endeavouring to moderate them by its discipline, at least in the case of women. On the other hand, the right of personal chastisement was often arrogated by the clergy themselves, since the Apostolic Canons enact that a bishop, priest, or deacon, striking the faithful who have sinned, or the unfaithful who have done wrong, seeking thereby to make himself feared, is to be deposed (c. 19, otherwise 26 or 28), and Augustine clearly testifies to the fact of corporal punishment being judicially inflicted by bishops, in that painful letter of his to the Prefect Marcellus, in which, whilst exhorting him not to be too severe in punishing the Donatists, he praises him at the same time for having drawn out the confession of crimes so great by whipping with rods (*virgarum verberibus*), inasmuch as this "mode of coercion is wont to be applied by the masters of liberal arts, by parents themselves, and often even by bishops in their judgments" (*Ep.* 133, otherwise 159).

Corporal punishment seems moreover to have formed from an early period, if not from the first, a part of the monastic discipline. The rule of St. Pachomius, translated into Latin by Jerome (art. 87), imposes the penalty of thirty-nine lashes, to be inflicted before the gates of the monastery (besides fasting), after three warnings, on a monk who persists in the "most evil custom" of talking, as well as for theft (art. 121). The same punishment may also be implied in the term "*corripere*" used in other articles, as "*corripientur juxta ordinem*," "*corripietur ordine monasterii*," &c. But the word might also apply to mere verbal correction, since by art. 97 children who could not be brought to think of God's judgment "*et correpti verbo non emendaverint*," are to be flogged till they receive instruction and fear. In the 4th book of Cassian's work, '*De coenobiorum institutis*' (end of 4th or beginning of 5th century), flogging is placed on the same line with expulsion as a punishment for the graver offences against monastic discipline (some of which indeed may appear to us very slight), as "open reproaches, manifest acts of contempt, swelling words of contradiction, a free and unrestrained gait, familiarity with women, anger, fightings, rivalries, quarrels, the presumption to do some special work, the contagion of money loving, the affecting and possessing of things superfluous, which other brethren have not, extraordinary and furtive refectations, and the like" (c. 16). In the rule of St. Benedict (A.D. 528) corporal punishment seems implied in the "*major emendatio*." And "if a brother for any

the slightest cause is corrected (*corripitur*) in any way by the abbot or any prior, or if he lightly feel that the mind of any prior is wroth or moved against him, however moderately, without delay let him lie prostrate on the earth at his feet, doing satisfaction until that emotion be healed. But if any scorn to do this, let him be either subjected to corporal punishment, or if contumacious, expelled from the monastery" (c. 71). Here, it will be seen, corporal punishment is viewed as a lighter penalty than expulsion.

We need not dwell on a supposed Canon of the above-referred to Council of Eliberis, to be found in Gratian and others (*ex cap. ix.*), allowing bishops and their ministers to scourge *coloni* with rods for their crimes. But in the letters of Gregory I. the Great, 590–603, the right of inflicting, or at least ordering personal chastisement is evidently assumed to belong to the clergy. In a letter to Pantaleo the Notary (bk. ii. Pt. ii. *Ep.* 40), on the subject of a deacon's daughter who had been seduced by a bishop's nephew, he required either that the offender should marry her, executing the due nuptial instruments, or be "corporally chastised" and put to penance in a monastery, and the Pope renews this injunction in a letter (42) to the uncle, Bishop Felix, himself. Bishop Andreas of Tarentum, who had had a woman on the roll of the church (*de matriculis*) cruelly whipped with rods, against the order of the priesthood, so that she died after eight months, was nevertheless only punished by this really great Pope with two months' suspension from saying mass (*ep.* 44, 45). Sometimes, indeed, corporal punishment was inflicted actually in the church, as we see in another letter of the same Pope to the Bishop of Constantinople, complaining that an Isaurian monk and priest had been thus beaten with rods, "a new and unheard of mode of preaching" (*ep.* 52). But the same Gregory deemed it fitting that slaves, guilty of idolatry or following sorcerers, should be chastised with stripes and tortures for their amendment (bk. vii. pt. ii. *ep.* 67, to Januarius, Bishop of Calaris). Elsewhere the flogging of penitent thieves seems to be implied (bk. xii. *ep.* 31, c. iv.).

Towards the end of the same century, the 16th Council of Toledo, A.D. 693, enacted that 100 lashes and shameful *decalvatio* should be the punishment of unnatural offences. With this and a few other exceptions, however, the enactments of the church as to corporal punishment chiefly refer to clerics or monks. The Council of Vannes in 465 had indeed already enacted that a cleric proved to have been drunk should either be kept thirty days out of communion, or subjected to corporal punishment (c. 13). The 1st Council of Orleans in 511 had enacted that if the relict of a priest or deacon were to marry again, she and her husband were after "castigation" to be separated, or excommunicated if they persisted in living together (c. 3). Towards the end of the 7th century, the Council of Autun (about 670), enacted that any monk who went against its decrees should either be beaten with rods, or suspended for three years from communion (c. 15). In the next century, Gregory III. (731–41), in his Excerpt from the Fathers and the Canons, assigns stripes as the punishment for thefts of holy things, and inserts the Canon of

the Council of Eliberis as to the penance of a mistress flogging her slave girl to death (cc. 2, 3). The Synod of Metz, 753, in a canon already quoted in part above as a capitulary, enacted that a slave or freedman without money, committing incest with a consecrated woman, a gossip, a cousin, was to be beaten with many stripes, and that clerics committing the like offence, if minor ones, were to be beaten or imprisoned (c. i.). We might, indeed, refer the reader under this head to all that is said above as to the Capitularies, the civil and ecclesiastical legislation of this period being almost absolutely undistinguishable.

The practice of the church on this subject was therefore in the main accordant with civil legislation, which it seems nevertheless to have humanised to some degree in favour of the slave. On the other hand, the mischiefs of clerical influence show fearfully in the enactments of the Wisigothic law against the Jews and others, and in the Carolingian legislation on the subject of marriage within the prohibited degrees.

[N.B.—Bingham's references on this head are more than once misleading.] [J. M. L.]

CORSICUS, presbyter, martyr in Africa, June 30 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

COSMAS. (1) Martyr at Aegea, with DAMIAN, under Diocletian, Sept. 27 (*Mart. Hieron., Bedae, Rom. Vet., Usuardi*); as "wonder-workers and unmercenary," Nov. 1 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) ἁγιοπολίτης καὶ ποιήτης, Oct. 14 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

COTTIDUS, or QUOTTIDIUS, deacon, martyr in Cappadocia, Sept. 6 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*). [C.]

COUNCIL [*Concilium*, as early as Tertull. *De Jejun.* xiii., *De Pudic.* x., and Σύνοδος (= "assembly," in LXX., and in the translation of Symmachus), in *Apost. Canons*, xxxvi. al. xxxvii. (and again in Euseb. *H. E.* v. 23, &c.), but the latter term still used also at the same period for any Christian assembly, e. g. *Apost. Constit.* v. 20: in late medieval times, Lyndwood (*Provinc. II. tit. vii. p. 115*) appropriates "council" to provincial, and "synod" to diocesan assemblies—"episcopi in suis diocesibus faciunt synodos, metropolitani vero concilia:"—*Conciliabulum* appropriated to the "conventicula haereticorum," as early as *Conc. Carth. IV. c. 70*, A.D. 398, and so also Ψευδο-σύνοδος, and Ψευδο-σύλλογος, in the Theodos. Code:] = an assembly of either a part or (as far as possible) the whole of the Christian Church, for either elective, judicial, or legislative purposes, or else to elicit the testimony of the collective Church upon emergent doctrinal questions,—suggested by Apostolic precedent, and by obvious reason, and grounding itself also (as time went on) upon the promise of our Lord to be present where any are gathered together in His name (e. g. *Conc. Chalced., Epist. ad Leon.*, A.D. 451; *Conc. Constantin. Act.* xvii. A.D. 681; *Conc. Tolet. III. A.D. 527*; *Facund. Herm., Def. Trium Capitul. c. vii.*; &c.), and upon His injunction to "tell the Church."

Such councils are usually classified somewhat as follows—in an order which also tallies with the chronological order in which each class came to exist:—

1. A council of a single "parochia," or (in the

modern sense) diocese, consisting of the bishop and presbyters, but with the deacons and people assisting; which will be here called DIOCESAN (called also *Episcopal*, and in later [Frank] times, *Civile* = of one city or see). Of such synods there is no distinct mention until the 3rd century, but it is obvious that, either in a formal or an informal way, they must have been part of the ordinary organization of the Church, at a time when each diocese consisted of the Christians of a single city in which bishop and clergy dwelt, with a few country congregations only, gradually growing up,—i. e. from the very beginning; and that they would be recognized in canons, only when the extent of dioceses, and other like causes, rendered canons on the subject necessary.

2. A council of the bishops of several dioceses, i. e. a PROVINCIAL Council, held (when metropolitan organization came to exist) under the metropolitan of the province, viz. from about the latter half of the 2nd century, and from that time considered a "perfect" (τελεία) synod of the kind, only if the metropolitan were present (ἡ συμπάρεστι καὶ ὁ τῆς μητροπόλεως, *Conc. Antioch. A.D. 341*, can. 16, and, much later, *Conc. Bracar. II. A.D. 572*, can. 9). And such councils were (with the diocesan synods) the essential framework, as it were, and bond of union and of good government in the Church; and became part of its ordinary machinery early in the 2nd century, and probably from the very beginning, but are first mentioned, of the East, by Firmilianus of Caesarea in Cappadocia (*Epist. 75 ad Cyprian.* earlier half of 3rd century), when they regularly and of necessity ("necessario") recurred in Asia once a year, for purposes of discipline, and of the West, by St. Cyprian, at the same period. The "Councils of the Churches," however, are mentioned by Tertullian (*De Pudic.* x.) as if in his time an ordinary church tribunal, which determined among other things against the canonicity of the Shepherd of Hermas.

3. A council of the bishops of a patriarchate, or primacy, or exarchate, i. e. of a *diocese* in the ancient sense of the term, as, e. g. a council τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως ordained Flavian of Antioch, *Conc. Constant.*, ap. Theodor. *H. E.* v. 9; called (as by St. Augustin, *De Bapt. c. Donat.* i. 7, ii. 3) "REGIONIS," or national, or again PLENARIUM, and UNIVERSALE (e. g. *Conc. Tolet. III. A.D. 527*, c. 18), and in Africa in the 4th century UNIVERSALE ANNIVERSARIUM (e. g. in *Conc. Carth. III. c. 7*); and by Pope Symmachus, speaking of a Roman Council of the kind, GENERALE. And under this head may be reckoned also:—i. The early councils, assembled incidentally and upon emergencies, and consisting of as many bishops of neighbouring provinces gathered together as circumstances allowed, such as those which Tertullian mentions: "Aguntur praecepta per Graecias illas certis in locis concilia ex universis ecclesiis," &c., *De Jejun.* xiii. (implying that hitherto there had been no councils of the kind in the West); or again, the councils in Asia Minor and at Anchialus, against the Montanists, in the middle of the 2nd century (Hefele), mentioned by Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 16; or the various councils respecting Easter in both East and West in the latter part of the same century (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24); which are the earliest councils upon record. ii. The councils of the Eastern



Church by itself, or of the Western Church by itself, as in the 4th century. And both these classes were extraordinary, and for particular emergencies. iii. The regular annual primatial councils (see *Conc. Constantin.* A.D. 381, can. 3), as, e.g. of Antioch, or more remarkably, of Africa: the latter of which, acc. to *Conc. Carthag. III.* A.D. 398, cans. 2, 7, 41, 43, was to consist of three bishops as legates from each African province, except that of Tripoli, which was to send only one, as having few bishops, thus admitting the principle of representation under pressure of circumstances; while subsequent councils permitted a "vicar" instead of the bishop in person in case of absolute necessity (*Conc. Carthag. IV.* can. 21), and enacted a division of the bishops into "duo vel tres turmae," each "turma" to attend in turn (*Conc. Carthag. V.* can. 10); and, lastly, altered the "yearly" meeting into one only "quoties exegerit causa communis" (*Conc. Milevit. II.* A.D. 416, can. 9, *Cod. Can. Afric.* xcv.). Like councils were (less regularly) held at Rome in the 5th century, as e.g. when three delegates from the Sicilian bishops were directed by Pope Leo the Great (*Epist.* iv. c. 71) to attend the autumnal synod of the two to be annually held at Rome. And occasionally elsewhere also, as in Spain and in Gaul. National councils, in later times (6th century onwards), e.g. in France, in Saxon England, and above all in Spain, belong, where they were purely ecclesiastical, to the same class.

4. A council of (as far as possible) the bishops of the whole Church, OECUMENICAL (first so called in Euseb. *V. Constant.* iii. 6, and again in *Conc. Constantin.* A.D. 381), not intentionally limited to specially the Roman world, but including all Christians everywhere, although at that period the Christian Church was nearly included in the narrower meaning;—"totius orbis" (St. Aug. *De Bapt. c. Donat.* i. 7), "ex toto orbe" (Sulp. Sev. ii.), "plenarium universae ecclesiae" (St. Aug. *Epist.* 162), "plenarium ex universo orbe Christiano," as distinguished from (not only "provinciarum," but) "regionum concilia" (Id. *De Bapt. c. Donat.* ii. 3). So Tertullian (as above cited) speaks of "representatio totius Christiani nominis." And Augustin (*De Bapt. c. Donat.* vii. 53) distinguishes "regionale" from "plenarium concilium," and rests the certainty of the latter on the "universalis ecclesiae consensio." And this was regarded as an extraordinary remedy for an extraordinary emergency, to be resorted to as seldom as possible; and even when necessary, yet an evil for the time, as throwing everything into disturbance,—as bad as a tempest ("procella," St. Hilar. *De Synodis*). And as it was first possible, so does it appear to have been first thought of, in the time of Constantine the Great.

To these must be added, as matter of history, although all more or less abnormal:—

5. The Σύνοδοι Ἐνδημούσαι, at Constantinople, from the 4th century, and again at the various cities where the Roman emperors dwelt, as at Rome, and in one case (under Maximus) at Treves, and again the *Concilia Palatina* under the Carolingian emperors, held "in regum palatiis;" consisting in each case of the bishops who happened to be at court.

6. The mixed national councils of the European kingdoms, after the conversion of the

Franks, Saxons, Spaniards, &c.; *Placita*, *Witensgemots*, &c.

The so-called Council of the Apostles (in Acts xv.) is a distinct precedent, in principle, for Church councils; as sanctioning the decision of emergent controversies and matters of discipline by common consultation of the whole Church under the guidance and leadership of the "apostles and elders," = the bishops and presbyters. It is "the apostles and elders" who come together to consider the matter (Acts xv. 6). Yet πάντες τὸ πλῆθος are present (ib. 12), but as listening. It is "the apostles and elders, with the whole Church," who make the decree (ib. 22). And the best MSS. make that decree run in the name of "the apostles and elders" only, although the reading is no doubt uncertain (ib. 23, reading οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοί). The formal deliberation and the decree, then, emanate from the apostles and the elders, but the whole Church, i.e. the laity also, are consulted. In the same way, in other cases, we find, e.g. the "prophets and teachers" at Antioch sending St. Paul and Barnabas on their mission; yet St. Paul and Barnabas report (ἀγγεῖλαι) to an "assembly of the Church" of Antioch what "God had done with them" (Acts xiii. 1, xiv. 27); St. Paul however at a later time reporting privately, for obvious reasons, to James and the elders (ib. xxi. 18). And the same two were formally sent to the council at Jerusalem by the Church of Antioch (προπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας), which plainly had also appointed them (ἔταξαν, Acts xv. 2, 3). In 1 Cor. v. 4, the Church of Corinth is represented as "gathered together" to exercise discipline. That St. James presided at Jerusalem naturally followed from his office of Bishop of Jerusalem. Strictly speaking, the assembly over which he presided was an assembly of the Church of Jerusalem only, to receive a deputation from the Church of Antioch. And it differed from the Church councils also in the actual presence in it of apostles. But this difference only strengthens the case as a precedent for mutual deliberation on the part of the Church collectively: ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν (Acts xv. 25). Other assemblies in apostolical times, mentioned in the Acts—viz. Acts i. 15, to appoint an apostle in the place of Judas; vi. 2, to establish the diaconate; ix. 27, to receive St. Paul—have been miscalled Apostolic Councils, by an obvious straining of the term.

It will be convenient to speak, successively, of—

A. The ORDER of holding Ecclesiastical Councils;

B. The CONSTITUENT MEMBERS of Ecclesiastical Councils;

C. The AUTHORITY assigned to such Councils. And, lastly, to add a few words respecting

D. IRREGULAR and abnormal assemblies akin to Councils.

A. Under the head of the ORDER of holding a council, we have to consider,—

I. *By whom councils were summoned.*

Diocesan and Provincial Councils were summoned respectively by the bishop of the diocese and by the metropolitan of the province (see authorities in Bingham), and this after the time of Constantine, as well as before it. A council of two or more provinces together would natu-



ally be summoned by the senior metropolitan; the earlier councils of neighbouring bishops, prior to the organization of the metropolitan system, by the leading bishops of the locality, as, e.g. that at Antioch, which condemned Paul of Samosata; those of a patriarchate or primacy, as e.g. of Africa, by the patriarch or primate. The *σύνοδοι ἐνδημούσαι* of Constantinople were summoned by the Patriarch of Constantinople; the *Concilia Palatina* by the Frank kings and emperors; the national councils of the European kingdoms, which were as much civil as ecclesiastical, by the respective kings. And in these last-named cases the royal permission or command to hold them is frequently mentioned. Oecumenical Councils, consisting in the first instance almost wholly of bishops of the Roman empire, were summoned by the Roman emperors until the 9th century (see Socrates, lib. v. *Prooem.*), although, naturally, upon consultation with the chief bishops of the Church herself. After that period, those that have been so called have been summoned by the popes in the Western Church. The great Council of Nice was summoned by Constantine (by *τιμητικὰ γράμματα* [Euseb., V. *Constant.* iii. 6, and cf. Socrat. i. 9, Theodoret, i. 9], which purport to be given in a Syriac version in B. H. Cowper's *Analecta Nicaena*, pp. 21-29), but "ex sententia sacerdotum" (Rufin, *H. E.* i. 1); and chiefly, as is plain, by the accounts of Eusebius, Socrates, and Sozomen, upon the advice of Hosius, bishop of Cordova. Later documents, of no value in such a point, viz. the *Liber Damiani* and the *Conc. Constantin.* A.D. 680, put forward Pope Sylvester as the adviser. The Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, was summoned by the Emperor Theodosius (Labbe, iv. 1123, 1124); that of Ephesus, A.D. 431, *κατὰ τὸ γράμμα*, or *ἐκ θεώσεως*, of Theodosius II. and Valentinian III. (*Act. in Mansi*, iv. 1111); Pope Damasus concurring in the former, but Eastern patriarchs (Meletius of Antioch, Gregory, and his successor Nectarius, of Constantinople) really "assembling" it (even according to the *Conc. Constant.* of A.D. 680, and see Vales. ad Theodoret. *H. E.* v. 9); while Pope Celestine similarly concurred in the latter, but (as is evident by his own letters) did not summon it (*Acts of the Council and Letters* in Mansi, iv. 1226, 1283, 1291). The case of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, so far differs from its predecessors, that the pope, Leo the Great, suggested and requested it (desiring, however, to have it in Italy), yet subsequently, and when too late, desired its postponement (Leo M. *Epist.* 44, 54-58, 69, 73, 76, 89-95). The application was originally made to Theodosius II. and Valentinian III., but the council was actually summoned by Marcian, "ex decreto piissimorum Imperatorum Valentiniani et Marciani," in the words of the council itself (Labbe, iv. 77), or in those of Leo, "ex praecepto Christianorum principum et consensu Apostolicae Sedis" (Leon. M. *Epist.* 114), and again, in Marcian's words to Leo (inter Leon. *Epist.* 73), "te auctore." The 2nd Council of Constantinople, A.D. 553, was convoked by Justinian (Labbe, v. 4) after consultation with Pope Vigilius and with Mennas patriarch of Constantinople. But Vigilius after a time put himself in direct antagonism with the council, and upon May 26, 553 was actually struck out of the diptychs by it, although, after its termi-

nation, he retracted, and in the end of A.D. 553, and by a *Constitutum* of February 23, A.D. 554, accepted its decrees. The 3rd Council of Constantinople, A.D. 680, was convoked by the "piissima jussio" of the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus (Labbe, vi. 608, 631), Pope Agatho only sending legates when requested, and with them his own exposition of the faith, and a profession of his readiness to pay "promptam obedientiam" to the emperor. The 5th of Constantinople, A.D. 754 (in Cave's reckoning, the 8th oecumenical), which condemned images, was summoned by Constantine Copronymus and Leo (Labbe, vii. 397). The 2nd of Nice, A.D. 787, was convoked by the Empress Irene and her son Constantine (Labbe, vii. 661), at the request of Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople, with the acquiescence of Pope Adrian I.; the latter, however, speaking afterwards of the council (in his letter to Charlemagne) as summoned "secundum nostram ordinationem." And, lastly, the Emperor Basil, the Macedonian, called together the 4th of Constantinople, A.D. 869 (not acknowledged, however, by the Eastern Church, which puts in its place that of A.D. 879), after an embassy, sent to Pope Nicholas I., but received and answered by his successor Adrian II. (Labbe, viii. 1313). The Council of Sardica, intended to be oecumenical, was summoned by the Emperors Constantius and Constans (Socr. ii. 20; Sozom. iii. 2; St. Athanas. *Hist. Arian.* § 36). And the numberless smaller councils about Arianism were likewise summoned by the emperors. See the summary of the whole case in Andrewes (*Right and Power of calling Assemblies, Sermons*, v. 160-165, and *Tortura Torti*, pp. 193, 422, sq.). The case of the 1st Council of Arles, A.D. 314, is a peculiar one. It was not a regular council of any portion of the Church, but rather a selected ecclesiastical tribunal, of which the members were specially chosen and summoned by the Emperor Constantine, and mainly from Gaul (Euseb. *H. E.* x. 5; Optat. *Hist. Donat.* p. 181, Dupin), intended to be oecumenical (the Emperor "assembling there a large number of bishops from different and almost innumerable parts of the empire," Euseb. *ib.*), and actually called "plenarium," and "universae ecclesiae," by St. Augustine, but not so really, as neither including all bishops nor any Eastern bishops. And its object was to revise the decision of a tribunal of fewer bishops held at Rome under the Pope Melchiades in the previous year, with which the Donatists were not content. It was simply an instance, therefore, of that which afterwards became a rule, viz. of the Emperor's assigning episcopal judges to decide an ecclesiastical case. Much like it is the summoning of the Roman councils about Pope Symmachus, two centuries later, by King Theodoric.

The regular title for the bishop's or metropolitan's letters of summons was *Synodicas* or *Tractorias* (St. Aug. *Epist.* 217 *ad Victorin.*); for the Emperor's like letters, *Sacrae*.

From the summons, we go on to—

II. The time when, and the occasions upon which, councils were summoned. Speaking first of those councils which recurred, or were meant to recur, regularly, we find the chief stress of the canons to be directed to provincial councils, as being no doubt more difficult to enforce, and

also in the interest of justice, such councils being the court of appeal from the decisions of individual bishops. In the time of Firmilian and of Cyprian, as said above, these were habitually held once a year; Firmilian's words being apparently determined to mean provincial, not diocesan, councils, by the mention of "seniores et praepositi," "presbyters and bishops" (in the plural). The great Council of Nice (can. 5) increased them to twice in the year, once before Lent, once in autumn. And so also the *Apostolic Canon* 37, specifying, however, the 4th week after Easter and the 12th of Ὑπερβεραῖος, i.e. October. And twice a year, accordingly, became thenceforward the rule of what ought to be, although in actual fact, and by repeated concessions of councils, finally relaxed into once. So *Conc. Antioch*, A.D. 341, can. 20 (slightly varying the days), *Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, can. 19; and for Africa, *Conc. Carthag. III.* A.D. 397, can. 2, and V. can. 7 (fixing October 21), and *Cod. Can. Afric.* c. 18; for Spain, *Conc. Tolet. III.* A.D. 589, can. 18, *IV.* A.D. 633, can. 3 (fixing May 20), *XI.* A.D. 675, can. 15, *XVII.* A.D. 742, can. 1; *Emerit.* A.D. 666, can. 7; for France, *Conc. Ratiens.* A.D. 439, can. 8 (twice a year), *Ausis. I.* A.D. 441, can. 89, *Auxel. II.* A.D. 533, can. 2, *Altissiod.* A.D. 578, can. 7; and for England, *Conc. Culchyth.* A.D. 787, can. 3 (the title of which, however, seems to refer it to diocesan councils), and before it, *Conc. Hertsf.* A.D. 673, can. 7, ordering a synod twice in the year, but in the next sentence limiting the number to once, viz. upon August 1, at Clovesho, on the ground of unavoidable hindrances. Once a year became, indeed, the recognized practice (but as an uncanonical concession to necessity), and is admitted by Gratian (*Dist. xviii.* c. 16, 189, 2 c.), and in England by Lyndwood (*Provinc. lib. i. tit. 14*); as it had been allowed much earlier by the council in *Trullo*, can. 8, and by *Conc. Nicaen. II.* can. 6. And similarly, Gregory the Great, enjoining once a year in Sicily (*Epist. i.* 1), and in Gaul (*ib. ix.* 106), adds in the latter case that it ought to be twice; and enjoins twice in Sardinia (*ib. iv.* 9), possibly as being an island of no great extent; while in yet another case (*ib. v.* 54) he orders such synods whenever needed. Leo the Great, likewise, A.D. 446, commands synods twice a year at Thessalonica (*Epist. xiv.*), but A.D. 447, only once a year at Rome, yet with the addition that it ought to be twice (*ib. xvi.*). See also Avitus Vienn. (*Epist.* 80—"It ought to be twice in a year, would that it were once in two years!") and Pope Hormisdas (*Epist.* 25—"If not two, at least one"). Finally, Pipin, A.D. 755 (in *Conc. Vern.* pref. cans. 2, 4), renewed the injunction of two a year, naming for them March 1 and October 1, but the second of them to be attended only by the metropolitans and certain selected clergy. Yet, a century after, the *Conc. Tull.* A.D. 859, can. 7, is again compelled to supplicate that they might be held once in the year.

Diocesan synods are assumed, in the 11th century (*Modus tenendi Synodos*, in Wilk. *Conc.* iv. 784), to be also held twice a year. And Herardus of Tours (*Capit. c.* 91) similarly commands them to be held twice, and each time not to last more than 15 days. But here, also, earlier rules speak of once, *Conc. Liptin.* A.D. 743, c. 1 (attributed also to *Conc. Tolet. XVII.* can. 1), *Suession.* A.D. 744, c. 2, St. Boniface (*Epist.* 105),

*Capit. Car. M. VII.* 108; of which authorities, however, the last is busied not so much with a synod as with ordering the clergy to give account of their acts and receive instructions, and bids them go "per turmas et per hebdomadas" to the bishop (*ib. vi.* 163). It was the office of such synods, among other things, to promulgate to the diocese the decrees of the provincial synods; and accordingly we find a provision, in *Conc. Tolet. XVII.* A.D. 693, can. 7 (and cf. also *Conc. of Clovesho*, A.D. 747 can. 25, and the nearly contemporary German Council under St. Boniface, can. 6, in Hadan and Stubbs, iii. 371, 377), that a diocesan synod should be held within six months after the provincial one. We find also abbats and presbyters summoned to an annual synod, sometimes together, sometimes separately (*Conc. Oicens.* A.D. 598, c. 1, for Spain; *Altissiod.* A.D. 578, can. 7, for Gaul). Diocesan synods were at that time commonly summoned about Lent. In earlier times still, e.g. that of St. Cyprian, such councils would seem to have been held whenever needed.

The primatial or patriarchal synods were intended to be annual, and that of Africa was commonly called *Universale Anniversarium*. But the usual difficulty of procuring attendance was at once testified, and in attempt remedied, by the provisions for representation mentioned already. Pope Hilary (*Epist.* 3) also orders such synods once a year in Gaul. And Leo the Great summons the Sicilian bishops to attend by representation at one of two such synods annually in Rome (*Epist. iv.*). But circumstances must have speedily rendered such regular synods impossible. The Council of Agde, A.D. 506, can. 71, seems to renew the annual rule. But the 2nd of Mâcon, A.D. 585, can. 20, made it triennial ("post trietericum tempus omnes convenient") for Gaul. And this is the Tridentine rule in later times. The *Concilia Palatina* were at first occasional, as the kings or emperors summoned them. Pipin, as above said, A.D. 755, called some council of the kind twice in the year; but the actual practice remained irregular. And *Conc. Tull.* A.D. 859, can. 7, asking for a provincial council once a year, asked also for a palatine council once in every two years. Hincmar, however, speaks of twice a year as customary ("consuetudo tunc temporis erat," speaking of "Placita," *Opp. II.* 211, sq.).

All these kinds of councils were parts of the ordinary constitution of the Church, even the Palatine councils being mixed up with ecclesiastical matters. And those of them that were proper Church councils were needed at regular times; as required (according to *Conc. Carth. III.* can. 2), "propter causas ecclesiasticas, quae ad perniciem plebium saepe veterascunt," although their functions were not restricted to cases of discipline only. Other kinds of councils were only occasional remedies for special emergencies, and were held therefore when needed. Of the six grounds usually enumerated (e.g. by Hefele) for holding oecumenical councils, setting aside all those that belong to medieval times, as, e.g. the deciding between rival popes, &c., there remains, for earlier times, only one, which is both historically the ground upon which the great oecumenical councils were actually summoned, and that assigned by the *Apostolic canon* (37) for councils at all—Ἀνακοινέσθαι ἀλλήλοις

[οἱ ἐπίσκοποι] τὰ δόγματα τῆς εὐσεβείας, καὶ τὰς ἐμπιπτούσας ἐκκλησιαστικὰς ἀντιλογίας διαλύεωσαν.

III. The *place* in which councils were held, when purely church councils, was commonly the church or some building attached to the church; *e.g.* the *Secretarium* or *Διακονικὸν* attached often to large churches (Liberat. *Breriar.* xiii.), in which kind of building the 3rd to the 6th Councils of Carthage were held, and others also (Du Cange in *v. Secretarium*); or the baptistery or *Φωτιστήριον*, wherein the Council of Chalcedon, for instance, A.D. 451, met (Labbe. *Conc.* iv. 235, and see Suicer in *v. φωτιστήριον*); or the church itself, as in the Council of Toledo IV. A.D. 633; or again in much later times (as A.D. 879 and 1165, at Constantinople), the galleries or *Κατηχούμενα* of the church (Bingh. VIII. v. 7). The great Council of Nice met, according to Eusebius (*V. Constant.* iii. 7) in an *οἶκος εὐκτήριος*, or as he words it elsewhere (*ib.* 10), *ἐν τῷ μεσαιτάτῳ οἴκῳ τῶν βασιλείων*. Theodoret (i. 7) and Sozomen (i. 19) determine this to mean a royal palace. Valesius, on the contrary (*ad loc. Euseb.*), argues that it must mean a church. The words of *e.g.* Sozomen appear really to show, that the bishops met during their first sessions in a church, but that when the day of decision arrived, and Constantine in person intended to be present, then they removed to his palace; which was *οἶκος μέγιστος*, and where the bishops sat on seats along the wall, and the emperor on a throne in the middle. The next four Oecumenical Councils were certainly held in a church or in a building attached to a church, respectively at Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and again Constantinople (Jo. Damasc. *De Sac. Inaug. tract.* iii., St. Cyril. Alex. *ad Theodos.* in *Act. Conc. Ephes.*, Evagr. H. E. ii. 3, &c.). The Council of Constantinople, A.D. 680, and the supplemental Trullan Council of A.D. 692, were held in the *secretarium* of the Imperial palace, called *Trullus*. The Council of Constantinople against images, A.D. 754, was held, first in the imperial palace of Hiera on the shore opposite Byzantium, and then in a church in Constantinople itself. Palatine councils and mixed national councils were commonly and naturally held in royal palaces. In Ciampini (*Vet. Mon. I. tab.* xxxvii.) is figured a mosaic of the 5th century, indicating a council, and with a *suggestus* and the open Gospels thereon in the middle, from the Baptistery at Ravenna.

Diocesan and provincial councils were held naturally and ordinarily in the cathedral and metropolitan cities respectively. Why Clovesho was selected for the provincial councils of Saxon England, it is impossible to say, in the absence of any certainty as to where Clovesho was. Possibly it was a central spot, which Canterbury was not. The outgoing council sometimes named the place for that which was to come next; as *e.g.* *Conc. Tolet.* IV. A.D. 633, can. 4, enacts that it shall do. So also the place for the first of Pipin's two annual councils was fixed by himself, but that first council determined the locality of the second. *Conc. Arausic.* I. A.D. 441, can. 29, forbids any council to be dissolved "*sine alterius conventus denuntiatione.*" *Conc. Emerit.* A.D. 666, c. 7, and *Conc. Tolet.* iv. A.D. 633, can. 3, leave it to the metropolitan to determine the place, which was the usual rule. The

palace where king or emperor happened to be, commonly decided the locality of the *Concilia Palatina*, as *e.g.* Clichy, Braine, Aix-la-Chapelle, &c. The localities of the Oecumenical Councils were determined by the circumstances of the case, and the convenience of the emperors. Nicaea, *e.g.* was close to the emperor's palace at Nicomedia. Ephesus was a convenient seaport, with great facilities of access on account of its trading importance, and accessible by land through the great road by Iconium to the Euphrates (see Howson and Conybeare's *St. Paul*, vol. ii., pp. 80, sq. 8vo. edit.). Chalcedon was close to Constantinople, yet apart from it. And Sardica again was chosen, in A.D. 347, as a place most convenient for East and West to meet in.

IV. *Provision at the public expense*, was also made, both for the conveyance of the bishops to the place of meeting, and for their entertainment during the sessions, at any rate during the period of the councils against the Arians. The former was ordered by Constantine in the cases of the Councils of Arles I. and Nice (Euseb. *H. E.* x. 5, and *V. Constant.* iv. 6-9, &c.); and is bitterly complained of, somewhat later, by Ammianus Marcellinus (*Hist.* xxi. fin.), as interfering with the public system of conveyance to the detriment of public business and convenience; while pope Liberius endeavoured to obtain a council from the emperor by (among other motives) offering that the bishops would waive the privilege and travel at their own expense (Sozom. iv. 11). Of the latter we read at the Council of Ariminum, A.D. 359, where only three of the British bishops accepted it, the others, with the bishops of Gaul and Aquitaine, declining it as interfering with their independence (Sulp. Sev. ii. 55).

V. The *ceremonial* of a council is described in respect to a provincial council, by an order of *Conc. Tolet.* IV. A.D. 633, can. 4, quoted and abridged, but not quite accurately, by Hefele (*I.* 65, *Engl. Tr.*), thus:—"Before sunset on the day appointed, all those who are in the church must come out; and all the doors must be shut, except the one by which the bishops enter; and at this door all the *ostiarii* will station themselves. The bishops will then come, and take their places according to the times of their ordination. When they have taken their places, the elected priests, and after them the deacons, [*'probabiles, quos ordo poposcit interesse,'*] will come in their turn to take their places. The priests sit behind the bishops, the deacons [stand] in front, and all are arranged in the form of a circle. Last of all, those laity are introduced, whom the Council by their election have judged worthy of the favour. The notaries, who are necessary, are also introduced. [And the doors are barred.] All keep silence. When the arch-deacon says, *Orate*, all prostrate themselves upon the ground. After several moments, one of the oldest bishops rises and recites a prayer in a loud voice, during which all the rest remain upon their knees. The prayer having been recited, all answer, Amen; and they rise when the arch-deacon says, *Erigite vos*. While all keep silent, a deacon, clad in a white alb, brings into the midst the book of the canons, and reads the rules for the holding of councils. When this is ended, the metropolitan gives an address, and calls on those present to bring forward their complaints. If a priest, a deacon, or a layman, has any com-



plaint to make, he makes it known to the archdeacon of the metropolitan church; and the latter, in his turn, will bring it to the knowledge of the council. No bishop is to withdraw without the rest; and no one is to pronounce the council dissolved, before all the business is ended." The synod concluded with a ceremony similar to that of the opening; the metropolitan then proclaimed the time of celebrating Easter (*ib.* can. 5), and that of the meeting of the next synod, such synods being annual by can. 3.

Probably councils elsewhere followed a like practice to those of Spain. The deacons, however, at all times, did not sit but stood (*Conc. Illiberit. in proem., Conc. Tolet. I., Bracar. II.,* several early Roman Councils in Bingham ii. xix. 12, and St. Cyprian's African Councils), unless they appeared as representing their respective bishops.

A "*Modus tenendi Synodos in Anglia*" (11th cent. *Cott. MSS. Cleop. C. viii. fol. 35*, printed in Wilkins' *Concilia* iv. 784-786), supplies a like although later account of a diocesan synod. After commanding such synods twice annually, and suspending contumacious absentees for a year, it proceeds to order the church to be cleared of all people, and the doors closed, except one at which the *ostiarii* are to be stationed. Then, at an hour to be fixed by the bishop or his vicar, and in solemn procession with crosses and litany, a seat having been placed in the middle of the church with relics lying upon it, and a "plenary," i.e. either a complete missal or a complete copy of the gospels, and a stole, being likewise placed thereon, the presbyters are to take their seats according to the times of their ordination: then the deacons are to be admitted, but only those who are "probabiles," or "quos ordo poposcerit interesse;" then chosen laity; lastly the bishop, or at least his vicar. Forms of prayer are then given, with benedictions and lessons, for three days, which is assumed to be the right limit of the duration of the synod.

From at least the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431 (St. Cyril Alex. *ad Theodos. in Actt. Conc. Ephes.*), an open copy of the Gospels was customarily placed in the midst on a throne covered with rich stuffs; a precedent followed by other Councils, e.g. by that of Hatfield under Abp. Theodore, A.D. 680 ("prepositis sacrosanctis evangelis"), down even to that of Basle (see also the mosaic in Ciampini already referred to, and Suicer in v. *Εὐαγγέλιον*). St. Cyprian describes a council as "considentibus Dei sacerdotibus et altari posito" (*Epist. xlv.*). In the 8th century, an image of Our Lord is mentioned as placed in the midst, by Theodorus Studita; and about the same time images of saints likewise, by Gregory II. (A.D. 715-731, *Epist. II. ad Leon. Isaur.*). And in similar times, or later, we find also relics so placed, as in the *Modus tenendi Synodos*, above quoted. Compare also the language of Gregory the Great (*Opp. II. 1288*) in the 6th century, speaking of a Roman provincial synod as assembled "coram sanctissimo beati Petri corpore," *Conc. Tolet. xi. A.D. 675, can. 1*, prohibited talking or laughing or disorder of any kind in a council. The order of the Patriarchal Councils is given by Adelhard, the Abbat of Corbey, and will be referred to below (under D).

VI. *The President* of an ecclesiastical council

was of course, in provincial councils, the metropolitan (such a council, as we have seen, was not "perfect" without him, and his presence became ordinarily necessary to the due consecration of a bishop [BISHOP]); in diocesan councils, the bishop or (in later times) at least his vicar; in primatial or patriarchal, the primate or patriarch; the chief bishop present, at those councils which were made up from neighbouring provinces (e.g. Vitalis of Antioch, at Ancyra); the patriarch of Constantinople, in his *σύνδοξαι ἐνδημοῦσαι*; kings or emperors in the mixed national synods of later date. At Arles, in A.D. 314, Marinus Bishop of Arles signs the synodical letter first, and therefore probably presided in the synod itself; and this probably by appointment of the emperor, just as Melchisedes had presided in the previous year over the abortive tribunal assembled at Rome. In the Oecumenical synods, down to A.D. 869, the emperor, either in person or by a representative, exercised a kind of external presidency—*πρὸς εὐκοσμίαν* is all that Leo the Great allows, in his synodical letter to the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451—in occupying the seat of honour when present, and in regulating and enforcing external order and the like. But the presidents or *πρόεδροι*, who are distinguished from the emperor and from his representative, and who conducted the real ecclesiastical business of the council, were either the principal bishops or patriarchs, or the legates of the patriarchs. At Nice, after opening the proceedings in person, seated in the place of honour, Constantine, who expressly disclaimed for himself the interfering with doctrine, and called himself bishop only *τῶν ἐκτὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, but the bishops themselves, *τῶν εἰσω, παρεδίδου τὸν λόγον τοῖς τῆς Συνόδου προέδροις* (Euseb. *V. Constant. v. 13*). And these *πρόεδροι*, although not expressly named, may be gathered from the list of chief members of the council (Euseb. *V. Constant. iii. 7*, Socr. i. 13, Sozom. i. 17, Theodoret, *H. E. ii. 15*), to have been, first and above all, Hosius of Corduba,—(employed by the emperor to manage the previous abortive council at Alexandria [Sozom. i. 16], present also at Elvira previously, and subsequently president at Sardica; see St. Athanas. *Apol. de Fuga*; and that Hosius gave advice to the emperor in the Donatist question also, c. A. D. 316, St. Aug. c. *Parmenion. i. 8, ix. 43*), Alexander of Alexandria (styled *κύριος* in the council, by the *Conc. Nicaen.* itself), Eustathius of Antioch (alleged by Theodoret to have addressed the opening speech to the emperor, which however Sozomen, and the title of c. 11 of Euseb. *V. Constant. iii.*, attribute to Eusebius himself, and Theodore of Mopsuestia to Alexander), Macarius of Jerusalem, and Vitus and Vincentius the presbyter-legates of the absent Bishop of Rome. Such authorities also as John of Antioch and Nicephorus (v. Tillemont, *Mém. Eccles. vi. 272*), speak of Eustathius as presiding. That Hosius presided as legate of the pope (so Gelas. *Cyzic.*, ab. A.D. 476, is commonly said to affirm, but he really says that Hosius "occupied the place of the Bishop of Rome at the council, with Vitus and Vincentius" [*ἐπέχων τὸν τόπον τοῦ τῆς μεγίστης Ῥώμης Ἐπισκόπου Σιλβέστρου σὺν πρεσβυτέροις Ῥώμης Βίτωνι καὶ Βικεντίῳ* (Labbe ii. 156)]), which is not quite the same thing), is distinctly contradicted by the language of Eusebius,



Socrates, and Sozomen. At Constantinople, A.D. 381, the successive presidents were Meletius of Antioch (no higher patriarch being at first present), and on his death, Gregory of Nazianzum until his resignation, and then Nectarius, patriarchs of Constantinople. At Ephesus, A.D. 431, Candidianus, "comes sacrorum domesticorum," was the commissioner of the Emperor Theodosius; but every one, "unless he was a bishop," was strictly forbidden by the emperor to intermeddle τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς σκέμμασιν: and Cyril of Alexandria, at first alone, afterwards with the Pope's legates, presided ecclesiastically, Candidian indeed favouring the Nestorians. In A.D. 451, at Chalcedon, the limits of imperial interference were less exactly kept. Paschasinus, bishop of Libybaeum, the pope's legate, is repeatedly said to have presided, and signs first, and as "synodo praesidens." But Marcian, in person, presided over the sixth session, proposed the questions, and conducted the business. And his commissioners, generally, "had the place of honour in the midst before the altar-rails, are first named in the minutes, took the votes, arranged the order of the business, and closed the sessions" (Hefele, from the *Acts*). At Constantinople, A.D. 553, neither Justinian nor Pope Vigilius took a personal part, the latter expressly refusing to join in it; and the actual president was Eutychius of Constantinople. In A.D. 680, Constantine Pogonatus interfered even more than Marcian in 451; and he is moreover expressly called the president. But the papal legates sign first, and Constantine only at the end of the episcopal signatures, and with the phrase, "Legimus et consentimus." At Nice, in A.D. 787, Tarasius of Constantinople really conducted the business of the council, but the papal legates sign before him; and the Empress Irene and her son were present as honorary presidents in the eighth and last session, but signed finally after the signatures of the bishops. Lastly, in A.D. 869, the papal legates with the Patriarch of Constantinople and the representatives of the other patriarchs, were practically the presidents, but the legates alone are expressly so called; while in the sixth and following sessions the Emperor Basil and his two sons acted as presidents and are so called, although refusing to sign except after the legates and patriarchs above mentioned. Of other synods, Hosius presided at Sardica, A.D. 347 (St. Athanas. *Hist. Arian.*, Sozom., ii. 12, Theodoret, *H. E.* ii. 15, and the *Acts* themselves), the two presbyter-legates of Pope Julius signing after him, and then the Bishop of Sardica itself. At the *Lutrocinium* of Ephesus, A.D. 449, the Emperor Theodosius gave the presidency to Dioscorus of Alexandria, after refusing it to the papal legates. It should be added, that objection was taken to the emperor's even sending a commissioner to the Council of Tyre, A.D. 335 (St. Athanas. *Apolog. c. Arian. n. viii.*); and that the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 869, ruled that the emperor not only need not but ought not to intervene in provincial synods, &c., but only in such as were oecumenical. But kings were present continually even in provincial synods in the West; as *e.g.* at Toledo IV. and V., A.D. 633 and 636, at the legatine councils in England, A.D. 787, in Gaul continually, and at Frankfort A.D. 794. And the king's commissaries were at the councils

of Toledo VIII. and IX., A.D. 653, 655. The remonstrance of Pope Julius to the Eastern bishops respecting the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341—that μή δει παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης κανονίζεῖν τὰς ἐκκλησίας (Soz. ii. 13, Sozom. iii. 9)—might obviously have been made by any of the patriarchs, the church not being truly represented if any chief bishop were passed over; and reads rather like a claim, which its maker felt it necessary to press, there being no doubt about the like right of the older and Eastern patriarchs. The second Council of Nice, A.D. 787, requires *all* the patriarchs (or their legates) for a really oecumenical council (Labbe. vii. 396).

VII. The order of *Precedence*, and of *Signatures*, in a council, which commonly went together, followed ordinarily, in respect to *Bishops*, the rule of priority of consecration (as *e.g.* in Africa, *Cod. Can. Afric.* 86, *Conc. Milev.* cans. 13, 14; in Italy and Gaul, Greg. M. *Epist.* vii. 112 [to Syagrius, Bishop of Autun], and so also in Spain, *Conc. Bracar.* I. A.D. 563, can. 6, and *Conc. Tolet.* IV. A.D. 633, c. 4, and [as may be seen in the signatures to charters] in England—see *Counc. of Hertford*, A.D. 673, can. 8; and *Conc. Londin.* A.D. 1075, in Wilk. i. 363). Here and there, however, custom gave precedence to a particular see, as in England latterly to London, Durham, Winchester. And in an oecumenical council, or indeed wherever present, the bishops of the chief sees, who in due time became patriarchs, took precedence of all others; the order being fixed by the council in *Trullo*, A.D. 692, as 1. Rome, 2. Constantinople, 3. Alexandria, 4. Antioch, 5. Jerusalem; the preceding general councils of Constantinople (can. 3) and Chalcedon (can. 28), having raised Constantinople from a subordinate place to have "equal honours" with Rome, but to count as second (so also Justinian, *Novel.* cxxxi. c. 2). Ephesus and Caesarea, as patriarchates in a secondary sense, followed the chief patriarchs; as *e.g.* in the 4th and 6th oecumenical councils. *Chorepiscopi*, so long as that office existed as an episcopal office, either in east or west—and again the titular and monastic bishops of the 6th and following centuries (mainly in north-western Europe)—counted in a council as bishops. If *priests* or *deacons* were present as vicars or legates of their respective bishops, they signed, in the East, in the order in which their own bishop would have signed, had he been present; in the West, usually after all the bishops present. In the 1st council of Arles, however, the priests and deacons, whom each bishop had been desired to bring with him, signed immediately after their own bishop; and the Pope's legates signed after several of the bishops. In France and England, and in the case of the archimandrites in Eastern councils, the *abbats*, although laymen, signed between the bishops and priests (if any signatures occur of the last named). In Spain, as laymen, they signed at first after the priests, but afterwards (becoming probably in many instances priests themselves) they signed, as elsewhere, after the bishops and before the priests. Of lay signatures, the emperor in the great oecumenical councils signed after all the bishops, except in A.D. 869, when the emperor and his sons signed after the great patriarchs but before all the other bishops. Imperial commissioners also took

precedence, in the council itself, immediately after the patriarchs or their representatives, but did not sign the acts at all. In the mixed European synods, lay signatures also occur. In England we have in order—king, archbishop, bishops, dukes, abbats, nobles, presbyters, *ministri*; sometimes abbesses also; but, of course, in mixed synods or rather witenagemots only; and all this, not in the same order always, for sometimes not only presbyters but deacons sign before the nobles, and abbats follow the presbyters. At Clovesho, A.D. 803, the bishop, abbats, and presbyters of each diocese, sign together, and in one case (that of Canterbury) an archdeacon also. The list of those present at the 1st Council of Arles, A.D. 314, as has been said, follows a like order. At Nice the signatures, so far as they are preserved, are of name and see simply. At the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and thenceforward, the custom began of adding “*gratia Christi*,” or “*Dei miseratione*,” or “*in Christi nomine*,” and also of adding to the name such epithets as *minimus*, *peccator*, *indignus*, *humilis*, &c. The sees are omitted commonly, but not always, in Anglo-Saxon, in Frank, and in Spanish councils. The chief exceptions in England are the Councils of Calchyth, A.D. 787, and Clovesho, A.D. 803, where the sees are certainly given. They occur, however, more often in France. But as the lists are commonly copies, the scribes are as likely as not to have added the sees in some instances, although this is clearly not the case in many. The addition of “*definiens (δριςας) subscripsi*,” belonged to bishops as such, and very often occurs, as e.g. *Conc. Chalced.* A.D. 451, from the 5th century; “*consentiens subscripsi*,” or “*consensi et subscripsi*,” or “*subscripsi*” simply, being the form for others as well as bishops. The Saxon “*pompositas*” varied the form in endless ways, as may be seen in Kemble’s *Codex Diplomaticus*. “*Pronuntians cum sancta synodo*,” also occurs in the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431.

VIII. The votes were taken no doubt by heads, from the beginning. The plan of voting by nations, the vote of each nation being determined by the majority of individual votes within the nation itself, was a device as late as the Council of Constance, intended to prevent the swamping of the council by Italian bishops, and was abandoned again after the Council of Basle. The distinction between *vota decisiva* and *vota consultativa*, the former alone counting in the formal decisions of the council, is of modern date also, so far as the terms are concerned; but the presence at councils of individuals, and of classes of persons, for consultation but without a vote, is of very early origin (see below under B), and indeed may be most probably said to date from Apostolic times.

IX. Lastly, councils were *confirmed*, in the case of the Oecumenical Councils, and so as to give their decrees the force of law, by the emperors; although, in *foro conscientiae*, St. Athanasius’s dictum holds good,—*πότε γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἠκούσθη τοιαῦτα; πότε κρίσις ἐκκλησίας παρὰ βασιλέως ἔσχε τὸ κῦρος*; (*Hist. Arian. ad Monach.* § 52, Opp. i. 376). The decrees of the Nicene Council were enforced as laws of the empire by Constantine (Euseb. *V. Constant.* iii. 17–19; Socr. i. 9; Gelas. *Cyzic.* ii. 36, in Mansi, ii. 919). Subscription to its creed was

enforced on pain of exile (Socr. i. 9; Rufin. *H. A.* i. 5). That of Constantinople, in A.D. 381, requested and obtained the legal confirmation of Theodosius the Great (July 30, A.D. 381, *Cod Theod.* xvi. l. 3). Theodosius II., after much hesitation, confirmed the principal decision of the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431 (Hefele), by exiling Nestorius and ordering Nestorian writings to be burnt (Mansi, v. 255, 413, 920). Marcian’s edicts are extant of February 7, March 13, July 6 and 28, A.D. 452, which confirm the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon of A.D. 451. The next four councils (in the Latin reckoning) of A.D. 553, 680, 787, 869, were either signed, or (as in the 6th and 8th) also enforced by an edict, by the emperors who respectively summoned them. Councils also were commonly held in the various provinces to accept the decrees of a General Council. And in this way the sanction of the bishops of Rome was given after some delay to the second council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. Nothing is said of the pope in relation to the great Council of Nice, except by documents of a date and nature such as to make them worthless (Hefele makes the best of them, but his own statements are the best refutation of his conclusion). Leo the Great refused to assent to the decree of Chalcedon respecting the patriarch of Constantinople, while accepting the rest. And both that council (ap. Leon. *M. Epist.* lxxxix.) and Marcian (*ib. Epist.* cx.) recognize in terms the necessity of obtaining the pope’s confirmation; although with special reference to the canon affecting the dignity of the see of Rome. Yet, in A.D. 553, Justinian compelled the submission of pope Vigilius to the Council of Constantinople. And the canons of the Trullan Council, in A.D. 692, were in like manner forced by the emperor upon pope Sergius. The General Councils, so called, of A.D. 680, 787, and 869, sought and received the papal confirmation. For the legal authority attached at various periods to the canons of either oecumenical or provincial councils, see CANON LAW. The “*Canones Patrum*,” i.e., probably the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, were brought forward by Theodore, and certain canons selected from them accepted as specially needed for the English Church, at the Council of Hertford, A.D. 673 (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 119). Charlemagne, in his Capitularies, dealt with ecclesiastical laws as well as civil, but consulted pope Adrian, and obtained a sort of enlarged *Codex Canonum* from him, A.D. 774; as Pipin had done before him, A.D. 747, with pope Zacharias. But the royal authority gave legal force to these laws—“*a vestra auctoritate firmentur*” (*Conc. Mogunt.* A.D. 813, in *Praef.*; and so repeatedly); as indeed had been the case with Frank and Burgundian kings, &c., before Pipin also.

The Council of Calchyth, A.D. 816, can. 9, enacts that a copy of decrees of councils should be taken by each bishop, with date and names of archbishop and bishops present; and that another copy should be given to any one affected by the decree.

B. Such being (so to say) the externals of a council, the next question relates to its CONSTITUENT MEMBERS.

I. To speak first of *provincial* councils, there can be no question that *bishops* were essentially their members. The *Apostolic Canon* (37) *speci-*

of *σύνοδοι τῶν Ἐπισκόπων*; the 5th canon of Nice, of *πάντων τῶν Ἐπισκόπων τῆς ἐπαρχίας*, &c.; and similarly *Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, can. 20, and the 29th canon of Chalcedon, which describes also such *σύνοδοι τῶν Ἐπισκόπων* as *κεκαλονισμένοι*; and the earliest known synods of the kind (the earliest indeed of any kind), those of Hierapolis and Anchialus against Montanism, and those held by Polycrates about Easter, respectively in the middle and towards the end of the 2nd century, consisted of bishops, without mentioning (yet certainly without in terms excluding) any one else (*Libellus Synodicus*, and Euseb. v. 16, 24). See also St. Cyprian (*Epist.* 73), St. Hilary (*De Syn. Prooem.*), St. Ambrose (*Epist.* 32, "audiant [presbyteri] cum populo"), St. Jerome (*Apol. c. Ruffin.* lib. II.), &c. &c. Moreover, from early times bishops but no others were compelled to attend such synods, under penalties (suspension for a year) for absence, or even for coming late; and the being present in them was a recognized and allowed cause of non-residence in their dioceses: *e.g.* *Conc. Laodic.* c. A.D. 365, can. 40; *Chalced.* A.D. 451, can. 19; *Agath.* A.D. 506, can. 35; *Vasens.* ii. A.D. 529, Pref.; *Turracon.* A.D. 516, can. 6; *Aurel.* ii. A.D. 533, can. 1; *Arvern.* i. A.D. 535, can. 1; *Turon.* ii. A.D. 567, can. 1; *Emerit.* A.D. 666, can. 7; *Tolet.* xi. A.D. 675, can. 15: see also Leo M. *Epist.* vi. A.D. 444; and Greg. M. *Epist.* I. 54 (allowing presbyters or deacons as representatives, if unavoidable). In the 3rd century, however, as in Apostolic times (Acts xv.), it becomes evident that *presbyters* also took part in such councils ("seniores et praepositi," Firmilian, as before quoted, speaking for Asia; St. Cyprian repeatedly for Africa; Euseb. *H.E.* vii. 28, of the Council of Antioch that condemned Paul of Samosata in A.D. 264 or 265, for Syria; and the case of Origen, again, at the Arabian synods respecting Beryllus; &c.). In the Council of Elvira (A.D. 305, Hefele) twenty-six or twenty-four presbyters "sat with" the bishops. In that of Arles I., A.D. 314, each bishop was directed to bring two presbyters with him, and some brought deacons also. A series of Roman councils (A.D. 461, 487, 499, 502, 715, 721) contained also presbyters, "sitting with" the bishops, and in two cases "subscribing" with them (Bingh. II. xix. 12); and others might be added, as *e.g.* under Gregory the Great (*Opp.* II. 1288). "Gregorius Papa coram sanctissimo beati Petri corpore, cum episcopis omnibus ac Romanae Ecclesiae presbyteris residens, adstantibus diaconis et cuncto clero." So again at Carthage, A.D. 387, 389, 401; at Toledo, A.D. 400; at Constantinople, A.D. 443; at Braga, II. A.D. 572; and the order of holding a council given above from *Conc. Tolet.* iv. A.D. 633, as well as the later English "ordo," also above mentioned, expressly provide for the presence of presbyters. They are present also at Calchyth, A.D. 787, and Clovesho, A.D. 803. And later still, presbyters subscribe at Lyons, A.D. 830. At the oecumenical councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon they were present, but did not subscribe. Three, however, subscribe in their own names at Constantinople, A.D. 381 (Labbe. ii. 957). But then it must be added, 1. That individual presbyters (and deacons) were sometimes specially invited to speak at such councils on account of their personal eminence and talents: as, *e.g.* Malchion,

the priest of Antioch, in the council that condemned Paul of Samosata (Euseb. *H.E.* vii. 29); and Origen at the Arabian synods that condemned Beryllus; and Barzumas the Archimandrite at the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus, invited by the emperor Theodosius II.; and St. Athanasius the deacon at Nice; and Wilfrid, still a presbyter, at Whitby. 2. That priests as well as deacons, *καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἡδικῆσθαι νομιζοντας*, *i.e.*, laymen also, are bid to be present at such synods in order to bring forward complaints and obtain justice (*Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341, can. 20, and so also in the "ordo" above quoted from *Conc. Tolet.* of A.D. 633). 3. That St. Cyprian, for instance, speaks of bishops only as the members of the synod, and this where presbyters had been present (Hefele), and of presbyters as "compresbyteri qui nobis assidebant;" while bishops only voted in the African council of A.D. 256. 4. That in *Conc. Constantin.*, A.D. 448, while the bishops signed with the formula *ὁπίσας ὑπέγραψα*, the archimandrites omit the *ὁπίσας* in their signatures. 5. That, having regard to the judicial functions of such councils, it seems impossible to suppose that any beside bishops could have been appointed judges of bishops. On the whole, then—setting aside the well known practice whereby priests (or deacons) signed and voted with the bishops as representatives or vicars of their own (absent) bishops, and reserving also the case of abbats—it would seem that bishops were the proper, ordinary, and essential members of a provincial council; but that the presbyters as a body were consulted, as of right, down to certainly the 3rd century, and not only continued to be present, but were admitted to subscribe in several instances in later centuries; but that it must remain doubtful whether they ever actually voted in a division, and that the apparent inference from the evidence is rather against than for their having done so. The presence of the metropolitan in a provincial synod, as above said, was necessary to render it a "perfect" synod. On the other hand, the metropolitan could not act, except of course in the exercise of his ordinary functions, apart from his provincial synod. *Chorepiscopi*, during the 4th century in the east, and during the 9th in the west, in France, and the monastic and titular bishops of north-western Europe from the 6th century onwards, were treated as bishops. But besides presbyters, *deacons* and *laymen* likewise took part in such synods. The usual phrase, both in St. Cyprian and in the Roman councils under Symmachus &c. just mentioned, is, "adstantibus diaconis, cum stantium plebe" (=with the laity who had not lapsed, but were in full communion); and in those Roman councils deacons subscribe, and in the same form with the bishops and presbyters; and St. Cyprian repeatedly states that he did nothing as bishop without consulting all his clergy and laity too; and the order of a council, drawn up at Toledo, A.D. 633, specifying "invited deacons" and "chosen laymen," shows that these were not supposed to come merely to bring forward complaints, but to join in consultation. "Considentibus presbyteris, adstantibus diaconis cum universo clero," is the common phrase respecting councils of 5th century onwards, but without mention of laity as a rule. There were laymen, however, at Toledo, A.D. 653, as there



had been at Tarragona, A.D. 516, and at the 2nd council of Orange, A.D. 529; and at this last named council the lay members also signed, although using the vaguer form, which, however, the bishops also used at the same council, of "consentiens subscripsi." And lay signatures occur in other instances also, as at the council of Calchyth, A.D. 787. The "seniores plebis" also, who occur in Africa in the time of *e.g.* Optatus (see Bingham, II. xix. 19), may be mentioned in the same connection. On the other hand, the archbishop of Lyons (*Conc. Epion.* A.D. 817), "permits" the presence of laity, but it is, "ut quae a solis pontificibus ordinanda sunt, et populus possit agnoscere." At Lyons itself, however, A.D. 830, we find not only presbyters, but deacons, laymen, and a chorepiscopus. The signatures of emperors indeed, or of their commissioners, to oecumenical synods; the presence of notaries at synods, who however had doubtless no votes; the part taken by kings in mixed national synods; the attendance of invited experts (so to say) as assessors, but without votes, as of doctors of theology and of canon law in later times, or of such individuals as Origen and the others above mentioned, or, again, of the "magistri ecclesiae, qui canonica patrum statuta et diligenter et noscent," at the council of Hertford, A.D. 670 (*Baed. H. E.* iv. 5, and cf. also *Conc. Tarracon.* A.D. 516, c. 13, &c.),—are obviously exceptional cases, which need no explanation. But the language in which the subject in general is mentioned, coupled with Apostolic precedent, establishes two things,—one, that deacons and laity had a right from the beginning to a certain *status* in councils; the other, that they occupied a distinctly lower *status* there than the bishops and presbyters did;—and that while there is distinct proof of both classes having been consulted and their opinions taken (so to say) *en masse*, no proof at all exists that the laity, and no sufficient proof that the deacons, ever voted individually in actual divisions. The fair inference from the evidence, as regards the general question, seems to be, that, as in the election of bishops, and in synods held for that purpose, so in provincial synods likewise, the consent of *all* orders in the Church—bishops, priests, deacons, and laity—was at the first held needful, although the bishops alone as a rule discussed and voted; that, as the Church increased in numbers, the presence of all, or nearly all, became impossible as well as mischievous; while no scheme of representation was devised to meet the difficulty, except partially in Africa (as already mentioned) in the case of bishops; and that, consequently, the presence of classes of members who did not take an active part in the actual council naturally and gradually ceased, and the bishops (or their vicars) came to constitute provincial councils alone, even presbyters no longer appearing there. It is to be added, that bishops were then in some fairly real sense the representatives of the diocese, which had indeed elected them bishops; and that (again in accordance with Apostolic precedent) they are found sometimes giving account to their dioceses of what they had done in councils, as, *e.g.*, Eusebius after the council of Nice at Caesarea (cf. Schaff's *Hist. of Christ. Ch.* i. 339). Late medieval English provincial councils, *i.e.*, convocations, which, it need hardly be said, include presbyters, are the result of an abortive

political scheme, dating from Edward I., for taxing the clergy; the proper episcopal synod gradually merging into the convention of clergy then devised (see a good account of this in Blunt's *Theol. Dictionary*, art. *Convocations*). But in Anglo-Saxon England, as in France and Spain, the purely episcopal synod was (at any rate at first) kept distinct from the Witenagemot or the Placitum, even when held at the same place and time (see Thomassin, II. iii. c. 47, § 1; and below, under D). The councils of Hertford and of Hatfield under Theodore were of bishops only, as actual members with votes. It is not until A.D. 787, that we find laity also in purely ecclesiastical councils in England.

The case of *abbats* still remains. And here we find, in the East, archimandrites, being presbyters, present and signing at the council of Constantinople, A.D. 448. In the West, it is mentioned as a singular honour, that St. Benedict, being a layman, was invited by St. Gregory the Great to a seat in a Roman council. But from the 6th century onwards in Spain, and a little later in France, abbats formed a regular portion of the councils, signing in the former country at first after, and at a later time before, the priests. They sign, also, in France. In England they occur repeatedly, and sometimes abbesses also (although Hilda at Whitby is a merely exceptional case, proving nothing), but it is either in diocesan or in mixed synods [ABBAT, ABBESS], until A.D. 787, at the legatine councils of Calchyth and in Northumbria, which are signed by abbats and lay nobles as well as bishops. So also at Clovesho A.D. 803, bishops, abbats, presbyters, deacons, sign in that order, but by dioceses (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 546, 547). A.D. 1075, Lanfranc (called by a blunder Dunstan in Hefele, i. 23, Eng. tr.) puts them on an equality with bishops in the privilege of addressing synods; as was done also at the same time and place with the archdeacons. In later times they sat and voted, just as the bishops did, and are ruled to have this right by *e.g.* the councils of Basle and Trent.

II. The constituent members of a *diocesan* council, were the *Bishop* and *Presbyters*, the latter being bound by canon to attend such councils, just as the bishops were bound to attend the Provincial Synod; but deacons and laity originally had the right to be present and to be consulted, although their actual right to a formal and individual vote is questionable at all times, and, if it ever existed, was certainly lost very early. In later centuries, in Europe, abbats also were summoned with the presbyters. The assembly of the presbyters was indeed the bishop's standing council [BISHOP, PRIEST] from the beginning: see *e.g.* Pius I. *Epist.* II.; *Constit. Apostol.* II. 28; S. Ignatius *passim*; S. Cyprian repeatedly ("Placuit contrahi presbyterium, ut . . . consensu omnium statueretur," *Epist.* 46 *al.* 49: "Cum statuerem . . . nihil sine consilio vestro [viz. of the clergy], et sine consensu plebis, mea privata sententia gerere," *Epist.* 6, *al.* 14, &c., &c.); and so at Ephesus, at Alexandria in the condemnation of Origen and of Arius, at Rome in that of Novatian (Bingham, II. xix. 8); and Pope Siricius in condemning Jovinian (*Id. ib.* 11): and for later times, *Conc. Oecum.* A.D. 598, can. 1; *Liptin.* A.D. 743 (*Labbe* vi. 1544), *Suess.* A.D. 744, can. 4; *Vern.* A.D. 755,



can. 8; *Arelat.* vi. A.D. 813, can. 4; *Capit. Theodulph.* c. 4; *Laws of Northumbrian Priests*, 44; *Eadgar's Canons*, 3-6. Abbats were also summoned, and a journey to the synod was an allowable canon of absence from their monasteries [ABBAT]. Theodore enacts that no bishop shall *compel* them to come (*Penitent.* II. ii. 3). In the Llandaff synods (*Lib. Landav.*, and extracts in Haddan and Stubbs, vol. i.), the bishop, the three great abbats of the diocese, and the presbyters (in one case, "electi"), the deacons, and all the *clerici*, form the synod. But Spanish and Frank councils, above quoted, require the attendance of abbats. Laity and deacons were obviously present and were consulted as a body both in St. Cyprian's time and later. Bishop Sage, who argues most strongly for the negative, is plainly arguing against facts. But there is always a distinction drawn, even by St. Cyprian, between the *consilium* of the clergy and the *consensus* of the *plebs* (see Moberly's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 119, 305). The gradual changes, no doubt, which are found in respect to the people's interest in the election of Bishops [BISHOPS], affected also their position in councils called for other than elective purposes.

III. Of *Oecumenical* Councils, as of provincial ones, bishops were clearly the proper and essential members; yet here too presbyters and even deacons were sometimes present. At Nice, in A.D. 325, presbyters and deacons were present, and in great numbers; and one deacon certainly, St. Athanasius, spoke: but there is no trace or probability of their having voted. At Constantinople, A.D. 381, three presbyters occur among the signatures, signing to all appearance in their own names, and intermixed with the bishops of the province from which they came. But there are many other signatures in the list of presbyters signing as representatives of bishops. And since the list as it stands is the work of a copyist, it is quite as likely as not that these three also represented bishops, but that the few words at the end of each name indicating the fact have been accidentally omitted. At Constantinople, in A.D. 448, presbyter-archimandrites sign exactly as if they had also voted; and this council, although itself not oecumenical, is embodied in that of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. At Chalcedon itself one presbyter is noted to have spoken; and at the 2nd of Nice, A.D. 787, one presbyter signs, apparently in his own name (*Bingh.* II. xix. 13, from Habert). But exceptions of this kind seem rather to prove the rule, viz. that bishops, and bishops only, each as representing his own church, were the members of Oecumenical Councils.

C. The AUTHORITY assigned to *Oecumenical* Councils was hardly made the subject of formal and systematic treatment, until the end of the great period of councils, viz. of the 4th century. It was then limited in three ways. i. Their decrees were not unalterable, in matters of discipline, by a further council; and required external obedience but nothing more, as being those of the highest church tribunal. ii. Their office, doctrinally, was not to enlarge the faith, but simply to testify in express and distinct terms to that which had been held implicitly before. "Quid unquam aliud conciliorum decretis enisa est [Ecclesia], nisi ut quod antea simpliciter credebatur, hoc idem postea diligentius crederetur;"

and again, "nisi ut quod prius a majoribus sola traditione susceperat, hoc deinde posteris etiam per scripturae chirographum consignaret . . . non novum fidei sensum novae appellationis proprietate signando" (*Vincent. Lirin. Commonit.* c. xxiii.); and this, so as to be a "sedula et cauta depositorum apud se dogmatum custos," without any the least change in them, of any kind whatsoever, whether of diminution or addition (*Id. ib.*). iii. They were not held to be formally infallible, but to possess an authority proportioned to their universality, to be capable of being amended by subsequent councils upon better information, and to be subordinate to Scripture. Of that which is certainly written in the Bible, says St. Augustin, speaking of a doctrinal question, "omnino dubitari et disceptari non possit utrum verum vel utrum rectum sit," but councils may set aside Episcopal *dicta* [St. Cyprian is the bishop specially intended], and national or provincial councils must "plenariorum conciliorum auctoritati, quae fiunt ex universo orbe Christiano, sine ullis ambagibus cedere: ipsaque plenaria saepe priora posterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clausum erat, et cognoscitur quod latebat" (*St. Aug. De Bapt. c. Donat. II. 3, § 4*). And again, in *Epist.* 54, the same St. Augustin, setting canonical Scripture first, places next in order universal customs, "non scripta sed tradita," which must be assumed to have been enacted "vel ab ipsis Apostolis, vel plenariis conciliis, quorum est in Ecclesia saluberrima auctoritas," instancing the observance of Good Friday, Easter Day, Ascension Day, Pentecost; and then, below these, mere national and local customs. Again, in arguing against Maximin the Arian, St. Augustin confines the decision to Scripture testimonies, bidding his opponent waive the Council of Ariminum, as he himself waives the "prejudication" of that of Nice. So again, St. Gregory the Great, saying repeatedly that he "quatuor Concilia suscipere et venerari sicut sancti Evangelii quatuor libros," and that "quintum quoque Concilium" (the last held up to his time) "pariter veneror" (*Epist.* i. 25; and see also, iii. 10, iv. 38, v. 51, 54), proceeds to allege as his ground for doing so, that they were "universali constituta consensu." St. Augustin indeed seems to consider the decision of a "plenary council" to be final, in a matter of discipline, because it is the highest attainable—"ultimum iudicium Ecclesiae" (*Epist.* 43, *Ad Glor. et Eleus.*); and refers the Donatists to such a council, as the remedy which "adhuc restabat," to revise, and if needful reverse, the sentence already delivered by the bishops at Rome under the pope. The well-known passage in St. Greg. Naz. (*Epist. ad Procop.* lv.), denouncing synods of bishops as doing more harm than good, through ambition and lust of contention, is simply an argument from the abuse of a thing against its use; yet proves certainly, that a council *per se* and *a priori* was not held to be infallible. On the other hand, besides the general phrase commonly prefixed to councils, "Sancto Spiritu suggerente," and the like, we find Socrates (i. 9) declaring that the Nicene fathers οὐδαμῶς ἀστοχῆσαι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐδύναντο, because they were enlightened ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος; and St. Cyril (*De Trin.* I.) calling their decrees a Divine oracle (and so

others, as *e.g.* Isid. Pelus. .v. 99, *θεόθεν ἐμπνευσθεῖσα*); and St. Ambrose, declaring that "neither death nor the sword could separate him from the Nicene Council" (*Epist.* xxi.); and Leo the Great declaring repeatedly, that the faith of Nice and Chalcedon is a first principle, from which neither himself nor any one else may swerve (*Epist.* cv. cxiv. &c. A.D. 452, 453). While Justinian, who ordered all bishops to subscribe to the faith of the first four councils, lays down in his Novels (cxxxii.), that τῶν προειρημένων ἁγίων συνόδων (viz. the four) τὰ δόγματα καθάπερ τὰς Θείας Γραφὰς δεχόμεθα, καὶ τοὺς κανόνας ὡς νόμους φυλάττομεν. The Council of Chalcedon again speaks of the Nicene decrees as unalterable. And Leo the Great speaks of the faith of Chalcedon itself as an "irretractabilis consensus." And St. Ambrose, of the decrees of general councils as "hereditary seals which no rashness may break" (*De Fide* III. 15). In short, while no one asserts that such councils were formally incapable of erring, the entire current of church teaching assumed that they had not erred; and that it would be the height of presumption and of folly in any part of the church or any individual Christian to contravene them; while both Vincent of Lerins, and possibly Augustin, would allow to a succeeding council power only to build doctrinally upon the foundation already laid by its accepted predecessors. The Provincial Councils "began," by ventilating the question; the General Council "terminated" the discussion, by sealing as it were and formally expressing the decision which had ripened to its proper and natural close; and this, on the assumption that such decision was accepted "universali Ecclesiae consensione" ("In Catholico regionali concilio coepta, plenario terminata," and so "universali Ecclesiae consensione roborata," St. Aug. *De Bapt. c. Donat.* vii. 53). And St. Vincent of Lerins, in requiring to anything "vere proprieque Catholicum," that "ubique, semper, ab omnibus, creditum est" (*Commonit.* c. 2), obviously rests the certainty of conciliar decisions upon the acceptance, implicitly or explicitly, of the whole church of all times (see Hammond on *Heresy*, sect. vi. § 9, sq.); but refuses to allow that any question so decided can be re-opened.

The relative authority of the pope and of a general council, did not emerge into a formal question until long after our period; although St. Augustin's language about Pope Melchiades, and about the *dicta* of St. Cyprian, sufficiently shows what at any rate his decision would have been, had it been possible that the question could have been raised at that time.

Whether Provincial Councils could entertain questions of doctrine, is also a question not formally put until very late times indeed. That they did so in point of fact in earlier times, may be seen in a list of instances in Palmer, *On the Church*, IV. xiii. 1 § 2. And upon St. Augustin's view above quoted, it was their proper office to ventilate such questions, and as it were ripen them for the final determination of the Oecumenical Council. Their authority, of course, like that of diocesan synods, was in proportion to their numbers and character, and to their subsequent acceptance by the Church at large.

The Church, speaking generally, has accepted absolutely the first six Oecumenical Councils,—of

Nice, A.D. 321; Constantinople, A.D. 381; Ephesus, A.D. 431; Chalcedon, A.D. 451; Constantinople, A.D. 553; Constantinople again, A.D. 680. Where the first four are spoken of especially, it is, commonly, either in order to parallel them with the four Gospels (as *e.g.* St. Gregory the Great, who adds that he equally venerates the 5th, the last then held), or because the Fathers or others who speak of them lived before the 5th was held (*e.g.* Theodosius Coenobiarcha, in Baron. *in an.* 511, no. 33, from St. Cyril and Suidas,—"*Si quis quatuor sanctas synodos non tanti esse existimat quanti quatuor evangelia, sit anathema*"), or, lastly, because the 5th and 6th are taken to be as it were supplementary to the 3rd and 4th. So *Conc. Lateran.* A.D. 649, cans. 18, 19, accepts the five councils already then held, as being all there were. The Greek and Roman Churches accept a 7th, viz. the Council of Nice in favour of images, A.D. 787 (rejected by the Western Council at Frankfort, A.D. 794, and by the English Church of the same date;—see Haddan and Stubbs, III. 468, 481); the Greek Church, however, fluctuating considerably in the point, accepting it A.D. 842, when the *Κυριακὴ τῆς Ὁρθοδοξίας* was appointed to celebrate the seven Oecumenical Councils, yet still hesitating in A.D. 863, but finally recognizing it in A.D. 879 (see Palmer, *On the Church*, P. IV. c. x. § 4). Pope Adrian accepted it. The previous Iconoclast Council of Constantinople, A.D. 754, is called the 8th Oecumenical by Cave, who counts the Trullan or Quinisext Council of A.D. 692 as the 7th. An 8th Oecumenical, viz. of A.D. 869, at Constantinople, which deposed Photius, is accepted as the next by Roman Theologians. That of A.D. 879, which restored him, is called the 8th by most of those of the East (Cave). The subsequent Western (so called) Oecumenical Councils do not fall within the scope of the present work. It is to be observed, however, that even in the 9th century, popes still spoke of the six General Councils, as *e.g.* Nicholas I., A.D. 859, and A.D. 863 or 866; Adrian I., A.D. 871 (see Palmer as above). The English Church accepted the first five, and also the canons of the Lateran Council of A.D. 649, respecting the Monothelites, which likewise accepted the five; and declared her own orthodoxy about Monothelitism with a view to the 6th General Council of A.D. 680, then impending, at the Council of Hatfield, A.D. 680 (Haddan and Stubbs III. 141, sq.). And Wilfrid had similarly professed orthodoxy in reference to Monothelite views at Rome itself in the same year, on behalf of English, Scots, and Picts (*ib.* 140). The legatine Councils of Calchyth and in Northumbria, A.D. 787, accepted the six General Councils (can. i. *ib.* 448). The canons of Aelfric, A.D. 957, accept the first four, as "the four books of Christ," and as having extinguished heresy, but add that "many synods had been held since, but these were the chief" (can. 33, Wilk. I. 254). The seventh General Council so called, of A.D. 787, was, as above said, not accepted by the English Church.

As a judicial body, the Provincial Council was at first the ultimate tribunal. An appeal from it to a larger council gradually became recognized; as at *Conc. Antioch.* A.D. 341. The appeal to the Patriarch of Constantinople, or to the Patriarch of Rome, was of later date still

[APPEAL]. *Conc. Avern. I.* A.D. 535, can. 1, enacts, that in such councils no bishop shall presume to introduce any business, until all causes are determined which pertain "ad emendationem vitae, ad severitatem regulæ, ad animæ remedia."

For the office of diocesan and provincial synods in the election of bishops, see BISHOPS.

D. Of IRREGULAR councils, a few words must be said. And first of—

I. The *σύνodoι ἐνδημοῦσαι*, as e.g. that of Constantinople A.D. 536 under Mennas, which is expressly so called, and at which also a letter was read from a similar meeting—*παρὰ τῶν ἐνδημούντων Ἐπισκόπων*—sc. from the bishops of the Patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, who happened at the time to be at Constantinople. Justinian, although passing a law against bishops coming to Constantinople without the emperor's command or leave (*De Episc. et Cleric. lib. i. leg. 42*), yet frequently consulted and employed such synods. Bishops only, however, constituted them, and the Constantinopolitan patriarchs summoned them. II. The Frank *Concilia Palatina*, on the contrary, consisted of both bishops and nobles, under the presidency of king or emperor; as did also the Witenagemots on the English side of the channel. Yet the "synod" of bishops is distinguished, as a separate assembly for purely ecclesiastical matters, from the "placitum" or "conventus," as e.g. at *Conc. Liptin.* A.D. 743, the latter of the two consisting of bishops, nobles, presbyters, and abbats. So also in Spain: where e.g. *Conc. Tolet. iv.* A.D. 633 can. 75, which was a national Spanish Council, especially characterizes its decree, even about the succession to the throne, as "pontificale decretum." In England, while bishops and nobles constituted the Witenagemot, Provincial Councils, as at Hertford and Hatfield, consisted of the clergy only. The king came in time to be usually present; and larger exceptions occur in later times, as e.g. at the Council of Calchyth, A.D. 787, at which lay nobles were present as well as the king. In Carlovingian France, the rule is laid down in terms in Abbot Adelhard's *Ordo Palatii* (ap. Hincmar. *Opp.* ii. 214):—"Utraque autem seniorum susceptacula [reception rooms for the various divisions of the Palatine Councils] sic in duobus divisa erant, ut primo omnes Episcopi, Abbates, vel hujusmodi honorificentiores clerici, absque ulla laicorum commixtione congregarentur: similiter comites vel hujusmodi principes sibimet honorificabiliter a cetera multitudine primo mane segregarentur, quousque tempus sive praesente sive absente Rege occurrerent: et tunc praedicti seniores more solito, Clerici ad suam, Laici vero ad suam constitutam curiam, subselliis similiter honorificabiliter praeparatis, convocarentur: qui cum separati a ceteris essent, in eorum manebat potestate, quando simul vel quando separati residerent, prout eos tractandae causae qualitas docebat, sive de spiritalibus sive de saecularibus seu etiam commixtis: similiter si propter quamlibet rescendi vel investigandi causam quemcunque convocare voluissent, et re comperta discederet, in eorum voluntate manebat. Haec interim de his que eis a Rege ad tractandum proponebantur." III. There occur, besides these, a few exceptional cases, as e.g. the Conference at Whitby, A.D. 664, which can hardly be called a council in the proper sense. But these need not be here dwelt upon.

[Thomassin; Van Espen; Richerius, *Hist. Conc. General.*; the older collections, as Crabbe's; Labbé and Cossart, Harduin, Mansi; and in each country, special writers upon their own national councils, as for England, Spelman, Wilkins, Landon, Haddan and Stubbs; for Spain, Loaisa, Catalani; for France, Sirmond; for Germany Harzheim; Salmon, *Études sur les Conciles* Hefele, *Concilien-Geschichte*; Pusey, *On the Councils*; Cave, *Hist. Litt.*; Bingham; Martigny.]  
A. W. H.

#### COURIER. [CURSOR.]

#### COUSINS, MARRIAGE OF. [COUSINS-GERMAN: MARRIAGE.]

COUSINS-GERMAN. No prohibition against the intermarriage of cousins-german is contained or implied in Leviticus xviii. or Deuteronomy xxvii., nor can any such be inferred from any other passage of the Old Testament; a direct sanction is, on the contrary, given to the practice in the instance of the five daughters of Zelophehad, who "were married to their father's brother's sons" (Numb. xxxvi. 11). Nor does any such prohibition occur in the monuments of early Christianity. If we take the so-called Apostolical canons to represent the customs of the Church prior to the Nicene Council, 325, neither in the text, nor in the ancient version of Dionysius Exiguus, as given in Cotelierius' "Patres Apostolici," is such a connection mentioned in the canon (c. 15, otherwise 10), which forbids clerical orders to one who has married two sisters, or a niece (*ἀδελφίδην*, rendered in the Latin *filiam fratris*). But it must be observed that in the version by Haloander, which is usually included in the *Corpus Juris*, the same canon (numbered 18) contains instead the larger term *consobrinam*, usually rendered "cousin"—a palpable tampering with the text to meet later ecclesiastical usage. At any rate Martene (*De ant. Eccles. Rit. bk. i. c. ix.*) admits that, till the end of the 4th century, marriages between cousins-german were allowed by the Church. It is therefore to be inferred that the disfavour with which the Church, especially the Western one, came to look upon cousins' marriages was rather borrowed from Roman feeling than from Jewish. It is certain that marriage between cousins-german was not practised in early times by the Romans, although, indeed, it had become prevalent in the 1st century of the empire, since we find Vitellius adducing the fact of the change in public opinion in this respect in order to justify the proposed marriage between the emperor Claudius and his niece, the younger Agrippina (Tac. *Ann.* bk. xii. c. 6). The jurists of the *Di. est* do not, however, look upon first cousins' marriages with disfavour, as appears by Paulus quoting, with approval, an opinion of Pomponius, that if a man have a grandson by one son and a granddaughter by another, they may intermarry by his sole authority (*Dig. xxiii. § ii. l. 3*). In the latter part of the 4th century, indeed, Theodosius, by a law of which the text is lost, forbade these unions, except under special permission; and a letter of Ambrose (who indeed is suspected to have advised the prohibition) to Paternus, refers both to the law and to its relaxations in special cases (*Ep.* 66). Augustine also, in his *City of God* (bk. 15, c. 16)



says that such marriages, though not prohibited by the Divine law, were rare by custom, even when not yet prohibited by the human law; "but who can doubt that in our time the marriages even of cousins were more fitly (honestius) prohibited?" And the law is likewise alluded to by Libanius, in his oration on Purveyances (*περὶ τῶν ἀργασιῶν*). A constitution of Arcadius and Honorius, A.D. 396 (*Cod. Theod.* bk. iii. t. xii. l. 3), confirms the law, assimilating the marriage with a cousin to that with a niece, and declaring that, though the man may retain his fortune during his life, he is not to be considered to have either wife or children, and can neither give nor leave anything to them even through a third person. If there be a *dos*, it must go to the imperial exchequer; it cannot be bequeathed to strangers, but must go to the next of kin, except such as may have taken part in or advised the marriage. Another law, of the same emperor, indeed (*ib.* t. x.), maintains the right of praying for a dispensation (this is a text Bingham has strangely misunderstood), and a third one (A.D. 405), which took its place permanently in Justinian's Code, swept the prohibition away. Professing to "revoke the authority of the old law," it declares the marriage of cousins-german, whether born of two brothers or two sisters, or of a brother and sister, to be lawful, and their issue to be capable of inheriting (*Code*, bk. v. t. iv. l. 19).

Narrower views, however, prevailed in the West, and in Italy particularly, to that extent that we might almost suppose the Theodosian legislation to have remained unrevoked. In the *Formularium* of Cassiodore, under the Ostrogothic King Theodoric (end of 5th century), we find a text implying its subsistence, since it is that of a state privilege legalizing such unions—the 46th Formula of the 2nd part being one "by which a cousin may become a lawful wife." And the "*Lex Romana*," supposed to represent the laws of the Roman population under the Lombard rule, expressly reckons marriage with a cousin as incestuous (bk. iii. t. 12). Finally, a capitulary of Arubis, Prince of Benevento, who usurped the fief after the death of Desiderius, the last Lombard king (A.D. 374), seems to prohibit—as in the earliest constitution of Arcadius and Honorius on the subject—all donations by a father to his children by such a marriage (c. 8). On the other hand, the Lombard laws themselves exhibit no restraint on cousins' marriages; and it appears clear that, whether the Theodosian legislation in the matter were inspired or not by the clergy, it was by the clergy that its spirit was preserved.

We need not indeed rely as an authority on an alleged decree on consanguinity by Pope Fabian (238–52), to be found in Gratian, allowing marriages within the 5th degree, and leaving those in the 4th undisturbed; nor on one of Pope Julius I. (A.D. 336–52), in the same collection, forbidding marriages within the 7th degree of consanguinity; nor on an alleged canon to the same effect of the 1st Council of Lyons, A.D. 517, to be found in Bouchard (c. 10). But the Council of Agde, in 506, declared incestuous the marriage with an uncle's daughter or any other kinswoman, the parties to remain among the catechumens till they had made amends, although existing marriages were not to be dis-

solved (c. 61); an injunction repeated by the Council of Epaoñe, 517 (c. 30), and substantially by the 3rd Council of Orleans, § 38, and by the Council of Auxerre, 578, which forbade even the marriage of second cousins (c. 31); see also the 3rd Council of Paris, about 557, c. 4, and the 2nd Council of Tours, 567, c. 51. We need, again, lay no stress on an alleged canon without a distinctive number, quoted by Ivo as from the canons of the Council of Orleans, 511, imposing for penance, in respect of such marriages, a twelvemonth's exclusion from church (during which the parties are to feed only on bread, water, and salt, except on Sundays and holidays), abstinence during life, and a prohibition to marry—a regulation savouring altogether of the later Carolingian period.

Pope Gregory the Great (590–603), whilst recognizing that the law of the Church was upon this point in opposition with the civil law, sought to base the prohibition, in part at least, on a physiological reason. In an "exposition of diverse things," in answer to Augustine of Canterbury, which forms the 31st in the 12th book of his collected letters—a most valuable repertory of facts as well for the social as for the Church history of the period—he says (c. 5) that "some earthly law in the Roman empire" (he is evidently alluding to the Constitution of Arcadius and Honorius, before referred to) allows marriage between the son and daughter of a brother and sister or of two sisters [or brothers]; but "we have learnt by experience that from such a marriage no issue can proceed;" besides that, the "holy law" forbids the uncovering of a kinswoman's nakedness. (See also Bede, *Hist. Eccles.* i. 27.) A wide experience shows how rash is the former assertion; whilst it is clear that so far from the "holy law" of the Old Testament forbidding generally intermarriage amongst kinsmen, the whole fabric of Jewish society, in its separation from the heathen, in its distinction between the tribes themselves, is based upon it. Cousins' marriages were, however, forbidden some years after Gregory's death, by the 5th Council of Paris, A.D. 615 (c. 14).

In the latter half of the 7th century we find marriage with an uncle's daughter condemned by the Eastern Church itself at the Council of Constantinople in Trullo, 691, and separation of the parties ordered (c. 54). It is remarkable, however, that in the canons of a council held in Britain under Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury (end of 7th century), it is stated that, "according to the Greeks, it is lawful to marry in the 3rd degree, as it is written in the law—in the 5th, according to the Romans—yet they do not dissolve the marriage when it has taken place" (c. 24, and see also 139), and the Roman rule is enacted in a later canon (108), which would seem to cast a doubt on the genuineness of the Trullan canon, about the middle of the 8th century. The *Excerpta*, attributed to Egbert of York, make it the rule that marriages are permitted in the 5th degree, the parties not to be separated in the 4th, but to be separated in the 3rd (bk. ii. c. 28). Substantially, first cousins' marriages seem for some considerable time, when once solemnized, to have been tolerated. Thus Gregory II. (714–30), in a long letter (*Ep.* 13) to Boniface, replying to various questions, whilst stating that he allows marriages



after the 4th degree (c. i.), does not expressly condemn those in the 4th. This, however, is now repeatedly done by councils and by popes; in the 1st Council of Rome against unlawful marriages, 721 (c. 4); by Gregory III. 731-41, in his excerpts from the fathers and the canons (c. 11); in the Synod of Metz, 753 (c. 1), which, for the first time enacts corporal punishment—the guilty party, if without money, being a slave or freedman, to be well beaten, and if an ecclesiastical person of mean condition, to be beaten or sent to jail: in the 6th Council of Arles, 813 (c. 11); and that of Mayence in the same year (c. 54).

We have now to see the influence of the clerical view on civil legislation in respect of first cousins' marriages after the barbaric invasions. With the exception of Italy, the peculiarities of whose legislation on this head have been previously noticed, the only barbaric code in which we find a prohibition before the Carolingian era is the Wisigothic one, strongly clerical in spirit, as must always be recollected. Here a law of Recarede forbids generally all marriages with the kindred of a father or mother, grandfather or grandmother, to the sixth generation, unless contracted by permission of the prince before the passing of the law, the parties to be separated and sent to monasteries (bk. iii. t. v. c. 1). In the case of Jews indeed there was superadded to separation the treble punishment of decalvation (scalping), 100 lashes, and banishment (bk. xii. 7, iii. c. 8). With these exceptions, all other enactments adverse to such marriages belong to the Carolingian rule or period. A capitulary of king Pepin at Vermerie, A.D. 753, only absolutely requires the dissolution of marriage in the 3rd degree, allowing those in the 4th, once contracted, to stand good under penance, but forbidding them for the future (c. 1). The capitulary of Compiègne A.D. 757 (see Pertz's text) is to the same effect (cc. 1, 2). On the other hand, the law of the Allamans (t. 39) renewed under Duke Lautfrid, supposed the 2nd (died 751), and the somewhat later law of the Bavarians (t. 6)—both indeed thought to have been touched up under Charlemagne—reckon all marriages between the sons of brothers and sisters unlawful, and require them to be dissolved; all property of the guilty parties to go to the public treasury, and if they be "mean persons" (*minores personae*) themselves to become slaves to it. The Carolingian capitularies proper, almost all of them confirmed by Church synods, are scarcely to be distinguished from ecclesiastical enactments. The text of some of the earlier ones must have been tampered with, since even King Pepin's Compiègne capitulary above referred to is brought into accordance with the far stricter rules of the Synod of Metz. As the law stands in the general collection of the capitularies, if a man marries his cousin, he is not only to lose all settled moneys, but if he will not amend his ways none is to receive him or give him food; he is to compound in 60 *solidi*, or be sent to gaol till he pays. If he be slave or freedman, he is to be well beaten, and his master to compound in 60 *solidi*. If he be an ecclesiastical person, he is to lose any dignity he has, or if not honourable, to be beaten or sent to gaol (A.D. 756-7, bk. vii. cc. 9, 10). A capitulary of the 6th book (130) forbids marriage to the 7th degree. So does one

of the *Additio tertia*, c. 123, under pain of the ban (at 60 *solidi*) and penance for a freeman; but for a slave, of public flagellation and decalvation, and penance. If the offenders be disobedient, they are to be kept in jail "in much wretchedness" (*sub magnâ aerumnâ*), nor touch any of their fortune till they do penance; and whilst living in crime (c. 124) are to be treated as gentiles, catechumens or energumens. Jews marrying within the prohibited degrees are to receive 100 lashes after having been publicly decalvated, to be exiled and do penance, with forfeiture of their property either to their children by any former marriage, not being Jews, or in default of such to the prince (*Additio quarta*, c. 2), a provision borrowed mainly from one of the Wisigothic codes above referred to. See also cc. 74, 75 of the Fourth Addition, anathematizing the man who marries a cousin, and repeating the prohibition against marriages within the 7th generation. The various enactments requiring inquiry to be made as to consanguinity before marriage, bear also on this subject; as for instance the Council of Fréjus in 791, c. 6; Charlemagne's first capitulary of 802, c. 35; an inquiry which by his Edict of 814 is even required to be made after marriage, the 4th degree being expressly specified as one of prohibited consanguinity.

On the whole, the course of Church practice on the subject appears to have been this: the traditional Roman prejudice against cousins' marriages, although quite uncountenanced by the Jewish law or practice, commended itself instinctively to the ascetic tendencies of the Western fathers, and through them took root among the Western clergy generally, embodying itself indeed temporarily, towards the end of the 4th century, in a general civil law for the Roman empire. But whilst this law was abrogated in the beginning of the 5th century, and in the East such unions remained perfectly lawful both in the Church and in the State throughout nearly the whole of the period which occupies us, never being condemned by any Oecumenic Council till that of Constantinople towards the end of the 7th century, in the West the clergy adhered to the harsher view; Popes and local synods sought to enforce it; wherever clerical influence could be brought to bear on the barbaric legislators it became apparent; till at last under the Carolingian princes it established itself as a law alike of the State and of the Church. But the history of this restraint upon marriage is that of all others not derived from Scripture itself. Originating probably all of them in a sincere though mistaken asceticism, they were soon discovered to supply an almost inexhaustible mine for the supply of the Church's coffers, through the grant of dispensations, prosecutions in the Church Courts, compromises. The baleful alliance between Carolingian usurpation and Romish priestcraft, in exchange for the subserviency of the clergy to the ambition and the vices of the earlier despots, delivered over the social morality of the people to them, it may be said, as a prey, and the savageness of Carolingian civil legislation was placed at the service of the new-fangled Church discipline of the West. [J. M. L.]

**COVETOUSNESS.** The works of the earliest Christian authorities are full of warnings

against the different forms of covetousness, *c.g.* Clem. *ad Corinth.* bk. ii. cc. 5, 6; Hermas, bk. i. vis. 1, and bk. ii. mand. 12; *Const. Apost.*, bk. i. c. 1; ii. c. 46; iv. c. 4; vii. cc. 3, 4. The Apostolical Constitutions follow St. Paul in treating covetousness as a disqualification for a bishop; bk. ii. c. 6; and in a later constitution also for a priest or deacon; bk. vii. c. 31. The covetousness of some of the Church-widows is especially denounced; "who deem gain their only work, and by asking without shame and taking without stint have already rendered most persons more remiss in giving,"—who "running about to knock at the doors of their neighbours, heap up to themselves an abundance of goods, and lend at bitter usury, and have mammon for their sole care; whose God is their purse," &c. (bk. iii. c. 7). The oblations of the covetous were not to be received (bk. iv. c. 6). With this may be connected the canonical epistle of Gregory Thaumaturgus, archbishop of Neocaesarea (about A.D. 262) which declares that it is impossible to set forth in a single letter all the sacred writings which proclaim not robbery alone to be a fearful crime, but all covetousness, all grasping at others' goods for filthy lucre; the particular object of his denunciation being apparently those persons who had thought a late barbaric invasion to be their opportunity for gain (can. 7 and foll.). Others of the Fathers in like manner vigorously denounced the existence of the vice among the clergy. The covetousness of Pope Zephyrinus (beginning of 3rd century) is denounced by Hippolytus in his *Philosophumena* (bk. ix. c. 7, §. 11). About the middle of the century, Cyprian, in his book *De lapsis*, speaks of those Christians who "with an insatiable ardour of covetousness pursued the increase of their wealth." Ambrose, in his 7th sermon, describes a cleric who, "not satisfied with the maintenance he derives, by the Lord's command, from the altar, . . . sells his intercessions, grasps willingly the gifts of widows," and yet flatters himself by saying, 'no one charges me with robbery, no one accuses me of violence'—as if sometimes flattery did not draw a larger booty from widows than torture." Jerome with bitter sarcasm speaks of some, "who are richer as monks than they were as seculars," and of "clerics who possess wealth under Christ the poor, which they had not under the devil, rich and deceitful, so that the Church sighs over those as wealthy, whom the world before held for beggars." And he beseeches his correspondent to flee from the cleric who from poor has become rich as from some pestilence (*Ep.* 2, *ad Nepotianum*; and see also *Ep.* 3, *ad Heliodorum*). In his long letter or treatise addressed to Eustochius again (*Ep.* 22), he draws a sharply satiric picture of an old cleric who wants to force his way almost into the very bed-chamber of a sleeper, and praise some piece of furniture or other article till he at last rather extorted than obtained it; contrasting with the prevalent covetousness of Roman society the story of the monk at Nitria, who at his death was found to have saved 100 *solidi* which he had earned by weaving linen. The monks consulted what to do; some were for giving it to the poor, some to the Church, some for handing it over to the family of the deceased; but Macarius, Pambo, Isidore and the other fathers of the community decided that it should be buried with him.

Gregory of Nyssa, indeed, in his letter to Letorius, observes that the fathers have affixed no punishment to this sin, which he assimilates to adultery; though it be very common in the Church, none inquires of those who are brought to be ordained if they be polluted with it. Theft, violation of graves, and sacrilege are, he says, the only vices taken account of, although usury be also prohibited by divine scripture, and the acquiring by force the goods of others, even under colour of business. Against this statement should indeed be set if not a decree (1) from Gratian ascribed to Pope Julius I. A.D. 336–52, which denounces as filthy lucre the buying in time of harvest or of vintage, not of necessity but of greed, victuals or wine, in order by buying to sell at a higher price, at least the 17th canon of the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325), directed against the love of filthy lucre and usury, and enacting deposition as the punishment for the cleric. But here, as in a parallel canon (6) of the Synod of Seleucia, A.D. 410, it is perhaps to be inferred that the vice was chiefly if not solely aimed at under the concrete form of usury (as to which see USURY); as also when St. Basil, in his canonical epistle to Bishop Amphilochius of Iconium, writes that the usurer who spends his unjust gains on the poor and frees himself from avarice may be admitted to orders (c. 14). That covetousness was as rife in the monastery as in the world may be inferred from the fact that Cassian's work, *De Coenobiorum institutis* (end of 4th or beginning of 5th century) contains a whole book (the 7th) *De Spiritu philargyriae*.

The very doubtful "Sanctions and Decrees of the Nicene fathers," of Greek origin apparently (2nd volume of Labbé and Mansi's *Councils*, pp. 1029 and foll.), require priests not to be given to heaping up riches, lest they should prefer them to the ministry, and if they do accumulate wealth to do so moderately (c. 14). The 3rd Council of Orléans, A.D. 538, forbids clerics, from the diaconate upwards, to carry on business as public traders for the greed of filthy lucre, or to do so in another's name. As the times wear on indeed, covetousness seems often to be confounded with avarice, and to be legislated against under that name. The Code of Canons of the African Church, ending with the Council of Carthage of A.D. 419, has thus a canon "on avarice," which it says is to be reprehended in a layman, but much more in a priest (c. 5). So with the Carolingian Councils and Capitularies. That of Aix-la-Chapelle in 789 forbids *avaritia*; no one is to encroach on the boundaries of others nor pass his father's landmark (c. 32, and see also c. 64, "de avaritia vel concupiscentia"). The Council of Frankfort, A.D. 794, has a canon (34), and the contemporary capitulary of Frankfort a section (32 or 34), "de avaritia et cupiditate." The capitulary of Aix-la-Chapelle of 801, according to one codex, enjoins priests to abstain from filthy lucre and usury, and so to teach the people (c. 25, and see also the *Admonitio generalis* of the same year, in Pertz). The first capitulary of 802 requires monks and nuns not to be given to covetousness (cc. 17, 18), nor canons to filthy lucre (c. 11). Some Additions to a Nimeguen Capitulary in 806 (Pertz) treat at some length of "cupiditas"—which is said to be taken either in good or bad part, "in bad part of him who beyond measure will desire any kind of thing," (c. 3)—

of "avaritia," which is "to desire the things of others, and having acquired them to impart them to none" (c. 4), and of "filthy lucre" (c. 5), of which an instance is given in the buying at harvest or vintage time, not of necessity, but for covetousness, in order to sell at a higher price; "but if a man buy for necessity, that he may have for himself and distribute to others, we call it trade" (c. 7). The Ecclesiastical Capitulary of Aix-la-Chapelle in 809 again enjoins priests to avoid all avarice and covetousness (c. 2). The second Council of Rheims, 813, also enacted that none (apparently of the clergy) were to follow the evil of covetousness and avarice (c. 28). The second Council of Châlons, in the same year, that if clerics gather together the fruits of the earth or certain revenues of the soil, they should not do so to sell the dearer and gather treasures together, but for the sake of the poor (c. 8).

One form of covetousness—the rapacity of judges and other functionaries in exacting fees,—would seem to fall better under the head of *SPORTULAE*, by which name such fees were known in the Roman world, and are designated in the legislation of Justinian (Code, bk. iii. T. ii. Novs. 17, 82, 123). We may however quote a chapter of the Wisigothic law (bk. ii. c. 25, amended by Chindasuinth), which says: "We have known many judges who by occasion of covetousness overpassing the order of law, presume to take to themselves one-third of the causes" (i.e. amounts in dispute); and which limits the judge's fee to 5 per cent., requiring him to restore any surplus beyond this proportion which he may have taken, with an equal amount besides.

[See also BRIBERY, COMMERCE, USURY.]

[J. M. L.]

COWL. [CUCULLA.]

CRATON, martyr at Rome, Feb. 15 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi).

[C.]

CREDENCE (Lat. *credentia*, Ital. *credenza*, Gr. *παράρπρεξον*). The table or slab on which the vessels and elements for the Eucharist are placed before consecration. "*Credentiam* appellat mensam . . . supra quam ad sacrificandum necessaria continentur" (*Ceremoniale Romanum*, i. 3, quoted by Ducange, s. v.). It is doubtful whether such a table or slab existed in the sanctuary within our period, as it rather seems probable that the elements were brought from the sacristy and placed at once on the altar, when they ceased to be taken from the offerings of the faithful. See PROTHESIS.

[C.]

CREED, from the Latin *credo*. Hence the title should be confined to such confessions of our Christian Faith as commence with the words I BELIEVE, or WE BELIEVE, or, again, to any interrogatories as may be addressed at baptism or other occasions, DOST THOU BELIEVE? but, in practice, it has been used in a more general sense, and any document which has contained a summary of the chief tenets of the Christian Faith as held by any local or national Church, has been called the CREED of that Church. Thus the *Rules of Faith*, of which we find traces in the earliest Christian writers, and which were intended to guide teachers in the instruction which they conveyed, have been called *Creeds*. So, also, have been designated the instructions which were prepared for candidates for baptism.

NAMES.—(2.) For "Creeds," in this wider sense, we find the following words used by early Greek writers: *ὁ πίστεως ἀρχαίας κανὼν*, *ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας*, *τὸ κήρυγμα τὸ ἀποστολικόν*, *ἡ εὐαγγελικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις*. So Tertullian very frequently appeals to the *regula fidei*. The creed of the Church, properly so called, was designated first as *ἡ πίστις* or *ἡ παραδοθεῖσα ἡμῖν ἀγία καὶ ἀποστολικὴ πίστις* among the Greeks, and as *fides*, *fides apostolica* among the Latins. We find the word *symbolum* for the first time in Cyprian, and after the title became prevalent among Latin writers it found its way among the Greek authors. But even in the fifth century the Nicene Creed was commonly known as *ἡ πίστις*. The words *τὸ σύμβολον τοῦ ἀποκεκάρθαι*, found in Origen, denote, not the Creed, but Baptism itself, or (possibly) "the outward and visible sign in Baptism." And, similarly, we must interpret a passage in Tertullian: "*Testatio fidei et signaculum symboli*." In a canon of the Laodicean council, however, the word occurs once. In later years the words *σύμβολον*, and *symbolum* or *symbolus*, became the favorite designation of the baptismal Creed. Its meaning will be discussed elsewhere.

3. The words of our Lord in the institution of Baptism undoubtedly gave the first form to the Baptismal Creeds which we find prevailing in the 3rd century. His injunction that His apostles should "make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," seemed almost of necessity to call forth on the part of the recipient of Baptism some avowal of belief in God as thus revealed. The words which we read in our English version of Acts viii. 37, containing the appeal of Philip to the Eunuch and the reply of the Eunuch, are not found in the best extant MSS. of the Acts of the Apostles; but the incident thus recorded may be regarded as not improbable; and we find indications in the pages of Irenaeus that it was believed by him to have occurred. St. Paul reminds Timothy of the good confession which he had made "before many witnesses." This is generally believed to have taken place at his baptism. Passing by for the present, as scarcely applicable to our immediate purpose, the passage of Justin Martyr where he relates how "they who are persuaded and believe that the things are true which are taught by us, are taken to some place where there is water, and are there baptized," and the expression of Irenaeus regarding "the canon of the truth which every one received at his baptism," we come to words of Tertullian, in which he speaks of the Holy Spirit "sanctifying the faith of those who believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost." [BAPTISM, p. 160.]

4. Thus are we led to infer that the primary baptismal confession corresponded to the baptismal formula; that as the convert was "baptized into the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit," so was he called upon to state that "he believed in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit." And that our inference is correct seems clear from fragments of liturgies which have come down to us from various ages and different Churches. The Aethiopic manuscript of the Apostolic Constitutions describes the catechumen as declaring at the time of his baptism: "I believe in the only



true God, the Father, the Almighty, and in His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, and in the Holy Spirit, the Life-giver." Other words follow. So the pseudo-Ambrose, in his treatise on the Sacraments (book ii. c. 7; Migne, xvi. 429), "Thou wast asked, 'Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty?' Thou saidst, 'I believe,' and thou wast immersed. Again thou wast asked, 'Dost thou believe also in our Lord Jesus Christ and in His cross?' Thou saidst again, 'I believe,' and wast immersed. For a third time thou wast asked, 'And dost thou believe in the Holy Spirit?' Thou didst reply, 'I believe,' and for a third time thou wast immersed." So, again, in the formula for baptism found in an old Gallican missal and printed by Martene (i. p. 51); in the old Roman Ritual as given by Daniel (i. p. 173); and in the formula adopted by Boniface, for use among his German converts (Migne, vol. lxxxix. p. 810).

5. But although this Baptismal Formula furnished the type of the Baptismal Confession, we find that, even in Tertullian's time, the Confession embraced something not mentioned in the words of Institution. "The Catechumen," says the great African writer (*de Corona militis*, § 3), "was thrice immersed, answering something more than the Lord commanded in His Gospel." From his treatise (*de Baptismo*, § 11) we may infer what that "something" was. "Some (Tertullian writes) would depreciate baptism, because our Lord did not Himself baptize. But His disciples baptized at His command. . . . And whereunto should He baptize? To repentance?—wherefore, then, His forerunner? To remission of sins?—which He gave by a word! Into Himself?—whom in His humility He was concealing! Into the Holy Spirit?—who had not as yet descended from the Father! Into the Church?—which was not yet founded." From this passage Bishop Bull (*Judicium Eccl. Catholicae*, Works, vol. vi. p. 139) infers (and, we think, is entitled to do so) that in Tertullian's neighbourhood and epoch, at the time of baptism, express mention was made, not only of the Father and of the Holy Spirit, and of the Son of God, but also of *repentance*, of *remission of sins*, and of *the Church*. Thus we are induced to say that at least these two articles *may* have been mentioned in Tertullian's Creed, viz. "Repentance unto the remission of sins" and "the Church." But in regard to "the Church" all doubt is removed by referring to a later section (§ 6) of the same treatise, where our author explains the origin of its introduction thus: "Where the Three are, there is the Church, the Body of the Three: there the *testatio fidei*;" this on the part of the baptized: "there the *sponsio salutis*;" this on the part of God.

6. We purposely abstain from adducing passages bearing on the Rule of Faith to which Tertullian continually appeals, because in our judgment such Rule of Faith was so called as being the guide of the believer and of the teacher, and was of wider extent than the Baptismal Creed. So we will proceed to ask what light do the works of Cyprian which have come down to us throw on the baptismal customs of his day? He followed Tertullian by a generation, being bishop of Carthage from 248 to 258, and his correspondence is in our present investigation very important, as it contains several letters

on the subject of re-baptizing those who had been baptized by heretical teachers; and these letters of course contain allusions (though they may be little more than allusions) to the ceremony of Baptism.

7. We will translate the most interesting. "If any object that Novatianus holds the same law of faith which the Catholic Church holds, that he baptizes with the same symbol" (the first time the name occurs in *Latin*), "knows the same God the Father, the same Son Christ, and may therefore avail himself of the power to baptize, because in the baptismal interrogations he seems not to differ from us: let such men know that we and the schismatics have not the same law of symbol, nor the same interrogations; for when they say, 'Dost thou believe remission of sins and eternal life through the Church?' in the question itself they speak falsely, because they have not the Church." This is found in his letter to Magnus (*Ep.* 69, § vii.). A passage somewhat similar is found in another letter (70, § ii.), and in his epistle to Firmilianus (75, § x.), he speaks of the "*usitata et legitima verba interrogationis*" at baptism. From all this we may safely conclude that this "fixed and legalised form of interrogation" did not *then* contain any reference to those points of doctrine on which Novatian went wrong: probably it called forth little more than the expression of belief in the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, and in remission of sins and eternal life, of which the assurance was conveyed when one was rightly admitted into the Church at Baptism.

8. We must pass now to consider the usage in regard to Creeds in the Churches of the East.

From the earliest years of the Christian era, the Oriental Churches were more harassed by strange teachings than were those of the Latin race. It was the boast of Ruffinus that no heresy took its rise within the Church of Rome; and of Ambrose that the Church of Rome had preserved undefiled the symbol of the Apostles. Thus the difference between the Eastern and Western symbols may be learnt from the opening clauses of their respective Creeds. In the former (and among these we of course include the "canon" of the Greek-speaking community of Lyons) men professed their belief in *one God*; in the latter, their belief in *God*. The growth of the latter creeds we will consider hereafter; for the present we confine ourselves to the former.

9. The seventh book of the Apostolic Constitutions is regarded by most critics as older than the Nicene Council, and by many as representing the customs of Antioch, about the end of the third century. Dr. Caspari assigns it to the same period, though he considers it to have belonged to the Syrian Churches. Herein we have a full account of the ceremonies which were performed at baptism, and of the confession which the catechumen made. He said: "I renounce Satan and his works," . . . "and after his renunciation (proceeds the text) let him say, 'I enrol myself under Christ, and I believe and am baptized into one, unbegotten, only, true God, Almighty, the Father of Christ, the Creator and Maker of all things, of whom are all things; and in the Lord Jesus the Christ, His only-begotten Son, begotten before all creation, who by the pleasure of the Father was before all



world; begotten, not made; through whom all things were made which are in heaven and on earth, both visible and invisible; who in the last days came down from heaven and assumed flesh, of the Holy Virgin Mary being born, and lived wholly after the laws of His God and Father, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and died for us, and rose again from the dead, after his suffering, on the third day, and ascended into the heavens and sat down on the right hand of the Father, and in coming again at the end of the world with glory to judge quick and dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. I am baptized, too, into the Holy Spirit; that is, the Paraclete, which wrought in all the saints since the beginning of the world, and was afterwards sent from the Father, according to the promise of our Saviour and Lord Jesus Christ; and, after the Apostles, to all who believe in (the) the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, in (the) the resurrection of the flesh, and the remission of sins, and the kingdom of heaven, and the life of the world to come." Such is the Creed which connects the rule of faith which may be found in Irenaeus with the Creed which has received the name of the Nicene.

10. It is beyond the scope of the present article to examine and enumerate the errors and the heresies to which reference is made in this long baptismal confession (*ἡμολογία βαπτισματικὴ*). The Confession of belief used by the Synod of Antioch against Paul of Samosata, and those of Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea and Lucian the Martyr, and others, were not used in any office of the Church; and they thus have the character of an exposition of the Faith, rather than that of a Creed proper. Only, we must note in passing, that in the letter of Alexander of Alexandria to his namesake at Constantinople, we meet with the phrase, *ἐν σπείρῳ θύουσ ἡμολογούμεν*,—we confess one Holy Spirit, and doubtless the conception of confession we must extend to other points named in the letter; and thus we have further intimation that a custom of confessing God prevailed, not only at baptism, with the *compunctus*, but amongst matured members of the Churches. This doubtless was made during some part of their common worship; and in the same sense we may perhaps understand his words, *ταῖς διδασκαλίαις, ταῖς ἀποστόλοις* (Migne, xlii. p. 548).

11. Still the passages in which the Creed is referred to speak almost exclusively of its use at baptism. When Eusebius wrote to his flock his interesting account of what had passed at the Council of Nicene, and transcribed for it the Creed which he had recited as that used "when he had been a catechumen, and again when he was baptized," he makes no mention of its use at the Eucharist. "During his whole ministerial life, both when he was a presbyter, and since he became a bishop, he had believed it and had taught it." So, again, when the Nicene Creed proper was referred to in the famous decree of the Council of Ephesus, the great danger against which the fathers were anxious to provide was this: "that no one should offer or exhibit any but the accepted faith to such as were willing to turn to the knowledge of the truth from Hellenism or Judaism." No mention is made of the introduction of the Creed into the other offices of the Church. Katsychev recited the Nicene

symbol at the Robber Synod of Ephesus, and stated that "in this faith he had been baptized and sealed, and in it he had lived, and in it he hoped to be perfected;" but no reference is made to any other public use: and once more, when at the second session of the Council of Chalcedon, the deacon Amatus read out the Creed of the holy Synod of Nicene and the holy faith which the 150 holy fathers put out at Constantinople agreeing with it, whilst both creeds met with the cry, "This is the faith of the Catholics: this is the faith of all. We all believe like this:" in regard to the Nicene symbol alone they added, "In this we have been baptized: in this we baptize;" but not a word was said as to the recitation of either at any other service (Mansi, vi. 257). Only the same limited use is mentioned by Epiphanius in the latter pages of his *Anchoratus*; and in the *Catechetical Lectures* of Cyril of Jerusalem.

12. We must not, however, omit to mention that it was the custom for the bishops present to subscribe to the Creed before they broke up from the great councils: thus, at the conclusion of the Council of Chalcedon, "all the most religious bishops cried out, 'This is our faith, let our Metropolitan subscribe; let them subscribe at once in the presence of the magistratus: things well defined admit of no delay: this is the faith of the Apostles: by this we all walk: we all thus think.'"

13. Let us now briefly trace the subsequent history of the use of the symbol. Timotheus, bishop of Constantinople A.D. 511, is stated by Theodorus Lector (*Hist. Eccl.* p. 563) to have ordered "that the creed should be recited *καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν*, at every congregation; whereas previously it had been used only on the Thursday before Easter, when the bishops catechized the candidates for baptism." As the avowed object of Timotheus was to express the continued abhorrence which the Church felt for the teaching of Macedonius, it is clear that the exposition of Constantinople was intended in the order, even though it speaks of "the Creed of the 318." A similar direction had been given by Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch (450 to 463). Then it seems to have spread through the East, and thus the Creeds seem to have found their way into the liturgies which bear the names of Chrysostom, Basil, and others. From the East the custom came into the West. The 3rd Council of Toledo, c. II. (A.D. 589) directed that "before the Lord's Prayer in the liturgy, the creed of the 150 should be recited by the people through all the churches of Spain and Galicia, according to the form of the Oriental Churches."

14. The words of Reccared's confirming order are so interesting, that we may be pardoned if we recite them at length: "Ut preter roborandam gratia nostrae novellam conversionem,

\* By the Creed of the 318 is meant the Nicene Creed. By the creed of the 150 the document as it is alleged to have been expanded in the Council of Constantinople, and as it was recited at the Council of Chalcedon. The chief difference between them is that the former after the words "and in the Holy Ghost," proceeded to declare the condemnation by the Church of all who maintained Arian views of the Saviour in the latter the subsequent clauses were added as we now read them, save that the words were, "who proceeded from the Father, who will, &c."

omnes Hispaniarum et Galliae (Galliciae) ecclesiae hanc regulam servant, ut, omni sacrificii tempore, ante communicationem corporis Christi vel (or et) sanguinis, juxta orientalium patrum morem, unanimiter clara voce sanctissimum fidei recenseant symbolum, ut primum populi quam credulitatem teneant fateantur, et sic corda fide purificata ad Christi corpus et sanguinem capiendum exhibeant" (Mansi, ix. 983). The priest recited the creed whilst he held the consecrated host in his hand (Mabillon, *Liturg. Gall.* 1685, pp. 2, 12, 450). [We should note that the position of the Creed in the Mozarabic Liturgy answers to the directions of Reccared.]

15. But the disputes regarding the interpolated *Filioque* afford us additional evidence of the use of the Creed at Mass. Some monks of a Frank convent on Mount Olivet complained to Leo III. (about A.D. 806) that they had been "accused of heresy, and partially excluded from the Church of the Nativity on Christmas Day, because they held that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father and the Son. Yea, they were charged with reciting more than was held in the Roman Church. Yet one of their number had heard it so sung in the West, in the chapel of the Emperor. What were they to do?" Other complications followed: Charlemagne was anxious to retain the clause; Leo to continue to exclude it. An account of the interview between the Pope and the emissaries of the Emperor may be seen in Dr. Neale's *History of the Holy Eastern Church* (pp. 1164-1166). The Pope recommended that the "clause should be omitted: if difficulty arose, let them give up the custom of singing the creed in the palace of the Emperor: it was not sung in the Holy Church in Rome: thus the cause of contention would be removed, and peace would be restored." (The express mention of the *singing* indicates that the laity would miss the words if they were omitted.) And he begged again that the Churches of Germany "would say the symbolum in the mysteries in accordance with the Roman Ritual" (see Martene, *De Ritibus*, p. 138; Binterim, *Denkwürd.* p. 357). Charlemagne refused to give way.

16. Thus it appears that in the time of Leo III. some symbolum was said at Rome at the time of the Sacrifice; whether the Roman Creed, as appears from the Sacramentary of Gelasius, or the original Nicene formula, or the uninterpolated faith of the 150, is uncertain. But a few years later, i.e. between 847 and 858, as we learn from Photius (*de Spiritus Mystagogia*, Migne, vol. cii. p. 395), Leo IV. and his successor Benedict III. directed that the Creed should be recited in Greek, *ἵνα μὴ τὸ στενὸν τῆς διαλέκτου βλασφημίας παρασχῇ πρόφασιν*. The words are ambiguous, but they seem to mean:—"lest the narrow character of the Latin language should afford any pretext for evil speaking," on the part of the Greek Church. But the Churches of the West continued to assert their independence of Rome. Aeneas, bishop of Paris, informs us (about 868) that "the whole Gallican Church chanted the Creed at the Mass every Sunday" (apud Dacher. *Spicilegium*, tom. i. p. 113, xciii.): Walafrid Strabo (Migne, cxiv. p. 947) notes that after the deposition of the heretic Felix, the Creed (as interpolated) began to be more frequently used in the

office of the Mass, in the churches of Germany: and Walter, bishop of Orleans, about the middle of the 9th century, found it necessary to enact that in his diocese the "Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto" and the symbol "Credo in unum Deum" should be sung by all at the same service (Martene, lib. i. c. iv. art. vi. §§ x. and xi.; Migne, cxix. p. 727). At length the popes gave way, and under the pressure of the Emperor Henry (A.D. 1014) Benedict VIII. consented to sing the Creed and after the form which was now universally received amongst the other Churches of the West.

17. One point connected with the Creed of Constantinople remains to be noticed—its use in the baptismal service of the so-called Gelasian Sacramentary. Dr. Caspari (*Ungedrückte Quellen*, part i. p. 236) considers that in the Church of Rome and some Churches of Gaul and Germany this Creed appeared first in the baptismal rite. The original Sacramentary is dated about 494, but we conceive that the rite which we are now about to describe cannot be regarded as *older* than the times of Leo IV. and Benedict III., the Popes of Rome who directed that the Creed should be recited in Greek, or *as more modern* than 1014, the date of the Emperor Henry's triumph over Benedict VIII. The Sacramentary directs that at the time of a baptism the priest shall address the elect on the importance of the faith, and bid them to receive the "*sacramentum* of the evangelical symbol inspired by the apostles, whose words indeed are few, but whose mysteries are great." The acolyth takes one of the children, a boy, and holding his left arm places his own right hand on the child's head, and the presbyter enquires, "In what tongue do they confess our Lord Jesus Christ?" The acolyth answers, "In Greek." The presbyter says, "State the faith as they believe it," and the acolyth chants the Creed of Constantinople in Greek: but, according to the MSS. of the Sacramentary, without the clause "God of God" and without the words "and the Son" (Assemani without any MS. authority printed the words *καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ* in his *Codex Liturg.* tom. i. p. 12; see Dr. Heurtley, *Harm. Symbol.* p. 158). The acolyth then takes a girl, and the question being repeated as to the language of the response, he answers "in Latin." In the first instance the Creed is written in Greek and Latin interlinearly, the Greek in Latin characters, thus—

Credo in unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem.  
Piscuo is hena theon pathera pantocratorem;

in the latter in Latin only. Possibly it is to this curious custom, possibly to a direct following out of the rule of Benedict III., that we owe three interesting relics of the 10th or 11th centuries, of which Dr. Caspari has given descriptions. The one is a MS. in the library of St. Gall which contains the interpolated Greek Creed in Latin letters, but with musical notes: the other two are MSS. in the library at Düsseldorf and Vienna respectively, which contain the uninterpolated Greek Creed, written in similar Latin characters. The earlier named MS. doubtless represents the Creed as it was chanted at great festivals; for Binterim (*Denkwürd.* p. 363) assures us that in the 9th century the Germans sang the Creed both in Greek and Latin.

18. Turning now to the symbol which for

many years has been called in the Western Churches the APOSTLES' CREED, our first remark must be that the Eastern Churches denied all knowledge of it at the Council of Florence. Ephesius, one of the legates of the Oriental Churches, is said to have there stated, *ἡμεῖς οὐτε ἔχομεν οὐτε εἶδομεν τὸ σύμβολον τῶν ἀποστόλων* (Waterland, iii. p. 196, note r; Nicolas, *Le Symbole des Apôtres*, p. 270). Thus we must look to the Western Churches alone for evidence of the growth and usage of this Creed.

19. In his interesting volume on the Apostles' Creed, Dr. Heurtley traces its growth through Irenaeus and Tertullian and Cyprian: then we must take a leap from Novatian, A.D. 260, to Ruffinus, bishop of Aquileia, A.D. 390, the intermediate space of 130 years affording only one stepping-stone, furnished by the notes of the Belief of Marcellus of Ancyra, which he left behind him on his departure from Rome: he says "I learnt it and was taught it out of the holy Scriptures." This Belief resembles in great measure the Creed of the Church of Rome, as we learn that Creed from the pages of Ruffinus; but Marcellus does not speak of its being used in any liturgic office, except so far as his words above quoted may show that he had received it before he was baptized.

20. This surmise is upheld by the account of Ruffinus. He describes the Creed of the Church of Aquileia as resembling very nearly that of Rome; he says that at neither Church had it ever been put into writing in a continuous form, but adds that he regards the type as preserved in the Church of Rome as probably of the purest character, because there the *ancient practice was preserved of the catechumen reciting the Creed in the hearing of the faithful*. He speaks of this as an ancient custom. At Aquileia it would appear that the baptism was a private service. About the same time we find Ambrose describing to Marcellina (Migne, xvi. 995) the riot at Milan: from his account it would seem that at that time the custom was to deliver the Creed to the *competentes* on any Lord's Day after the lessons and the sermon and the dismissal of the catechumens: his words are, "Sequente die, erat autem Dominica, post lectiones atque tractatum demissis Catechumenis, symbolum aliquibus competentibus in baptisteriis tradebam basilicae," when he was called out to rescue an Arian.

21. The custom of preserving this symbolum unwritten is referred to again and again by Jerome and Augustine. It will be remembered that the Faith of the Churches of the East was treated with less reserve, although St. Cyril of Jerusalem desired that his lectures should be regarded as confidential documents. We are inclined to believe that the Creed must have been committed to writing when it became customary to recite it at the Mass. The Gelasian Sacramentary (which, even if interpolated, must describe the ritual of the Roman Church at some epoch or other) contains it. Since the time of Benedict VIII. as we have seen, the Nicene Creed so called, i.e. the interpolated faith of the 150, has been used at Rome in the Eucharistic service.

22. We have referred from time to time to the custom of repeating the creeds of the earlier councils at an early session of each succeeding assembly of a similar character. We have one interesting proof that the Apostles' Creed was

deemed of sufficient importance to be so used in a council of the West. Etherius, bishop of Osmia, and Beatus, presbyter of Astorga, recited it in 785 as against the errors of Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo. The account is noteworthy: "Surgamus igitur," they cried, "cum ipsis apostolis et fidei nostrae symbolum, quem (sic) tradiderunt nobis brevi compendio, recitemus, quicumque unum Dominum, unam fidem, unum baptismum habemus; et fidem in qua baptizati sumus<sup>b</sup> in hac perversitate et duplicitate haereticorum non negemus: sed sicut corde credemus ore proprio proferamus publice et dicamus CREDO IN DEUM, &c." The Creed recited, Etherius added, "Ecce fidem apostolicam in qua baptizati sumus, quam credemus et tenemus." It will be noticed that the Creed was here put forth *publicly*.

23. Nor should the fact that there were creeds thrown into an interrogatory form be entirely passed over. Of these some were used from an early period at baptism; and others in later years at the visitation of the sick. Dr. Heurtley has collected several instances of the former series; and the pages of Martene contain many extracts from old MSS. giving the order for the latter. The earliest instance of such a use at confession that we have found is in the rule of Chrodegang (A.D. 750). [Migne, 89, p. 1070.]

24. The (so called) Athanasian Creed appears to have been originally composed as an exposition of the faith for the instruction of believers [CRESSY, COUNCIL OF], and then it came to be sung at the Church service as a Canticle. Gieseler and others consider that it was this Creed that was ordered to be learnt by heart by the Council of Frankfort, 794, when it decreed, "Ut fides catholica sanctae Trinitatis et oratio Dominica atque Symbolum Fidei omnibus praedicatur et tradatur;" but it is more probable that the term *fides catholica* here is generic: at all events we would refer to the creed contained in Charlemagne's letter to Elipandus [Migne, xcvi. 899], which is assigned to the same date (794) as being more probably the *fides catholica* of the Canon. It seems to have been recited at Prime on the Lord's Day at Basle in the 9th century: we hear that in 997 it was sung in alternate choirs in France and in the Church of England: in 1133 it was used daily at Prime in the Church of Autun; from 1200 it assumed the titles "Symbolum S. Athanasii" and "Psalmus Quicumque cult," which mark the character it occupies in our services. It was daily used at Prime in those English churches which adopted the use of Sarum, but was always followed by the recitation of the Apostles' Creed: as if the declaration of the Faith of the worshipper always followed on the instruction of the Church as to what it was necessary to believe.

(Books. — Great use has been made of Dr. August Hahn's Collection of Formulae: and Dr. Caspari's *Programme*. Dr. Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica* has of course furnished important assistance. To other works reference has been made as required.) C. A. S.

CRESCENS. (1) Disciple of St. Paul, bishop in Galatia, is commemorated June 27 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*); April 15 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

<sup>b</sup> Thus the Apostles' Creed was the baptismal creed of Spain.

(2) One of the seven sons of St. Symphorosa, martyr at Tivoli under Hadrian, July 21 (*Mart. Bedae*); June 27 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) Or CRESCENTIUS, martyr at Tomi, Oct. 1 (*Mart. Hieron., Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CRESCENTIA, martyr in Sicily under Diocletian, June 15 (*Mart. Hieron., Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CRESCENTIANUS. (1) Martyr in Sardinia, May 31 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr in Africa, June 13 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(3) Martyr in Campania, July 2 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(4) Martyr at Augustana, Aug. 12 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(5) Martyr at Rome under Maximian, Nov. 24 (*Mart. Bedae, Usuardi*); March 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [C.]

CRESCENTIO, or CRESCENTIUS, martyr at Rome, Sept. 17 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CRESSY, COUNCIL OF. [CHRISTIACUM.] In Ponthieu, A.D. 676; but according to Labb. (vi. 535), at Autun, A.D. 670, the canons being headed with the name of Leodegarius, bishop of Autun: passed several canons, but among others, one exacting, on pain of episcopal condemnation, from every priest, deacon, subdeacon, or "clericus," assent to the "Fides Sancti Athanasii praesulis." [A. W. H.]

CRISPINA, martyr in Africa under Diocletian, Dec. 5 (*Cul. Carthag., Rom. Vet., Usuardi*); Dec. 3 (*Mart. Hieron., in some MSS.*). [C.]

CRISPINUS. (1) Martyr with CRISPINIANUS at Soissons under Diocletian, Oct. 25 (*Mart. Hieron., Bedae, Usuardi, Cul. Anglican.*).

(2) Bishop, martyr at Astyagia, Nov. 19 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

CRISPOLUS, or CRISPULUS, martyr in Sardinia, May 30 (*Mart. Hieron., Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CRISPUS. (1) Presbyter, martyr at Rome under Diocletian, Aug. 18 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*).

(2) The "chief ruler of the synagogue," martyr at Corinth, Oct. 4 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CRISTETA, martyr in Spain, Oct. 27 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CROSIER. [PASTORAL STAFF.]

CROSS. The official or public use of the cross as a symbol of our redemption begins with Constantine, though it had doubtless been employed in private by all Christians at a much earlier date. (See Guericke's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, Morison's tr., 1857, and Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, &c., with Molanus, quoted below.) In the Catacombs, and all the earliest records, it is constantly used in connexion with the monogram of Christ; and this may point to the probable fact of a double meaning in the use of the symbol from the earliest times. As derived from, or joined with, the monogram, especially with the monogram in its earliest or decussated form, the cross is a general or short-hand symbol for the name and person of Christ. As used with the somewhat later or



transverse monogram, or when separated from the monogram and used by itself, it directs special attention to the sacrifice and death of the Lord, and as it were avows and glories in the manner of His death. "Le triomphe de la Christianisme s'affichait bien plus ouvertement sur cet insigne [the Labarum] au moyen du monogramme, comme exprimant le nom du Christ, que par l'idée de la croix." Its use as a symbol of His person is of high antiquity; see Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.* t. ii. pp. 81 and 82, tav. xxiv., and c. viii. tav. xvii. D; although some discredit may have fallen on it from the actual personification of the symbol in later days, after the publication of the Legend of the Cross, when churches were dedicated to it, as St. Cross, or Holy Rood, and it became an object of prayer.\* [SIGN OF THE CROSS.] For the purely symbolic use of the great Christian and in part human emblem, Ciampini's plate, a copy of the great "Transfiguration" in mosaic in St. Apollinaris at Ravenna, A.D. 545, may be here described as a typical example. It covers the vault of an arch. The presence of the Father is represented by the ancient symbol of a HAND [see s. v.] issuing from a cloud above all. Below it is a cross of the Western form, slightly widened at the extremities, or tending to the Maltese, inscribed in a double circle or nimbus. At the intersection is the Face of our Lord, scarcely distinguishable in Ciampini's small engraving, but visible in the now accessible photograph; and



\* Didron, *Iconographie C.*, vol. i. p. 367; Hahn: "Christ is embodied in the Cross, as He is in the Lamb, or as the Holy Spirit in the Dove. . . . In Christian Iconography, Christ is actually present under the form and semblance of the Cross. The Cross is our crucified Lord in person," &c. In the 9th century the praises of the Cross were sung, as men sing those of a god or a hero. Rhaban Maur, who was Archbishop of Mayence in 847, wrote a poem in honour of the Cross, *De Laudibus Sanctae crucis*. See his complete works, fol., Coloniae Agrippinae, 1626, vol. i. pp. 273-337. He further quotes St. Jerome's comparisons of "species crucis forma quadrata mundi;" "aves quando volant, ad aethera formam crucis assumant . . . homo natans, vel orans . . . navis per maria antenna crucis similata. Tau littera signum salutis et crucis describitur."—*Comment. in Marcum*.

The *Pontifical*, or bishop's office-book, of Egbert or Egbert, brother of Eadbert, king of Northumbria, and consecrated archbishop of York in 732, contains an office for the dedication of a cross, which certainly makes no mention of any human form thereon (v. *Surtees Society*, 1853, pp. 111-113). ". . . . Quaesumus ut consecres tibi

hoc signum crucis, quod tota mentis devotione



famuli tui religiosa fides construxit trophaeum scilicet victoriae tuae et redemptionis nostrae. . . . Radiet hic Unigeniti Filii tui splendor divinitatis in auro, emicet gloria passionis in ligno, in cruore rutillet nostrae mortis redemptio, in splendore cristalli nostrae mortis redemptio: sit suorum protectio, spei certa fiducia, eos simul cum gente et plebe fide confirmet, spe solidet, pace consociet: augeat triumphis, amplifcet secundis, proficiat eis ad perpetuitatem temporis, et ad vitam aeternitatis," &c. &c. A curiously mingled state of thought or feeling is indicated by this passage: the cross is a symbol of Christ and a token of His victory; it is of material wood, gold, jewels, &c.; but a sacramental power seems to be considered as adherent in the symbol; its consecration gives it personality; and it is to be addressed in prayer as if possessed of actual powers.



verified on the spot, as we understand, by M. Grimoult de St. Laurent. (Didron's *Annales Archéologiques*, vol. xxvi. p. 5.) This Face of the Lord seems in a work of the 5th century to import no more than the name or monogram: but it is found again on the oil-vessels of Monza. (See Martigny, s. v. *Crucifix*, and Didron, *Annales Arch.* vol. xxvi.) The A and ω are at its right and left, and the ground of the inner circle is sown with stars; that of the outer with small oblong spots in pairs, which probably indicate only variations of colour in the mosaic. Further to right and left are Moses and Elias adoring the cross, with St. Apollinaris below. The ascent of the mountain is indicated by trees and birds, among which are the universally present sheep. The Holy Dove is not represented, the mosaic having reference to the Transfiguration only. Above the cross are the letters IMDVC, which Ciampini interprets as "Immolatio Domini Jesus Christi:" below it the words "Salus Mundi." Didron, however (*Christian Iconography*, p. 396, vol. i.), asserts on the authority of M. Lacroix, who has given particular attention to the church of S. Apollinare in Classe, that these letters are really IXΘΥC. The accession of Constantine seems to have been an occasion of publicly avowing to the Pagans, and therefore of more vigorously enforcing on the Christian mind, the sacrificial death of the Lord for man. The office of Christ was distinguished from the person of Christ: the cross was, so to speak, extricated from the monogram; and its full import, long understood and felt by all Christians, was now made explicit. However long the change from the symbolic cross to the realist or portrait crucifix may have taken—with whatever long-enduring awe and careful reverence the corporeal suffering of the Lord may have been veiled in symbol—the progress of a large part of the Church to actual representation of the Lord in the act of death seems to have been logically certain from the time when His death as a malefactor for all men was avowed and proclaimed to the heathen. The gradual progress or transition from the symbol to the representation is partly traced out s. v. CRUCIFIX; and as the words "cross" and "crucifix" are to a great extent confounded in their popular use in most European languages, particularly in Roman Catholic countries, the following tentative distinction may perhaps hold good,—that a cross with any symbol or other representation of a victim attached to it, or anyhow placed on it, passes into the crucifical category.

The usual threefold division of the form of the cross into the Crux Decussata or St. Andrew's cross; the Crux Commissa, Tau, or Egyptian, and the Immissa or upright four-armed cross, seems most convenient. It would appear from Ciampini's plate above quoted, and is historically probable, that the distinction between the Greek and Latin crosses, by reason of the equal or unequal length of the arms, is scarcely within our province. Its earliest origin dates perhaps from the time succeeding the Iconoclastic controversy (see CRUCIFIX), when the Latin mind continued to insist specially on the cross as the instrument of the Lord's death, and carefully selected the most probable shape of the cross on which He suffered. The symbol of the intersecting bars was enough for the Greek. As a

Christian emblem, the decussated cross may be considered the most ancient: but all are of the earliest age of Christian work; as are many curious varieties of the cruciform figure. The forms in the woodcuts are Christian adoptions of pre-Christian crosses. They are supposed by Martigny and others to be what he calls *formes dissimulées*; or ancient symbols adopted by Christians as sufficiently like the cross or tree of punishment to convey to their minds the associations of the Lord's suffering, without proclaiming it in a manner which would shock heathen prejudice unnecessarily. Constantine appears to have felt that a time was come when his authority could enforce a different feeling with regard to the death of the Lord for men. He used the cross or monogram privately and publicly; impressed it on the arms of his soldiers; and erected large crosses on the Hippodrome and elsewhere in Constantinople. His use of it on his standards is well known. (Cf. LABARUM, DRACONARIUS.) Euseb., *Vit. Const.* iii. 3, refers to the Triumphal Cross made and set above the Dragon by Constantine. For his vision and the making of the Labarum, see *ibid.* pp. 28–39; Bingham, *Antiq.* s. v. *Crucifix*. Of its use on coins, which appears to begin with Valentinian I., A.D. 364–375, see coin of Valens in Angelo



Engraved stone of earliest epoch. (Didron, *La Chrétienne*, vol. I. p. 396.)

Rocca, *infra*. It seems as if Constantine really hoped to use the Christian symbol as a token of union for his vast empire, with that mixture of sincere faith, superstition, and ability which characterized most of his actions. The frequent recurrence of the *τοῦτῳ νόμῳ* on ancient crosses shows the importance which he and others attached to his vision. Tertullian's words may suffice to express the general use of the cross in private in his time (*De Cor. Mil.* c. iii.): "Ad omnem progressum atque promotum; ad omnem aditum atque exitum: ad calceatum, ad lavacra, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia:—quaecunque nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo terimus." This is paralleled by St. Chrysostom's *πανταχοῦ εὐρίσκεισθαι* (τ. σταυρὸν)—*παρὰ ἀρχουσι, παρὰ ἀρχομένοις, παρὰ γυναιξί, παρὰ ἀνδρασι, . . . ἐν δόλοις κ. ἐν παστάσιν, ἐν σκεύεσιν ἀργυροῖς, ἐν τοίχων γραφαῖς*. Julian had derided the Christians as *εἰκόνας σταυροῦ σκιαγραφοῦντες ἐν τῷ μετώπῳ*, &c. They were accused of worshipping it as a divinity or fetiche. See the words of the pagan Caecilius, in Minucius Felix *Octav.* cc. ix. and xxix.: "Et qui hominem

sanctis supplicis pro facinore punitum, et crucis ignis feralia eorum caeremoniis fabulantur, congruentia perditis sceleratibusque, . . . ut id colant quod merentur." He is answered simply, "Cruces nec colimus nec optamus." This is also referred to by Molanus, *De Picturis*, c. v., with many other passages. [See SIGN OF THE CROSS.]

The cross of course conveyed to earlier Christians, as to ourselves, the lesson of our own personal sacrifice or dedication to Christ, and the thought of His command to take up the cross. Hence doubtless its constant use in times of actual or remembered persecution. But this use of it would necessarily lead on from the thought of His person to that of His sacrifice. See the inscription by Paulinus of Nola, who made such ample use of pictorial and other decorations, placed under a cross at the entrance of his church:—

"Corne coronatum Domini super atria Christi  
Stare crucem, duro spondentem celas labore  
Præmia. Tolle crucem, qui vis auferre coronam."  
(See Binterim, vol. iv. part i., and Molanus,  
*De Imaginibus*, c. v. *De Picturis*.)

The private use of crosses, or representations of the cross, is highly uncertain before Constantine, though Martigny refers to Perret (*Catacombes de Rome*, iv. pl. xvi. 74) for certain stones, apparently belonging to rings, on which the cross is engraved, and which appear to be of date prior to Constantine. It seems probable that the use of the monogram prevailed before and during his time, with sacrificial meaning attaching more and more to the cruciform in the Christian mind. (See Binterim, vol. iv. part ii.)



The most interesting cross in existence of this kind seems to be the pectoral cross or *kykloskion* in gold and niello, described last by M. St. Laurent in Didron's *Annales Archéologiques*. It is said to contain a fragment of the wood of the cross, and bears on its front EMANOVHA NOBISCVM DEVS on the back, "Crux est vita mihi; mors, inimice, tibi," in same characters. It must date from the time of the Empress Helena, when many like crosses began to be worn. Compare drawing of serpent below the monogram.

One example is given by Boldetti of a tau-cross, dating A.D. 370 according to the consuls: neither the Crux Immissa nor the Greek cross appear by actual examples till the 5th century. This question of date can hardly be decided in the Catacombs, from the number of crosses inscribed there by pilgrims of all periods.

There is a passage from Severus Sanctus Eusebius or Eusebius, a Christian poet, probably of Aquitaine, in the latter part of the 4th century, where a Christian shepherd has secured his flock from disease by planting or marking between their horns ("signum mediis frontibus additum") the cross of "the God men worship in great cities":—

"Signum, quod perhibent omnes crucis Ihesu  
Magnis qui collitur solus in urbibus,  
Christus, perpetui glorie numine," &c.

De Rossi's work, *De Titulis Christianis Carthaginiensibus*, speaks of 4th century marbles bear-

ing the cross; and it is possible that in distant provinces the associations of shameful death may not have clung to it so closely. M. Laurent makes the obvious remark that the use of the cross spread with a rapidity proportioned to the advance of Christianity, and speaks of its earlier and freer use in Africa, quoting De Rossi, *D. T. C.* For Constantine's golden cross on the tomb of St. Peter, see Anastasius, *Lib. Pontif.*, *In Sylvestro*, p. 8, Scr. Byz. (Fabroti); also Eusebius, *Const. Hist.* iii. 49. Two crosses from the Catacomb of St. Pontianus given by Bottari, tav. xlv. xlv., richly adorned with jewels and metal-work, one of which has the A  $\omega$  attached to it by chains, may also date from the years immediately preceding Constantine, if not works of his time. The great Cross of the Lateran, so called, is referred to his time, and apparently accepted as of that date by Binterim, vol. iv. part i. frontispiece. It is in mosaic, and though restored by Nicolas IV., can hardly have been altered. It is a plain cross, having a medallion of the Lord's baptism at its intersection. The Holy Spirit, in form of a dove, with nimbus hovers above; and from Him seems to proceed the baptismal fountain, which at the cross-foot becomes the source of the four rivers, Gihon, Pison, Tigris, Euphrates. Between the rivers is



Lateran Cross. (Binterim, vol. iv. p. 4.)

the Holy City of God, guarded by the archangel Michael, behind whom springs up a palm-tree, on which sits the Phoenix as a symbol of Christ. [PHOENIX.] Two stags below near the waters represent the heathen, seeking baptism; and three sheep on each side stand, as usual, for the Hebrew and Gentile Churches. This relic should be compared with a similar one given by De Rossi (*De Titulis Carthaginiensibus*), where the cross stands on a hill, and the four rivers spring from its foot, with stags, &c., as both have decided reference to baptism, and illustrate the earliest representative use of the cross as a symbol of Christ, with special reference not to His death but His baptism. Others even in later times were made with this view, and indeed with ornaments representing Old Testament types of the Redeemer. (See CRUCIFIX, account of the station-cross of Mainz.)

The use of the Tau, patibulary, or Egyptian

\* For examples and discussion of this subject, see *Monumenta*, vol. iv. part i.

**T** *Cross*,<sup>\*</sup> is general from perhaps the earliest period. Some special difficulties appear to be connected with it, as it is beyond doubt a pre-Christian emblem, and as such connected in the minds of those who used it with special, at least pre-Christian, meanings. These meanings will of course be of two classes:—1stly, the interpretations of speculative minds in all ages which connect the tau-cross with Egyptian nature-worship through the *Crux Ansata*, and which include all the Ophite and Gnostic uses of the symbol, and its connexion with the serpent, as a sign of strength, wisdom, &c.; 2ndly, those of Hebrew origin, connected as types with the Old Testament, and through that with the Christian faith,—the wood borne by Isaac, and the tau or cross on which the brazen serpent was supported. Didron's remark seems appropriate here, that the tau is the anticipatory cross of the Old Testament. We are not concerned with it as such, and may refer for much interesting and erudite speculation on the pre-Christian cross, or decussated figure, to the text and references of an article in the *Edinburgh Review* of April, 1870.

The tau appears in the Callistine Catacomb, in a sepulchral inscription, referred to the 3rd century, thus: IRE **T** NE. This frequently

occurs elsewhere (De Rossi, *Bullet.* 1863, p. 35); and some of the crucifixes on the vessels of the treasury of Monza are of the same shape. (See Didron's *Annales Archéologiques*, vv. xxvi.-vii.) Still in some of the earliest examples it may possibly have been used, even by Christians, in the pre-Christian sense, as a type of life in the world to come.

In Boldetti, lib. ii. c. iii. p. 353, an Egyptian cross of black marble mosaic is given, which may probably be of later date than the catacomb in which it was found; but the next page contains an early inscription of the tau between A and ω,

thus: A **T** ω. He quotes the following

passage from Tertullian on this form of the cross, who refers to Ezekiel thus: "Pertransi medio portae in medium Jerusalem et da signum Tau in frontibus virosum. Ipsa enim litera Graecorum Tau, nostra autem T, species crucis."—*Adv. Marcian.* lib. iii. 22. This form of cross is specially appropriated to the thieves rather than the Redeemer, in some crucifixions of early mediæval type. [CRUCIFIX.]



Anchor-Cross.  
(Didron's *Annales Archéologiques*, vol. xvi. frontispiece.)

\* In Lipenius, *De Cruce*, l. 7, it is shown to be of Phœnician origin.  
GREY, T. ANT.

Both Greek and Roman crosses, and in particular cruciform churches,<sup>4</sup> sometimes possess one or even two additional cross limbs, shorter than the main or central one. The upper additional



bar **⊕** is supposed by Didron to stand for

the title over the head of the Crucified One. Is this be so, the lower may be taken to represent the *suppedaneum*, a support for His feet. In cases where both the shorter limbs are placed above the main cross-bar, as in the cross represented in Boldetti, lib. i. c. ii. p. 271, they certainly represent the crosses of the malefactors. [CRUCIFIX.] See two coins of Valens and Anthemius, Angelo Rocca, *Bibl. Vaticana*, vol. ii. p. 253 one, a *nummus aureus*, has the three crosses, the other with two smaller cross-beams under the large one.

The term "statist-cross" is derived from the



Cross on Tomb of Flavia Jovina, referred by Zaccaria to A.D. 267  
(Boldetti, lib. i. c. ii. p. 271.)



On a single Tomb, Callistine Catacomb.  
(Boldetti, lib. ii. c. iii. p. 353.)

Roman military term *statio*, and applied to a large cross on the chief altar, or in some principal place of a church, but occasionally removed or carried in procession to another place, and then constituting a special place of prayer. (See Bottari, tav. xlv., and illustration of Lateran Cross.) Processional crosses may be traced to the use of the Labarum in Constantine's army, and also of his substitution of the Cross for the Dragon, or placing it above the Dragon on standards of cohorts, &c. (See the Church use of the word *Draconarius*, *standard-bearer*.)

The distinction between the Cross of the Resurrection, or Triumphal Cross, and the Cross of the Passion, is traceable to early times. In Ciampini, *V. M.* tav. xvii. D (ch. viii.), our Lord in glory stands by and supports a large cross, having the angels Michael and Gabriel on either hand. The Lamb is also frequently represented as bearing the lighter and longer triumphal cross. (See CRUCIFIX, and references to the Vatican Cross, &c.) It is also borne by our Lord in representations of the Descent into Hades. It is symbolic

<sup>4</sup> Constantine's ancient church of St. Peter S. Paolo fuori delle Mura, and Sta. Maria Maggiore were all built

in the form of a cross. That of S. Paolo is a






with projecting apses.

of the victory gained by the sufferings to which the Passion-cross calls our special attention.

The drawing of the engraved stone or signet-cross at p. 495, with the motto "Salus," represents a device with the triumphal cross. The monogram of the Lord is placed over the serpent, which vainly tempts the doves, who look to the symbol of their Lord. But see s. v. SERPENT.

The statement of Bede (Binterim, vol. iv. i. p. 501) relating to the four kinds of wood of which the cross was made—the upright of cypress, the cross-



In Cemetery of Domitilla.  
(Baldetti, lib. M. c. III. p. 353.)

piece of cedar, the head-piece of fir, and the *suppedaneum* of box—departs from the Eastern tradition, which substitutes olive and palm for the two latter varieties of wood. This forms part of the legendary history of the cross, with which we are not concerned. The only remarks to be made by way of conclusion or summary appear to be these: that a double, and indeed manifold, meaning attached to the cross from the earliest ages. Derived as a Christian sign from the monogram, and connected with traditions of ancient learning by its Egyptian form, it may be said to have stood for all things to all men. To the earliest

members of the Church it represented their Master, who was all in all to them; and thus in their view, a somewhat wider and happier one than in later days, it represented all the faith—the person of Christ, His death for man, and the life and death of man in Christ. The Lateran and other crosses point to baptism and all its train of Christian thought, without immediate reference to the Lord's sacrifice. [LAMB.] Constantine indeed (see Anastat. *Vit. Pontif. in Sylvestro*) seems to have attached the symbolic Lamb to the Baptist and the sacrament he administered, as well as to the Lord's Supper and the showing forth of His death. The tendency of Christian feeling towards special or exclusive contemplation of the Lord's sufferings and death is matter of ecclesiastical history; and its effect on Christian emotion, and therefore on Christian art, is the transition from the cross into the crucifix. (See s. v.)

An evidence of the feelings of subdued triumph with which the cross was regarded in the earliest times, as a symbol first of the Lord's life and death, then of the life and death of man, is that it is so frequently wreathed, embossed, or otherwise ornamented with flowers. Even as late as the Monza vessels, it is represented as a living and budding stem; but the cross from St. Pontianus, given by Bottari, xlv. is made to put forth golden or silver flowers half-way up its stem.

Count Melchior de Vogué (*Revue Archeologique*, vol. vii. p. 201) gives a highly interesting account of the ruins, or rather the scarcely-injured remains, of four ancient Christian towns, on the left bank of the Orontes, between Antioch and Aleppo. They contain many ancient crosses, and were probably deserted at the same time, on the first Mussulman invasion. "On est transporté," he says, "au milieu de la société chrétienne . . . non plus la vie cachée des catacombes, ni l'existence humiliée, timide, souffrante, mais une vie large, opulente, artistique. . . . Des croix, des monogrammes du Christ sont sculptés en relief sur la plupart des portes: le ton de ces inscriptions indique une époque voisine du triomphe de l'Eglise. . . . Le *graffito* d'un peintre obscur, qui, décorant un tombeau, a, pour essayer son pinceau, tracé sur le paroi du rocher des monogrammes du Christ, et dans son enthousiasme de Chrétien émancipé écrit, en paraphrasant le labarum, *Τὸυτο νικᾷ*, Ceci triomphe." [R. St. J. T.]

CROSS, ADORATION OF. (*Adoratio Crucis*, ἡ προσκύνησις τοῦ σταυροῦ.)

I. *Adoration of the Cross from the heathen point of view.*—Christianity being a "religion of the cross," the cross being in every Christian teacher's mouth as the watchword of the new faith, the action of signing with the cross [SIGN OF THE CROSS] being believed in by the Christians as a preservative against all dangers bodily and spiritual, what wonder is it that the heathen should have seen in early Christianity but a *σταυρολατρεία*, and in the cross but a Christian idol not less material than their own?

Thus we find Tertullian feeling it necessary carefully to combat this among divers false views of Christian worship prevalent among the heathen. His words, with the logic of which we have nothing to do, are "Sed et qui Crucis nos religiosos putat, consecratus erit noster:"—Even if we did worship the cross, we should be no worse than you, for the cross enters directly



or indirectly into your own objects of worship; for example, as being the structure around which the makers of images of the gods would first erect the clay model, or as being the framework of trophies reared in honour of victory whom you adore as a deity (*Apol.* c. 16; and in similar strain, *Ad Nationes* i. c. 12).

We find references to the same heathen taunt in the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix, as e.g. in c. 9, where the heathen objector winds up his remarks "ut id colant quod merentur;" and again (c. 12), "et jam non adorandae, sed subcundae Cruces." The writer in meeting this attack speaks as Tertullian had done of the way in which the cross entered into heathenism, and adds (c. 29), "Cruces etiam nec colimus, nec optamus," by which he seems to mean, We Christians do not worship the cross so as to give such adoration and honour to it as you heathen to your idols. That this misconception on the part of the heathen was not speedily overcome may be seen from the case of so intelligent a man as the Emperor Julian, who, a century after Minucius had written, taunts the Christians, as the Caecilius of that writer had done, with inconsistency, in that while they refused to reverence (*προσκυνεῖν*) the sacred Ancile which fell down from Jupiter and was preserved among them as a pledge of the protection ever to be shown to the city, they still revered the wood of the cross, continually made the sign of it on their foreheads, and engraved it before their houses (Cyril Alex. *Contra Julianum*, lib. vi. *Patrol. Gr.* lxxvi. 795). The gist of Cyril's answer is worthy of notice:—Since Christ the Lord and Saviour of all divested Himself of His Divine Majesty, and leaving His Father's Throne was willing to take upon Him the form of a servant, and to be made in the likeness of man, and to die the cruel and ignominious death of the cross, therefore we being reminded of these things by the sight of the cross, and taught that One died thereon that we all might have life, value the symbol as productive of thankful remembrance of Him.

II. *Point of view of early Christian writers.*—Having thus alluded to the adoration of the cross as seen from the heathen point of view, we shall next endeavour to trace the existence of the idea among Christians of a modified form of reverence to be paid to the cross. That idea may be expressed roughly thus: No reverence is paid to the material cross as such; it is the idea of the cross for which reverence is felt; but it is the reverence or worship due to a most holy or cherished thing, not that which is due to God, *προσκύνησις*, not *λατρεία*. Certain it is that in this modified sense of worship the early Christians maintained the duty of reverence to the sacred symbol of redemption (see especially Le Nourry's *Dissertation in Minuc. Fel.* c. xii. Art. 4 in *Patrol.* iii. 531). Thus Eusebius says of Constantine, *τὸν νικοποιδὸν ἐτίμα σταυρόν* (*Vita Const.* i. 31; cf. *ib.* ii. 16; iv. 21; and *Oratio de laudibus Const.* c. 9; also Sozomen i. 4, *ἀεὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ προσκυνήσεως νενόμιστο παρὰ τῶν στρατιωτῶν*). Cyril of Jerusalem (*Ep. ad Const.* p. 247) speaks of *τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ σταυροῦ ξύλον*. The above-mentioned instances taken by themselves might be viewed as due to a somewhat rhetorical way of speaking, but the real nature of

the feeling is shown by the following more definite instances.

Ambrose (*In ob. Theodosii*, § 46) tells of the Empress Helena's adoration of the cross after her discovery of Pilate's superscription, and adds: "*Regem* adoravit, non *lignum* utique, quia hic Gentilis est error et vanitas impiorum; sed adoravit illum qui pependit in ligno, scriptus in Cruce." Shortly afterwards he describes how the cross was placed upon kings by Helena, "ut in regibus adoretur."

Jerome, again, in the *Epitaphium Paulae Matris* (*Ep.* 108 *ad Eustochium*, § 9, *Patrol.* xxii. 883), says that "Paula prostrata ante Crucem quasi pendentem Dominum cerneret, adorabat."

In the above instances Ambrose and Jerome are referring to the cross said to be found by Helena, but in the case of Minucius and others anterior to the time of Constantine the allusion is necessarily to crosses, viewed as signs and images of the true cross; and the view which is controverted is the belief of the heathen world in the veneration paid by Christians to the cross absolutely (see further, Origen, in *Celsum* ii. 47). Cf. further the distinction as drawn by Augustine (*Tract.* i. in *Johannem*, § 16): "Dicimus quidem lignum vitam, sed secundum intellectum lignum Crucis unde accipimus vitam." The same line is taken in the *Quaestiones ad Antiochum ducem* (xxxix.: *Patrol. Gr.* xxviii. 622), falsely attributed to Athanasius, in answer to the question, Why, when God has forbidden through His prophets the worship of created things, do we offer adoration to images and the cross? Rusticus Diaconus, a writer of the time of Pope Vigilius, carefully defines the matter in the same way, for after maintaining the adoration of the cross as leading on to that of the Crucified, he adds, "non tamen Crucem coadorare dicimur Christo" (*Contra Acephalos*: *Patrol.* lxvii. 1218).

John Damascenus (ob. circa 756 A.D.) is careful exactly to define, as the above-mentioned writers have done, the nature of the reverence paid by Christians to the cross. He says (*de fide orthodoxa* iv. 11): *προσκυνούμεν δὲ καὶ τὸν τύπον τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ . . . οὐ τῆς ὕλης τιμῶντες (μὴ γένοιτο), ἀλλὰ τὸν τύπον ὡς Χριστοῦ σύμβολον*. And hereon, he adds, may our adoration of the cross rest, *ἐνθα γὰρ ἂν ᾗ τὸ σημεῖον, ἐκεῖ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται*.

Further illustrations of the wide spread of the feeling are to be found in numerous narratives of the Fathers, of a more or less legendary character, referring to the miraculous power inherent in the sacred symbol. Thus Sozomen (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 3) gives us an account of a certain physician named Probianus who had been converted to Christianity, but who would not accord honour to the cross as the sign of salvation, until when suffering from a painful disease of the feet he was taught by a vision [cf. *ALTAR*, p. 66] to find in reverence of the cross a means of relief, and thus was cured. [We again find this story, cited from Sozomen, in the *Historia Tripartita* (ii. 19), compiled by Cassiodorus.]

A parallel incident is that related by Evagrius (*Eccl. Hist.* iv. 26), to the effect that on the burning of Antioch by Chosroes, the bishop of Apamea consented to display the wood of the cross to the adoration of the people, that their

last kiss of the sacred relic might be as it were their viaticum to the other world. The historian mentions that he was present with his parents, and describes the scene at some length, and tells how, while the bishop made the circuit of the church carrying the cross *ὁσπερ ἐν ταῖς κυρίαις τῶν προσκυρήσεων ἡμέραις εἰθίστο*, he was followed by a large mass of flame, blazing but not consuming: a token of the safety vouchsafed to the city.

Again, Bede (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 2) tells us of Oswald, a Saxon king (635 A.D.), who, being in imminent danger in war, erected and offered adoration to a cross, by which victory was secured.

One more illustration may suffice. In the Trullan Synod held at Constantinople in 691 A.D., it was ordained that since the cross shows to us the way of salvation, and therefore we offer to it in words and in thought our adoration, it should be distinctly prohibited to engrave crosses on the pavement, where they would be trodden under foot, and that where these already existed they should be erased (can. 73; Labbé, *Concilia*, vi. 1175).

The above examples clearly prove the existence amongst the early Christians of a veneration for the cross, combined with the feeling of the necessity of excluding from this the idea of absolute worship. The constant use of the sign of the cross [SIGN OF THE CROSS] is a further exemplification of this.

The special character of hymns is obviously such as to admit of a less exact style of language, but the tone of the early Christian poets shows clearly the nature of their views as to the veneration of the cross. In a poem (*De Passione Domini*) attributed by some to Lactantius, it is said—(vv. 50 sqq.):—

"Flecte genu lignumque Crucis venerabile adora  
Flebilla, innocuo terramque cruore madentem  
Ore petens humili."\*

Much again can be gathered from Prudentius (405 A.D.) on this point. Thus we find (*Apotheosis* 446)—

"Jam purpura supplex  
Sternitur Aeneadae rectoris ad atria Christi,  
Vexillumque Crucis summus dominator adorat."

Again in the description of Constantine's victory over Maxentius (*Contra Symmachum* i. 494), he says—

"Tunc ille senatus  
Militiae ultricis titulum, Christique verendum  
Nomen adoravit quod collucebat in armis."

The allusion here is to the cross and the monogram on the labarum (cf. also *Cath.* vi. 129, and Paulinus Nol. *Poem.* xxx. 97 sqq.).

Finally, we may cite the words of Sedulius (*Carmen Paschale*, lib. v. 188; *Patrol.* xix. 724)—

"Neve quis ignoret speciem Crucis esse colendam."

\* In the prolegomena to the Roman edition of Prudentius (*Patrol.* lix. 669), the accusation is brought against George Fabricius of tampering with the above, by omitting, through doctrinal proclivities, the words "lignumque. . . flebilla;" a proceeding justly reprehended by John Albert Fabricius: "Sane praestitisset G. Fabricium . . . passim, tum hic tum alibi, non ita fuisse in alienis operibus quae debebat ingeniosum" (*Bibl. Vel. Lat.* p. 709, ed. 1712).

III. *Adoration of the Cross in ancient Liturgies.*—In the Western Church such a rite has long been observed on Good Friday. The custom is probably very ancient, and has possibly flowed hither from the East, for the words of Paulinus (*Ep.* 31, *Patrol.* lxi. 329) with reference to the observance of the like practice at Jerusalem, will carry back the date to the 4th century\*:—"Quam episcopus urbis ejus quotannis, cum Pascha Domini agitur, adorandam populo princeps ipse venerantium promit." According to the Gregorian Sacramentary (*Patrol.* lxxviii. 86), at Vespers on Good Friday a cross is set up in front of the altar; then—"Venit Pontifex, adoratam deosculatur Crucem. Deinde episcopi, presbyteri, diaconi et caeteri per ordinem, deinde populus: Pontifex vero redit in sedem usque dum omnes saluent." Whenever a salutation is made (salutante pontifice vel populo) the Antiphon *Ecco lignum Crucis* is sung; and then when all have saluted, the pope descends to the front of the altar and the service proceeds. Sundry differences, but of no great moment, occur in the form given in the Gelasian Sacramentary (*Patrol.* lxxiv. 1103). A more elaborate ritual, however, is to be found in the Mozarabic Liturgy (*Patrol.* lxxxv. 430; lxxxvi. 609), in which before Nones on Good Friday, after the Lord's Prayer, came the hymn *Ad Salutationem Ligni Domini*,

"Pange lingua gloriosi  
Proelium certaminis," &c.

This was followed by the prayer, "O sancta Crux, in qua salus nostra pependit, per te introeamus ad Patrem, per te veniam mereamur, per te apud Christum habeamus indulgentiam et veniam;" and this again by three antiphons *de ligno Domini*. Nothing further is added here in the Breviary as to the adoration of the cross, possibly because the rest is to be found in the Missal.

From this we learn the nature of the ceremony of adoration as performed at the Nones, and this, as in the preceding instance, we shall briefly describe.

Two priests hold before the altar a cross draped in black, standing first at the left, then at the right, and lastly at the middle of the altar. As each position is occupied, the antiphons are respectively chanted—*Popule meus quid feci tibi . . . . Quia eduxi te . . . . Quid ultra debui . . . .* with its own response after each. At the end of the third station the officiating priest receives the cross from the hands of the two who are holding it, and standing successively at the right end, the left end, and the middle of the altar, he uncovers at each station respectively the right arm, the left arm, and the whole of the cross, saying on each occasion, with voice growing louder each time, the antiphon *Ecco lignum Crucis*, to which is responded, *In qua salus nostra pependit*, it being ordered that as each limb of the cross is unveiled, the people should bend the knee. The priest having reverently placed the cross in front of the altar "statim presbyteri cum suis ministris adorent Crucem flectendo genua ter, cum summa re-

b Paulinus, it will be observed, speaks of this rite as taking place on the "Pascha;" but there seems fair ground from the context for explaining this, with Ménard, of the anniversary of our Lord's crucifixion. (*Notes to Greg. Sac. in Patrol.* lxxviii. 332.)

verentia et humilitate osculando terram, et offerant oblationem Cruci, ut aliis praebeant exemplum;" the rite is then concluded by an *oratio ad Crucem*, in which, however, our Lord is addressed distinctly, and by the antiphon *Crucem tuam adoramus Domine*.

Alexander Leslie, the Jesuit editor, argues in his note on the above passage for the identity of the terms *adoratio* and *salutatio* as applied to the cross, the former word being that employed in the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries and the Mozarabic Missal, the latter in the Mozarabic Breviary; and Amalarius (*De Eccl. Off.* i. 14) cites the *Ordines Romani*, "Praeparatur crux ante altare, quam salutant et osculantur omnes."

As illustrating our present subject, we may quote from the collect for the Festival of the Exaltation of the Cross in the Gregorian Sacramentary: "Concede propitius ut qui ad adorandam vivificam ejus Crucem adveniunt . . ." At the end of Mass on that day a cross was held up by the pontiff for the adoration of the people (cf. Alcuin, *Adv. Elipantum*, lib. ii. 9, who furnishes us with a collect, *Ad Elevationem Sanctae Crucis*); and a parallel instance is to be derived from the Greek *Menology* for September 13, χαίροις, ὁ ζωφόρος τῆς εὐσεβείας, τὸ ἀήττητον τρόπαιον, ἡ θύρα τῆς παραδείσου, ὁ τῶν πιστῶν στηριγμός . . . [See also EXALTATION and FINDING OF THE CROSS.]

The season which in the Eastern Church has been specially associated with the adoration of the cross is the third Sunday in Lent, with the ensuing week. Numerous sermons are extant in the writings of the Greek Fathers having reference to this. Thus in one wrongly assigned to Chrysostom, but apparently not long subsequent to his time, εἰς τὴν προσκύνησιν τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ τῇ μέσῃ ἑβδομάδι τῶν νηστειῶν, the writer speaks of the day as yearly appointed for adoration, and as though he would imply the custom to be a well established one:—Σήμερον τοιγαροῦν προσκυνήσιμος ἡμέρα τοῦ τιμίου σταυροῦ καθέστηκε. Again, in the works of Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, is a sermon with the same title and occasion (*Oratio v. Patrol. Gr.* lxxxvii. 3309). Again (*Oratio iv. in Exaltationem S. Crucis*), in describing the change of the season of the Exaltation to a time subsequent to our Lord's resurrection, he speaks of σταυροῦ δαδούχος προσκύνησις. Sermons of the same character are also extant by Theodorus Studita (*Patrol. Gr.* xcix. 691), and by Theophylact (*ib.* cxxxi. 113). For rubrical directions concerning this fast, see Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Caerimoniis Aulæ Byzantinae*, i. 5, 24; and especially ii. 11 (*op. cit.* cxii. 137, 196, 1017); and cf. also Suicer's *Thesaurus*, and Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v. σταυροπροσκύνησις, by which name and by κυριακὴ τῆς προσκυνήσεως the Greek Church knows the day. The Epistle and Gospel for this day in that Church are Heb. iv. 14—v. 6, and Mark viii. 34—ix. 1. There is also in the Greek Church a bringing about of the cross for adoration on August 1 and thereabouts, for which see Const. Porph. ii. 9 (*Patrol. Gr.* cxii. 1009). This latter day is marked in the *Menology* thus: εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἢ πρόδοσ τῶν τιμίων ξύλων τοῦ τιμίου ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ; and its importance is testified to by the fact of its having its προεόρτια or vigil.

IV. *Disputes among Christians as to the Adoration of the Cross*.—At the Second Nicene General Council (787 A.D.), in their fourth *actio*, among the various testimonies read from the fathers in support of the use of images in worship, was a long extract from the fifth of the λόγοι ὑπὲρ τῆς Χριστιανῶν ἀπολογίας κατὰ Ἰουδαίων καὶ περὶ εἰκόνων τῶν ἁγίων of Leontius, bishop of Neapolis in Cyprus (ob. 620 or 630, A.D.). The general tenour of his remarks (for which see Labbé, vii. 236) is as follows:—Christians are justified in offering adoration to the cross, by way of remembrance of Him who died thereon, not with any feeling of reverence for the mere material. Thus, a decree sanctioned by the seal of the emperor is reverentially treated, not on account of the decree or the lead of the seal, but of him whom the seal indicates; and so we Christians, in our adoration of the cross, honour not its material, but see in it a seal and signet of Christ Who was crucified thereon, and Whom we salute and adore. The further illustration may be taken of children who cherish some memento of an absent father, even as all things associated with our Lord are for His sake to be loved and revered. δταν οὖν, he concludes, ἴδῃς Χριστιανοὺς προσκυνοῦντας τὸν σταυρὸν, γινώθι ὅτι τῷ σταυρωθέντι Χριστῷ τὴν προσκύνησιν προσάγουσι καὶ οὐ τῷ ξύλῳ.

A counterblast to the views of the Nicene Council is to be found in a capitulary of Charlemagne, *De Imaginibus* (i. 13, *Patrol.* xcvi. 1034), where we find an attack on the argument brought forward by the other party based on the expression, "Jacob . . . adoravit fastigium virgae ejus" (Heb. xi. 21). The writer there insists on the "differentia crucis Christi et imaginum pictorum arte pictarum," and promises to enter upon the subject "quanto mysterio Crux imaginibus emineat, sive quomodo humanum genus non per imagines, sed per Crucem Christi redemptum sit, quae duo illi vel paria vel aequalia putant." This promise is fulfilled subsequently (ii. 28; *op. cit.* 1096), where the language, though probably referring to adoration of the cross, is to a certain extent vague: "Non sunt imagines Cruci aequiparandae, non adorandae, non colendae, . . . et Tu solus adorandus, Tu solus sequendus, Tu solus colendus es."

The cause of the adoration of the cross and of images found a zealous champion in Theodorus Studita, who expounds his views in his *Antirrhēti* iii. *ad Iconomachos*, in the form of a dialogue (see esp. *Antirrh.* i. 15; iii. 3; *Patrol. Gr.* xcix. 345, 419). After an elaborate discussion, and after dwelling on the distinction between εἰκὼν and εἶδωλον, in which he carefully repudiates any association of the adoration of the cross or image with the latter term, he sums up in a number of theses which maintain the importance of the adoration, but again insists on the distinction referred to above. Thus (*ib.* 349): "If any one boldly calls the relative (σχετικὴν) worship of Christ in the image, worship of the image and not of Christ Himself . . . he is a heretic." For further illustrations of the subject from the writings of Theodorus, see *op. cit.* 691, 1757; cf. also Nicephorus (Patriarch of Constantinople), *Antirrhēt.* iii. 7. Later notices of the subject may be found in Photius, *Epist.* i. 1, *Ad Nicolum Papam*; i. 8, 20, *Ad Michael. Bulgar. Principem*.

A brief reference may here be made in passing to the views on this subject of the Paulician heretics, who first appeared towards the end of the 7th century. They, generally speaking, were strongly opposed to any adoration of the cross or images. In regard to the cross, they maintained that the real cross was Christ Himself, not the wood on which He hung:—λέγοντες, ὅτι σταυρὸς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστίν, οὐ χρὴ δὲ προσκυνεῖσθαι τὸ ξύλον ὡς κεκατηραμένον ὄργανον (Georgius Hamartolus, *Chronicon* iv. 238, in *Patrol. Gr.* cx. 889). In accordance with this is what we are told by Petrus Siculus (*Hist. Manichaeorum* 29; *ib.* civ. 1284; and cf. Photius, *Contra Manich.* i. 7; *ib.* cii. 25), to the effect that a certain Timotheus of this sect was sent by the Emperor Leo the Isaurian to the Patriarch of Constantinople to be reasoned with; and on being asked, "Why dost thou not believe and worship the honoured cross?" answered, "Anathema to him who does not do so." But by the cross he understood τὸν Χριστὸν τῇ ἐκτάσει τῶν χειρῶν σταυρὸν ἀποτελοῦντα. The above quoted Georgius Hamartolus tells us (*Patrol. Gr.* cx. 892), with what truth is perhaps doubtful, that in cases of sickness they laid a cross on the patient, which cross on his recovery they dared even to break or burn (see also Euthymius, *Panoplia Dogmat.* Tit. 24; *op. cit.* cxxx. 1196; and cf. Photius, *Bibliotheca* 279; *ib.* ciii. 524).

Much about this time there arose a contention of like character in the West. The actual literary warfare in this case belongs to the early part of the 9th century, but from its connection with the earlier struggle in the Eastern Church, and as throwing light on the tone of thought on this subject in the Western Church during the preceding period, it is of too much importance to be passed over here.

The immediate cause of the outbreak was the publication by Claudius, bishop of Turin (820 A.D.), of a fierce attack on the doctrine of the adoration of the cross and of images. Further he ordered the removal of crosses from all the churches of his diocese. When urged by a letter from a certain Abbot Theodemir to reconsider his views, he retorted, in a long treatise, that the Gauls and Germans were held in the nets of superstition. This work Jonas, bishop of Orleans, answers in detail in his treatise *De Cultu Imaginum* (*Patrol.* cvi. 305), in which he appeals largely to the writings of the Fathers of the earlier centuries, and discusses the objections of Claudius seriatim. See especially *op. cit.* 331, where he meets Claudius's remarks as to the superstition of the votaries of the cross: "Nos ob recordationem Salvatoris nostri crucem pictam . . . . . veneramus atque adoramus."

Other writers of the time joined in the fray, as Theodemir above mentioned; Eginhard, the biographer of Charlemagne, in a work *De Adoranda Cruce* not now extant; Wistremir, archbishop of Toledo (cf. Pseudo-Liutprand, *Chronicon*; *Patrol.* cxxvi. 1103); and a priest named Dungalus, who (about the year 828 A.D.) wrote a treatise dedicated to Louis the Pious and his son Lothaire: "Pro cultu sacrarum imaginum adversus insanas blasphemiasque naenias Claudii Taurinensis Episcopi" (*Patrol.* cv. 457 sqq.).

[R. S.]

CROSS, EXALTATION OF (*Exaltatio Crucis*, ἡ ὑψώσις τοῦ σταυροῦ). This festival, held on September 14, most probably celebrates primarily the consecration of the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem by Bishop Macarius at the command of Constantine (335 A.D.), although some would see in it a commemoration of the Vision of the Cross seen by the Emperor.

It is, however, to the victory of Heraclius over the Persians and his subsequent restoration of the Cross to its shrine at Jerusalem that the renown of the festival is mainly due.

Still there are not wanting indications of its observance before that event, in both the Eastern and Western Churches. Thus in the *Acta* of the Egyptian penitent Mary, whose death is referred to 421 A.D., it is apparently recognized as a thoroughly established festival at Jerusalem: thus, *c. q.* . . . . τῆς ὑψώσεως ἐνεκεν τοῦ τιμίου σταυροῦ, ἥτις μετ' ὀλίγας ἡμέρας εἴωθε γίνεσθαι (*Acta S. Mariae Aegypt.* c. 19, in *Acta Sanctorum* for April 2; also in *Patrol. Gr.* lxxxvii. 3711).

In the life (c. 70) of the Patriarch Eutychius (ob. 582 A.D.) by his chaplain Eustathius, this festival is spoken of as celebrated in Constantinople on September 14 (*Acta Sanctorum* for April 6): and in the 7th century the Patriarch Sophronius of Jerusalem refers to it as a feast then widely known. He adds that the Festival of the Exaltation had formerly (πάλαι) preceded that of the ἀνάστασις (that is, the annual commemoration on September 13 of the dedication of the church at Jerusalem), but now the order had been reversed (*Oratio in Exaltationem S. Crucis* in Gretser, *De Cruce*, vol. ii. p. 90, ed. 1608).

Again, an observance of the festival in the Western Church prior to Heraclius's victory may be inferred from our finding it in the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries, and from its designation simply as *Exaltatio S. Crucis*, without any allusion to Heraclius, in the earlier Latin Martyrologies, as in that attributed to Jerome (*Patrol.* xxx. 475): it may be added that this is also the case with those of Bede and Rabanus Maurus (*ib.* xciv. 1044, cx. 1168).

The circumstances attending the victory of Heraclius are briefly these. In the year 614 Jerusalem was taken by the Persian king Chosroes II., and after the slaughter of many thousands of Christians, and the destruction, partially at any rate, of the church of the Holy Sepulchre by fire, a long train of captives was led away, among whom was the Patriarch Zacharias,\* and with him the cross said to have been discovered by Helena [CROSS, FINDING OF], which was sealed up in a case by the patriarch himself. After some years of uninterrupted success on the part of the Persian king, during which the empire was reduced to the very verge of dissolution, Heraclius at last declared war (622 A.D.), and after three expeditions the boldness of which was justified by their success, the tide was turned and the Persian king worsted, until at

\* Nicephorus (*vide infra*) styles the patriarch Modestus, though the other historians unite in calling him Zacharias. The error, for such it probably is, has been explained by supposing Modestus to have acted as deputy for Zacharias during his captivity (see Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, vol. II. p. 170); or that the latter died shortly after his return to Jerusalem, and was succeeded by the former (Petavius *in loc.*).



last he was deposed and murdered by his son Suerus (628 A.D.).

The new sovereign speedily concluded a peace with the emperor, one of the conditions specially insisted on by the latter being the restoration of the cross, with which borne before him, as he rode in a chariot drawn by four elephants, Heraclius entered Constantinople. In the following spring he made a pilgrimage with the recovered cross to Jerusalem, where the patriarch recognized his own unbroken seals on the case containing the precious relic (*vā rīpān am (sewed) fāda*, as Theophanes [*vide infra*] constantly styles it), thus preserved it is said by Sira the wife of Chersurus. Heraclius wished himself to carry the cross to its shrine, but before treading on the sacred ground he was bidden to divest himself of his splendid array, that so barefoot and clad in a common cloak he might more resemble the humble guise of the Saviour. Some of the Martyrologies referred to below remark that the emperor was held by some invisible power from entering upon the sacred precincts till he had so divested himself\* (cf. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, vol. i. pp. 503, 504, ed. Classen; Nicephorus, *Byzantium*, pp. 11 A, 15 A; *Chronicon Paschale*, vol. i. p. 704, ed. Dindorf; and more generally for the history of the period, Cedrenus, vol. i. pp. 717 seq. ed. Bekker; also Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, ch. 46).

Thus was the cross once more "exalted" into its resting-place, and the festival of the "Exaltation of the Cross" obtained fresh removal. Before long, possibly under Pope Honorius I. (oh. 638 A.D.), September 14 came to be observed as a festival with special memory of the restoration of the cross by Heraclius: the Eastern Church, which has not strictly speaking a separate festival of the Finding of the Cross, commemorates also on that day the original discovery by the Empress Helena.

This festival is referred to more or less fully by all Martyrologies under September 14. Of those of Jerome, Bede, and Rabanus Maurus we have already spoken. We may further specify that of Wandelbert [deacon of monastery at Trèves in the time of the Emperor Lothaire] where we find (*Patrol.* cxii. 611)

"Exaltata Crux fulgens vestita rotas,  
Perennis ab indigna victor quam vexit Hovatum."

In the Martyrology of Ado and of Usuardus we find a further addition: "Sed et procurentibus annis, papa Sergius miras magnitudinis portionem ejusdem ligni in sacrario Beati Petri Domino revelante repperit, quae annis omnibus "in Basilica Salvatoris quae appellatur Constantiniana." Ado] ipso die Exaltationis ejus ab omni oculatur et adoratur populo" (*Patrol.* cxviii. 170, 354; cxvii. 467). See also the Martyrology of Notker (B. cxii. 1151), and for various forms of ancient Western Calendars containing a mention of this festival, see *Patrol.* cxxviii. 1188, 1191, &c. Besides this, we may again refer to the presence of this festival in the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries. The

\* It may be remarked that the historians of the reign of Heraclius vary somewhat in the dates they assign to the above events. We have followed those given by Clinton, *Past. Annals*, vol. ii. pp. 163, 176. The taking of Jerusalem is referred to a later campaign by Theophanes (A. C.).

collect for the day in the latter of them has been cited in the article on the Adoration of the Cross, that is the former runs as follows:—"Deus qui non hodierna die Exaltationis Sanctae Crucis annua solemnitate laetificas, praesta ut ejus mysterium in terra cognovimus, ejus redemptionis praemia consequamur."

The Eastern Church, as we have already said, includes in the festival of September 14 the two festivals of the Finding and of the Exaltation of the Cross. As in the Calendars of the Western Church, so also in those of the Eastern Church is it invariably found. Thus in the Greek metrical calendar given by Papebroch in the *Acta Sanctorum* (vol. i. of May), we find under September 13, *μνήμη τῆς ὑψώσεως τῆς ὁρίας τοῦ Σταυροῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀναστάσιου καὶ ὑψώσεως τῆς ὁδοῦ τοῦ τῶν τοῦ τοῦ καὶ (sewed) fāda*; that is, as has been already explained, they celebrated the dedication of the Church built by the Emperor Constantine to commemorate our Lord's resurrection. We further gather that the festival of the Exaltation had its *σποδοὶ* or vigil. The notice for September 14 is *ἡμέρη Σποδῆς σποδοῦ ἑλίου ἡμέρη τερτίου*; and the fact is also recognized in the pictorial Moscow Calendar accompanying the preceding. The Octave also of the festival (September 21) is given in the Monology under that day, *τὴν τερτίου τῆς ἡμέρης Ἀναστάσεως ἡ ἡμέρη τοῦ τῶν τοῦ σποδοῦ*. See also the Calendar of the Arabian Church given by Selden (*De Synodis Ebraeorum*, lib. 376, ed. 1635), where September 14 is marked "Festum Crucis gloriose;" as also in those of the Ethiopic or Abyssinian and of the Coptic Church given by Ludolf (p. 3). We also learn from him that in the case of the latter of these churches, the festival extends over three days, September 13-15, marked respectively "Festum C. gl. (primum, &c.)."

Further, the Ethiopic Church, as well as several other branches of the Eastern Church, recognize in addition a festival of the Cross in May, possibly having more or less reference to the "Inventio Crucis" of the Latin Church (op. cit. p. 17; Gretser, vol. i. 232; see also several Eastern Calendars in Neale, *Holy Eastern Church*, introd. pp. 775, 799, 813). The proper lessons for this festival in the Syrian Church, as marked in the Peshito, are, for Vespers, Matt. xxiv. (possibly on account of verse 30); for Liturgy, Luke xxi. 3 seq.; and for Matins, Mark xii. 41 seq. (Gretser, l. c.).

In addition to the works named in this article, reference should be made to Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Kathol. Kirche*, vol. v. part 1, pp. 455 seq. See also Ducauge's *Glossary*, s. v. *Stavros*. [H. S.]

#### CROSS, FINDING OF. (*Inventio Crucis*.)

1. *Introduction*.—By this name it is to be understood the discovery which tradition asserts that the Empress Helena, the mother of Constantine, made of the cross on which our Lord suffered. The earliest account we have of the exploration for the Holy Sepulchre is that given by Eusebius (*Vita Const.* iii. 26 seq.), who relates Constantine's determination to remove the abominations that defiled the holy place and build there a Christian shrine, as detailed in the emperor's letter to Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem (op. cit. 30; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 17; Theodoret,

doret i. 18), but no allusion whatever is made to a discovery of the cross. Some have indeed argued that an expression in Constantine's letter to Macarius is better suited to the discovery of the cross than of the grave—τὸ γὰρ γνώρισμα τοῦ ἀγιοτάτου ἐκείνου πάθους ὑπὸ τῇ γῇ πάλαι κρυπτόμενον...; but a comparison with c. 26 would sufficiently account for the above quoted language, and it is hard to understand that Eusebius should have lost so good an opportunity of glorifying Constantine, had a real or supposed discovery of our Lord's cross taken place under his auspices.\* The date of Helena's visit to Palestine, and consequently that of the alleged discovery, is 326 A.D.; yet in the *Itinerarium Burdegalense*, the record of a journey to Jerusalem in 333 A.D., only seven years after this date, there is no reference to the finding of the cross, even in a context where we might certainly have looked for it: "Crypta ubi corpus ejus positum fuit et tertia die resurrexit; *ibidem modo jussu Constantini Imperatoris basilica facta est*" (*Patrol.* viii. 791).

The earliest mention we have of the Finding of the Cross is in the *Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem, delivered rather more than twenty years after Helena's alleged discovery; in which, though he does not allude to the narrative in the form given by subsequent writers, he yet says that fragments cut off from the cross were spread over the whole world (*Catech.* iv. 10; x. 19; xiii. 4; *Patrol. Gr.* xxxiii. 468, 685, 776), and he also alludes to the Finding of the Cross in a letter written some years later to Constantius, the son of Constantine, on the occasion of a luminous cross appearing in the sky over Jerusalem (*Ep. ad Const.* c. 3, *op. cit.* 1168). From the beginning of the 5th century onwards all ecclesiastical writers take the truth of the narrative in its main form for granted, though sundry variations of detail occur.

II. *Legend.*—The general tenour of the tradition is that an attempt had been made (by Hadrian, or at any rate, in his time, according to Jerome, *Epist.* 58, *Patrol.* xx. 321) to destroy every trace of the site of the Holy Sepulchre, that the ground had there been raised to a considerable height, and temples and statues to Jupiter and Venus erected thereon. On the death of Licinius, whom Constantine charges with the continuance of the evil, it was determined to purify the sacred places, and this resolution of the Emperor was carried out by his mother Helena, who went in person to Jerusalem, and by the Bishop Macarius. By the Divine guidance (and by the aid of a Jew, one Judas, afterwards baptized as Quiriacus, according to Gregory of Tours and others, *infra*) the spot was discovered, and the superimposed earth having been removed, the sepulchre was seen with three crosses lying near, and separate from these the superscription which Pilate had attached to that

\* Montfaucon (*Collectio Nova Patrum*, vol. i. p. viii. ed. 1706) does indeed cite a passage of Eusebius as certainly referring to the cross: εἰ δὲ τις νῦν ἐπιστήσῃ τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀμφὶ τὸ μνήμα καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἐπιτελεσθεῖσι θαυμασίοις, ἀληθῶς εἴσεται ὅπως πεπλήρωται ἔργοις τὰ τεθεσπισμένα. (*Comm. in Psal.* lxxxviii. 11). When, however, we find Eusebius silent, where, if anywhere, he might be expected to speak, we cannot attach much weight to a passage of, at best, most doubtful reference.

of our Lord. Not knowing which of the three crosses was the one they sought, Macarius caused them to be successively presented to the touch of a noble lady of Jerusalem then lying at the point of death. The first two crosses produced no effect, but at the touch of the third the sick woman rose up before them perfectly healed, thus showing that it was upon this that the Saviour had suffered. One part of the cross set in silver was entrusted to Macarius to be carefully guarded in Jerusalem, and the remainder, together with the nails was forwarded to Constantine. One of the nails was attached to his helmet, and another to the bridle of his horse, in fulfilment, according to sundry fathers, of the prophecy of Zechariah xiv. 20<sup>b</sup>

For the above tradition, see Socrates (*l. c.*), Theodoret (*l. c.*), Sozomen (ii. 1), Ambrose (*de obitu Theodosii*, c. 46; *Patrol.* xvi. 1399), Sulpicius Severus (*Hist. Sacra*, ii. 34; *Patrol.* xx. 148), Rufinus (*Hist.* i. 7, 8; *Patrol.* xxi. 1475), Paulinus of Nola (*Ep. ad Severum* 31; *Patrol.* lxi. 325), Gregory of Tours (*Liber Miraculorum*, i. 5 sqq.; *Patrol.* lxxi. 709). Cyril of Alexandria also (*Comm. in Zech.* in loc.; *Patrol. Gr.* lxxii. 271) refers to it as the current history in his day. Chrysostom evidently believed in the discovery of the cross, and speaks of the practice of conveying small portions of it about as amulets (*Quod Christus sit Deus*, c. 10; *Patrol. Gr.* xlvi. 826).

One or two further details may be added. Socrates states that the portion of the cross sent to Constantine was by him inclosed in his own statue, which was placed on a column of porphyry in the so-called forum of Constantine in Constantinople, that thus the city might be rendered impregnable by the possession of so glorious a relic. According to Sozomen, besides the miracle wrought on the sick lady, a dead man was instantly restored to life by the touch of the cross; but Paulinus, while mentioning this says nothing of the other miracle. In Ambrose, spite of a protest to the contrary, we see traces of the feeling in which respect for the cross, as a token of Him who hung thereon, drifted into an adoration of the cross itself. Thus Helena is represented as saying, "Ecce locus pugnae, ubi est victoria? . . . quomodo me redemptam arbitror, si redemptio ipsa non cernitur?" It may be added that according to Ambrose's version of the history, the inscription is found adhering to the cross it originally belonged to. The occasion of the notice in Paulinus is the sending of a piece of the cross to Severus for a church about to be consecrated, which affords him a natural opportunity for relating the story: he adds, that however much might thus be cut away from the cross, the bulk of the wood miraculously remained undiminished.

III. *Festival.*—With the belief in the discovery of the cross thus widely spread and thus cherished, it is only natural to expect that an annual festival to commemorate it would soon be established; though it is impossible from the want of satisfactory evidence to speak with any certainty as to the actual origin of such festival.

<sup>b</sup> Jerome, however (*Comm. in Zech.* in loc.), speaks of it as one might have expected, "nam sensu quidem per dictam sed ridiculam."

An attempt has been made to assign its first appointment to Pope Eusebius (ob. 310 A.D.), who, in a letter "Episcopis Tusciae et Campaniae," is made to say "Crucis ergo Domini nostri Jesu Christi, quae nuper nobis gubernacula Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae tenentibus quinto Nonas Maii inventa est, in praedicta Kalendarum die Inventionis festum vobis solemniter celebrare mandamus" (*Patrol.* vii. 1114).

Of course the utter spuriousness of this letter is shown, if by nothing else, by the fact that Pope Eusebius died before Constantine had embraced Christianity, and many years before the work of restoration began at Jerusalem at his command.

Nicephorus (*Hist. Eccles.* viii. 29) asserts that a festival to commemorate the Finding of the Cross was held at Jerusalem in Constantine's time, but appeals to no earlier authority in support of his statement:<sup>c</sup> and in the *Chronicon* of Flavius Lucius Dexter, if the passage be genuine, Pope Silvester I. (ob. 335 A.D.) is claimed as the originator of the festival: "Festum Inventionis S. Crucis a Silvestro institutum celebre multis est" (*Patrol.* xxxi. 563). It is not impossible that there may have been a festival peculiar to the Roman Church, before its observance had become general.

Most Western Martyrologies and Calendars mark May 3 as "Inventio S. Crucis," including the ancient Martyrologium Hieronymi (*Patrol.* xxx. 435); but there are grounds for doubting the genuineness of the words here, more especially from the fact that they are absent from the very ancient Cod. Epternacensis, as is pointed out by Papebroch (*Acta Sanctorum*; May, vol. i. p. 369). It is found in the Martyrologium Bysuntinum (*Patrol.* lxxx. 415), the Mart. Romanum Vetus (*ib.* cxxiii. 158), and those of Rabanus, Ado, Usuardus, and Notker (*ib.* cx. 1142; cxxiii. 256; cxxiv. 15; cxxxi. 1075); also in a Gallican and an English Martyrology (*ib.* lxxii. 614, 620), the Mozarabic and the Gothic Calendar (*ib.* lxxxv. 98, lxxxvi. 39), the Cal. Mutinense (*ib.* cvi. 821), Floriacense (*ib.* cxxxviii. 1187).

There is a special office for this day in the Gothogallic Missal (*ib.* lxxii. 285), in the Mozarabic Breviary and Missal (*ib.* lxxxv. 739, lxxxvi. 1119), in the Gelasian Sacramentary (*ib.* lxxiv. 1162), in the Gregorian Sacramentary and Antiphonary (*ib.* lxxviii. 101, 687). To this last we shall again refer.

Some, however, omit the festival altogether, and some give it a secondary place after the names of the Martyrs who are commemorated on this day. Thus there is no mention of it in the Calendar of Leo (*ib.* lxxiv. 878), in the metrical Martyrology of Bede (*ib.* xciv. 604), in the Sacramentarium Suaviciense (*ib.* cli. 823), and some others (see in Leslie's note to the Mozarabic Missal *in loc.*). Again in the Martyrology of Bede given in the *Acta Sanctorum* (March, vol. ii. p. xviii.), a long narrative of the Martyrs commemorated on this day is followed by "Ipso die Inventio Sanctae Crucis." So too runs the metrical Martyrology of Wandelbert (*Patrol.* cxxi. 598):—

"Praesul Alexander quinas et Eventius ornant,  
Theodolusque Del pariter pro nomine caesi,  
His quoque celsa crucis radiant vexilla repertae."

<sup>c</sup> This, however, is doubtless to be connected with the festival of the Exaltation of the Cross (ὑψωσις).

The same is the case with an old English Calendar, which reads "Natale SS. Alexandri, Eventii et Theodoli presbyteri, Inventio Crucis" (*ib.* xciv. 1151). See also the Cal. Stabulense and the Cal. Brixianum (*ib.* cxxx-iii. 1196, 6270).

In the Gregorian Sacramentary also the mention of the *Inventio Crucis* follows that of the Saints commemorated on this day (as also the Antiphonary in the MSS.), and Ménard (note *in loc.*) states that in the most ancient MSS. this festival is altogether wanting.

In the list of feasts to be observed given in the *Capitulaire* of Ahyto or Hatto (appointed Bishop of Basle in 806 A.D.) there is no mention of the *Inventio Crucis* (*Patrol.* cxv. 12), and in the *Capitula* of Walter, bishop of Orleans (857 A.D.), the festivals of the *Inventio Crucis* and *Exaltatio Crucis* are appended to the end of cap. xviii. "De Sanctorum festivitibus indicendis et observandis" (*ib.* cxix. 742), as though they had been introduced at a later date than the others mentioned.

All this evidence seems, as far as it goes, to point either to the fact that the festival was established at a comparatively late date, or that it was for some time of local rather than general observance. Papebroch (*Acta Sanctorum* *in loc.* c. iii.) suggests 720 A.D. as approximately the date of the general recognition of the festival, but the reference above to its absence in documents of even later date will incline us to look upon the end of the 8th century or the beginning of the 9th as the earliest period we can safely fix on.

Attention may be called here to the fact that several of the above mentioned authorities make an error of at least half a century in the date of Helena's alleged discovery. Thus the Martyrologium Hieronymi speaks of it as "post Passionem Domini anno ducentesimo trigesimo tertio," in which it is followed by Florus in the additions to Bede's Martyrology, by Rabanus and others.<sup>d</sup>

The Greek Church has not, properly speaking, a separate festival for the Finding of the Cross, but celebrates this event on the day of the Exaltation of the Cross, September 14. Some branches, however, of the Eastern Church do observe a festival of the Finding of the Cross also. Thus in the Calendars of the Ethiopic and Coptic Churches given by Ludolf (*Fasti Sacri Ecclesiae Alexandrinae*), March 6 is marked "Inventio S. Crucis" (p. 22), and, in the case of the former Church, May 4, "Helena reperit Crucem" (p. 27).

Mention may be made here of writings on the subject of the Finding of the Cross referred to in the decrees of a council held at Rome under the presidency of Gelasius: while allowed to be read, their statements are to be received with caution. "Item [recipienda] scripta de Inventionione Crucis Dominicae, . . . novellae quaedam relationes sunt, et nonnulli eas Catholici legunt. Sed cum haec ad Catholicorum manus pervenerint, beati Pauli Apostoli praecedat sententia, omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete" (*Patrol.* lix. 161). Further, in the *Acta Sanctorum* (May, vol. i. p. 362), Papebroch adduces grounds for believing the unhistorical character of much of this writing,—among other things, the same error in the

<sup>d</sup> Theophanes (*Chronographia*) makes a similar mistake, and refers the discovery to the year 317 A.D.

date of the Finding, amounting to more than half a century, into which we have already mentioned that several of the late martyrologies have fallen. These writings seem to have found their way to the East and to have been translated into Syriac (see Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, vol. i. p. 487).

In addition to the books already cited in this article, reference may be made to Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vol. v. part 1, pp. 368 sqq., to Newman's *Essay on Miracles* recorded in *Ecclesiastical History*, pp. cxlii. sqq., where the truth of the legend is strongly argued for, as also in Greiser, *De Cruce Christi*, vol. I. lib. 1, cc. 62-64. [R. S.]

**CROSS, THE APPARITION OF THE**, at Jerusalem, about the third hour of the day, in the time of Constantine, in the year 345, is commemorated May 7 in the *Byzantine and Ethiopic Calendars*. [C.]

**CROSS, SIGN OF.** [SIGN OF THE CROSS.]

**CROWN.** Referring to the article **CORONATION** for the distinction between the *crown* or *garland*, "*corona*," *στέφανος*, and the *diadem* or *fillet*, "*taenia*," "*fascia*," *διδήματα*, and for fuller details on both to the *Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*, it is proposed in this article to furnish some description of imperial and regal crowns belonging to our period, the form and ornamentation of which are known to us either from contemporaneous representations or from the crowns themselves having come down to our own time.

From the portraits on their coins it appears that the early emperors adopted the *diadem*, worn either simply or encircling the helmet



Constantine from medal, from Ferrario, 'Costumi.'



Heraclius, from Ferrario, 'Costumi.'

(*galea diademata*), *cidaris* or *tiara*, with which their head was covered. The coins of Constantine the Great depict him wearing diadems or filets of various kinds; some ornamented with gems; some enriched with a double row of pearls, with the loose ends of the fillet hanging down over his shoulders. Sometimes he wears a helmet surrounded by a diadem, with a cross in front (Ferrario, *Costumi*, Europa, vol. I. part 2—*Appendice sulla Corona di Ferro*). This combination is also seen on the coins of Gratian, Valentinian II., Theodosius, Leo the Great, and Basil. In a drawing given by Ferrario (u. s. No. 3), Heraclius, A.D. 610-641, wears a helmet encircled by a gemmed diadem with pendent ends, and a cross above the forehead. The combination of the diadem with the *cidaris* or *tiara* was borrowed from the Orientals, among whom it had been in use from ancient times (Xenoph. *Cyrop.* viii. 3-13: *Κίρος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔχουσιν τὴν τιφάνην καὶ διδάματα περὶ τῇ τιφάνῃ*; Anab. ii. 5; Herod. vi. 61; Anach. Pers. p. 668). It was worn by

Zenobia (Trebell. Poll. xxix.: "*ad conciones galata processit cum lumbis purpureis gemmis dependentibus per ultimam fimbriam*"), and was adopted by her conqueror, Aurelian. It is seen in medals under the form of a peaked cap ornamented with gems, rising from a jewelled diadem or fillet, tied behind. The cap in later times assumed the popular name of *tuphan*, *τοῦφ*, the origin of the modern *turban*. Zonaras de-



Tuphan, from Ferrario.



Constantine from his Arch at Rome.

scribes the Emperor Basilica, in the 9th century, as *τίφης ταινιωδὲς ὅστις ἔν τοῦφῳ καλεῖ ὁ δημόδης καὶ πολλοὶ ἀσπάρτες*. Its origin, and the history of its adoption, is thus given by Tzetzes, *Chiliades*, viii. 184:—

*τίφης στέφανος κεφαλῆς ἐνέχυρον παρὰ Πέρσας,  
ἔσπερον ἐν ταῖς νύκτας δὲ ἡμῶν αἱ στροφόμεναι  
σφαῖραι κεφαλῆς ἐνέχοντο τῶντες φρενὶ τῶφης,  
ὅλας ἔβαντο φορεῖν ὁ δὲ δόριος Ἰουλιανὸς  
ὁ Λουσιτανικὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἑτάμεν.*

Another form of the imperial headgear was a low-crowned cap, apparently destitute of diadem or any special distinction of royalty. This was known as **CAMELAVCIUM** (which see). Constantine appears in this garb on his triumphal arch in Rome (Ferrario, u. s. pl. 30, No. 2), and in an illumination from a MS. of the 9th century, representing the Council of Nicaea, given by Agincourt (*Peintures*, pl. 32). Justinian, in the mosaics of the sanctuary of San Vitale at Ravenna, has his head covered with a jewelled cap, while the Empress Theodora wears a tiara surrounded with three circlets of gems. Strings of pearls and other gems hang down from each. These jewelled tassels were known as *κατακλυσά*. (Const. Porphy. *De Caesaron*, i. 582; ii. 688.)



Justinian and Theodora, from mosaics of St. Vitale, Ravenna.

The diadem in its original form of a linen or silken riband or fillet gradually went out of use from Justinian's time (La Barte, *Arts Indust. du Moyen Age*, ii. 39), and was replaced by a flexible band of gold, *στέμμα*, *στέφανος*, sometimes adorned with a band of pearls and precious stones, representing the old *διδήματα*. The name *στέφανος* was in use for the imperial symbol as early as the time of Constantine. Cyril, *Ep.* ad Const. II.: *ἔσπερον . . . αὐτὸν ἔν τῷ στέφανῳ*



τιμίαν σου πλάσας στεφανοῦσι κεφαλὴν, χρυσοκόλλητους στεφάνους λίθοις διαγυγασμένοις πεποικιλμένους προσκομίζοντες. This circlet was closed by a cap of rich stuff decorated with gems. From being shut in at the top it took the name of *στανάκλειστος*, which appears in Anastasius Bibl. and other authors in the perplexing



Diadem, from Ferrario.

form of *spanochiata* (Anast. Bibl. *Paschalis*, 434, &c.). Examples of this form of crown are given in the annexed woodcuts of the Emperor Phocas, A.D. 602-610, and the Empress Irene, wife of Leo IV., A.D. 797-802. In the time of Const. Porphy., the royal treasury contained circlets or *stemma* of various colours, white, green, and blue, according to the enamel with which they were coated. These circlets decorated with gems are mentioned



Phocas, from a woodcut. Ferrario, pl. 28, fig. 5.



Irene, wife of Leo IV. from a woodcut. Ferrario, ib.

by Claudian in connection with the two sons of Theodosius, Arcadius, and Honorius, towards the end of the 4th century "Et vario lapidum distinctos igne coronas" (*In pr. Cons. Stilich.* ii. 92.)

The most ancient examples of crowns are those long preserved in the treasury of the cathedral of Monza, in Lombardy, belonging to the early part of the 7th century. These crowns were three in number: (1) the so-called *Iron Crown*, "*Corona Ferrea*;" (2) the crown of Agilulf, and (3) that of Theodelinda. Agilulf's crown was taken to Paris as a prize of war by Napoleon I., in 1804, by mistake for the Iron Crown, and was stolen from the "Cabinet des Médailles," in which it was deposited, and melted down. The most celebrated of these crowns is—

(1) *The Iron Crown of Lombardy*, the reputed gift of Queen Theodelinda, who died A.D. 628. This crown is formed of six plates of gold, each double, united by as many hinges of the same metal. The face of each plate exhibits two panels, divided by spiral threads; one long, and squarish, the other tall and narrow. The plafond is covered with emerald-green semitransparent enamel. The long panels contain a large gem in the centre, surrounded by four gold roses, or floral knobs, from which ramify small stalks and flowers, in red, blue, and opaque-white enamels. The tall narrow plaques contain three gems set vertically. One plaque has only one gem, and two roses. The two centre plafonds meet without an intervening plaque. The number

of gems is 22; of gold roses, 26; and of enamels, 24. Within the golden circlet thus formed is the iron ring, from which is derived the designation of the "*Iron Crown*" (which, however, Ferrario asserts, is comparatively modern, never being found in the rituals of the churches of Milan and Monza before the time of Otho IV., A.D. 1175. Before this epoch even its advocate Bellani allows it appears in the inventories as *Corona Aurca*). This is a narrow iron band .04 inch thick and .4 inch broad, united at the extremities by a small nail, and connected with the articulated plates of the crown by little pins. Bellani asserts that it was hammered into shape, and bears no marks of the file. Burges, a more trustworthy authority, states that the marks of the file are clearly visible. (*Arch. Journal*, vol. xiv. p. 14.) This iron ring, as is well-known, is regarded as a relic of the greatest sanctity, being reputed to have been fashioned out of one of the nails of the true cross. This belief cannot be traced further back than the latter part of the 16th century. The existence of the band of iron is mentioned by Aeneas Sylvius (Pope Julius II. d. 1464) in his *Hist. Aust. lib. iv.*, but simply as *lamma quaedam*, without a hint at its supposed sanctity, and with an expression of contempt for the allegorical meaning assigned to its employment in the coronation of the emperors, as denoting *strength*—"stultae interpretationi efficit locum." According to Muratori (*De Cor. Ferr. Comment.* A.D. 1688), Bugatus is the first author who mentions



The Iron Crown of Lombardy, at Monza Cathedral.

it (*Addit. ad Hist. Univ.* 1587). He was followed by Zucchius (*Hist. Cor. Ferr.* 1613), whose violations of truth Muratori holds it charitable to attribute to gross carelessness. Two years before the publication of Bugatus' book, A.D. 1585, a letter, sent from the archpriest of Monza to Pope Sixtus V., quoted by Muratori, speaks of the Iron Crown as a most precious possession of his church, as having been used from early times for the coronation of the Roman emperors (even this fact is doubtful), but distinguishes it from the relics properly so called, and makes no allusion to its having been wrought out of a nail of the crucifixion. From the 16th century onwards the belief gained strength, but having been discredited by the searching historical investigations of Muratori in the treatise referred to above, the worship of the crown as a sacred relic was alternately suspended and re-enforced by decrees and counter-decrees of the ecclesiastical authorities, until in 1688 the matter was laid before the Congregation of Relics at Rome. A process was instituted, which lingered on till 1717, when a diplomatic sentence was pronounced, leaving the chief point—the identity of the iron ring with the nail—undecided, but sanctioning its

being exposed to the adoration of the faithful, and carried in processions.

The chain of evidence connecting the Iron Crown with the crucifixion nail is very precarious, and shows some alarming gaps. According to the statement of Justus Fontaninus (Archbishop of Ancyra, *De Coron. Ferr.* 1719), who wrote in defence of its genuineness, the inner ring was believed to have been formed out of one of the two nails given by the Empress Helena, after her discovery of the true cross on Calvary, to her son Constantine. One of these was made into a bit for the emperor's bridle (in allusion to Zech. xiv. 20); the other was used in a head-covering—a diadem, according to some authorities (Ambros. *De Obitu Theod. Magn.*); a helmet, according to others, and those the most credible. Constantine's idea seems indeed to have been that so sacred an amulet affixed to his helmet would be a protection to him in battle, "galea belli usibus aptum" (Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.* x. 8; Soz. i. 17; Soz. ii. 1; Theod. i. 18; Cassiod. i. 18). The orthodox theory identifies the Monza crown with the diadem supposed to have been presented by Helena to Constantine, which passed, no one knows when or how (it is needless to enumerate the more or less probable hypotheses), from Constantinople to Rome, and is affirmed—a fact of which there is absolutely no evidence—to have been sent as a present by Gregory the Great to Queen Theodelinda; although it is in the highest degree improbable that Gregory, who is known to have been "tenax reliquiarum," should have parted with a relic of such supreme sanctity, while, if such a precious gift had been made, it could not fail to have been mentioned by Gregory when describing his donations (Greg. Mag. *Ep. xii. [vii.] lib. xiv. [xii.]*). The view of Bellani (cannon of Monza, who wrote an elaborate treatise (Milano, 1819) in answer to Ferrario's *Appendice sulla Corona di Ferro, Costumi, Europa*, vol. iii.) is that the iron ring and the gold circlet were originally distinct; that the former is the sacred relic affixed to the helmet of Constantine, while the latter was primarily a diadem, open behind, and fastened to the head by clasps, the extremities of which were united in the present shape when it was adapted to the iron ring. The view of Muratori, which appears the most probable, dissipates all notion of sacred interest attaching to the iron ring, which he considers to have been inserted within the gold circle, as in the crown of Charlemagne (see post), simply for the purpose of giving firmness to the articulated plates.

However it may have reached Italy, the character of the workmanship of the Iron Crown proves its Byzantine origin. La Barte, who holds this as an incontrovertible fact, remarks that the art of working in enamel had not penetrated into Italy in the time of Theodelinda (*Les Arts industriels d: Moyen Age*, ii. 56 sq.).

The small size of the crown, barely large enough for the head of a child of two years old, the internal diameter being 6 inches (its height is 2.4 inches), leads to the conclusion that it was never intended for ordinary wearing, but was a suspensory or votive crown, with a cross and lamp usually depending from it, hung over the altar, and employed temporarily, on the occasion of coronations, for placing on the sovereign's head as a symbol of royalty, and then returned

again to its place. Such crowns are seen hanging over the altar in a bas-relief of a coronation, now in the S. transept of Monza cathedral (see the woodcut p. 480), exactly resembling that which is being placed on the sovereign's head. In the church of St. Sophia, at Constantinople, also, according to Codinus, the royal *oréques* were suspended over the holy table, and were only worn on high festivals. Ducange (*Constantiniana*) also informs us that the Greek emperors were inaugurated with one of the lamp-bearing crowns ordinarily hanging over the altar [CORONA LUCIS].

(For the history of the Iron Crown, see Muratori, *De Coron. Ferr. Comment.* Melliana et Lipsa. 1719; also *Anecd. Latin.* ii. 267 sq.; Fontanini *De Corona Ferrea*, 1817; Frisi, *Memorie Storiche di Monza*, ii.; Zucchi, *Hist. Coron. Ferr.* 1817; De Murr, *Dissert. de Coron. Reg. Ital. vulgo Ferrea dicta*, 1810; Bellani, *La Corona Ferrea del Regno d' Italia*, 1819; Ferrario, *Costumi, Europa*, iii. *Appendice sulla Corona di Ferro*; La Barte, *Les Arts industriels du Moyen Age*, ii. 56 sq.).

(2) *The Crown of Agilulf.*—This hopelessly lost treasure takes its name from Theodelinda's



Crown of Agilulf.

second husband, chosen by her A.D. 591, on the death of Authar. From its small size, even less than the Iron Crown, it is evident that it was not intended for ordinary wear, but was a votive, suspensory crown. This is also proved by the inscription it bore: "† Agilulf, Grat. D'i. vir. glor. rex. totius. Ital. offeret. s'co Johanni. Baptist. in. Eccl. Modica." A gold cross depended from it, with a large amethyst in the middle, two gems in each arm and four large pearls. Seven little chains with pendent acorns hung from the cross. The crown itself was a circle of gold, decorated with 15 arched niches of laurel boughs containing figures of our Lord seated between two angels, and the Twelve apostles standing. It bore a circle of emeralds, carbuncles, and pearls above.

The inscription was in enamel. The clumsiness of execution leads La Barte u. s. to the conclusion that this and the following crown were of Lombard, not Byzantine workmanship.

(3) *The Crown of Theodelinda*.—This is a plain circlet, enriched with a vast quantity of gems of more or less value, chiefly emeralds and pearls, and a great many pieces of mother-of-pearl. From it depends a cross, also set with emeralds and pearls. (For these crowns consult Muratori, *Ant. It.* i. 460; Ferrario, u. s. iii. 70; Frisi,



Crown of Theodelinda.

*Memorie di Monza*, i. pl. vi. p. 42; vol. ii. 76; Agincourt, *Sculpture*, pl. 26; La Barte, ii. 56, *Burges Arch. Journ.* vol. xiv.)

(4) *Crowns of Reccesvinthus, King of the Spanish Visigoths, and his Queen and Family*.—These eight gold crowns belonging to the 7th century, now in the museum of the Hôtel de Clugny, were discovered buried in the earth at Fuente de Guarrasar in 1858, having probably been interred early in the 8th century on the invasion of the Saracens. The whole of the crowns found were evidently, from their form and dimensions, votive crowns, probably dedicated by the king and queen and chief officers of the court. The crown of Reccesvinthus, who reigned A.D. 653–675, is one of the most gorgeous and remarkable relics of its age, composed of a fillet jointed and formed of a double plate of purest gold. It measures about 9 inches in diameter, or 27 inches in circumference. The hoop is about 4 inches broad, and more than half an inch in thickness. The rims of the hoop are formed of bands of intersecting circles in *cloisonné* work in red and green, with incrustations of cornelian. It is enriched with thirty uncut sapphires of large size, alternating with as many very large Oriental pearls, forming three rows. The intervening spaces are pierced with open work, and engraved so as to represent foliage and flowers. To the lower edge of this hoop is suspended by small chains a very remarkable fringe of gold letters about 2 inches long, incrustated with gems, with a pendant pearl and sapphire attached to each, forming the inscription—

† RECCESVINTHVS REX OFFERET.

A little below the fringe of letters hangs a massive Latin cross mounted with six fine sapphires

and eight large pearls, with jewelled pendants attached to its foot and limbs. To the upper margins are attached four golden chains of beautiful design, by which it might be suspended, uniting in a foliated ornament, and surmounted by a knop of rock crystal, with sapphires hanging round.

A second crown discovered in the same place has been assigned with much probability to the queen of Reccesvinthus. In form and arrangement it corresponds to that of the king, but the enrichments are less gorgeous. Like that, it is formed in two pieces with a hinge, to adapt it to the head of the wearer. The hoop is set with fifty-four gems, rubies, sapphires, emeralds, and



Crown of Reccesvinthus.

opals. From the lower rim hang eight sapphires. There is no inscription. The pendant cross is covered with jewels, but less costly than those on the former one.

The six smaller crowns are reasonably supposed to have belonged to the younger members of this royal family. Three of these are gold hoops without pendant crosses, jewelled, enriched with *repoussé* work and mother-of-pearl. One is decorated with an arcade of little round-headed arches, and has a fringe of rock crystal. The other three are of a very singular construction. They consist of a kind of open framework or basketwork of gold, formed of three horizontal

circlets, connected by numerous uprights, gems being set at the points of intersection. Each crown is rudely decorated with as many as fifty-four precious stones and pearls, and is terminated with the fringe of sapphires and the pendant cross. One of the crosses presents the dedicatory inscription—

† IN DEI NOMINE OFFERET SONNICA  
SANCTE MARIE IN SORBACES.

"Few relics of the period," writes Mr. Albert Way, *Archæol. Journal*, xvi. 256, "deserve com-



Crown of Svintila.

parison with this precious regalia, both in barbaric magnificence of enrichment, and in the impressive effect of so sumptuous a display of natural gems remarkable for their dimensions

and lustrous brilliancy." (*Lasteyrie, Description du Trésor de Guarrazar*, Paris, 1860. La Barte *Arts indust.*, i. 499 sq.)

(5) *The Crown of Svintila*.—Svintila was king of the Visigoths, A.D. 621–631. His crown, preserved in the royal armoury at Madrid, is of massive gold enriched with sapphires and pearls set rose fashion between two borders set with delicate stones. From the lower rim hangs a fringe of open letters of gold, set with red glass, suspended by chains of double links, with pendant pear-shaped sapphires. The letters form the inscription,

SVINTILANVS REX OFFERT.

(*Proceedings of the Soc. of Antiq.* ii. 11. José Amador de los Ríos, *El Arte Latino-bizantino*, Madrid, 1861.)

These Spanish crowns are considered by La Barte to be of Spanish workmanship. Lasteyrie, on the other hand, assigns to them a Gothic origin, and, with less probability, thinks that they were brought into Spain by North-German barbarians.

The suspensory form of these crowns and the inscriptions some of them present prove that they were of a votive character, and were dedicated to God by the king and his family on some memorable occasion, to be hung up over the altar. But this does not preclude their previous use as crowns for wearing. That such was their primary destination is rendered almost certain by the variation in diameter of the different circlets, and by the hinges and fastenings which facilitated their being fitted to the wearer's head. The queen's crown also has little loops, above and below, for attaching a lining or cap within the gold circlet, to prevent it from galling the wearer's brow.

(6) *The Crown of Charlemagne*.—This crown, preserved in the treasury at Vienna, is evidently made up of portions belonging to different epochs. It is composed of eight round-headed plaques of gold; four larger, enriched with emeralds and sapphires *en cabochon*, and four smaller, presenting enamelled figures of David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Christ. Strength and unity are imparted to the whole by the insertion of two little circlets of iron. A jewelled cross rises from the apex of the front plaque, from which an enamelled arch stretches over the head to the back, bearing the name of the Emperor Conrad, A.D. 1138. The costumes of the figures in the enamels are Byzantine. (Hangard-Mangé, *Les Arts somptuaires*, Paris, 1858, pl. 31, vol. ii. p. 31.)

*Authorities*.—In addition to the treatises of Muratori, Fontaninus, and Bellani, named above, we may refer the student to the following:—Bayer, *De duob. Diadem.* in *Mus. Imp. Comment. Acad. Scient. Imp. Petropol.* viii. 1736. Agincourt, Seroux d', *Art par les Monuments, Sculpture, Prieture*. W. Burges, "On the Treasures at Monza," *Archæol. Journ.* xiv. Ciampini, *Vet. Monim.* cxiv. i. p. 107. Guenebault, *Diction. iconogr. des Monuments*, Paris, 1843, and *Glossaire illustré* in *Annales de Philosophie chrétienne*, xi. Ferrario, *Costume antico e moderno d'Europa*, vol. i. pt. 1, vol. iii. pt. 1, *Appendice sulle Corone Ferreae*, vol. i. pt. 2, Hangard-Mangé, *Les Arts somptuaires*, Paris, 1858. La Barte, *Les Arts industriels*. Migne, *Encycl. Theol.* xxvii. *Dis-*



*Mémoire d'Orfèvrerie, &c. Montfaucou, Mémoires de la Monarchie française, t. Paschalis, De Coronis. Paris. 1610. Soummerard, du, Catalogue des*

*Musée de Cluny, Paris, 1851. Way, "On the Crowns of Guarramar," Arch. Journal, xvi, [L. V.]*



Crown of Charlemagne.

**CROWNS FOR BRIDES.** } These two uses  
**CROWNS FOR BURIALS.** } of crowns or  
wreaths, as connected with Christian social life,  
seem to call for a separate notice. In each case  
there was a custom belonging to a non-Christian  
period. The bridal crown, of Greek origin, had  
been adopted by the Romans, and was in uni-  
versal use, sometimes worn by the bride alone,  
sometimes by the bridegroom also. The rigorous-  
ness of early Christian feeling rejected the use of  
coronae generally, as connected either with the  
excesses of heathen feasts, or the idolatry of  
heathen worship. Christians were to avoid mar-  
riages with heathen women lest they should be  
tempted to put the evil thing upon their brows  
(Tertull. *de Coronat.* c. 13). Flowers might be  
worn as a bouquet, or held in the hand, but not  
upon the head. It was not long, however, before  
the natural beauty of the practice freed itself  
from the old associations and reasserted its claim.  
It is probable that the objections to it were never  
very widely entertained. In the time of Chry-  
sostom it was again a common usage. Bridegroom  
and bride were crowned as victors, assuming their  
purity, over the temptations of the flesh. It  
was a shock to Christian feeling when the wreaths  
were worn by the impure (*Rom.* ix. in 1 *Tim.*).  
The bridegroom's wreath was for the most part  
of myrtle (*Vidos. Apollin. Carm. II. ad Anthem.*),  
the bride's of verbena. The prominence of the  
rite in the Eastern church has led the whole  
marriage service to be described in the Greek  
*Εὐχαριστία* as the *Ἀναθήκη τοῦ στέφανου*

*παρεσ.*, and the ceremony itself, as probably  
handed down from an early period, deserves  
mention here. First, the bridegroom solemnly  
crowns the bride in the name of the Father, the  
Son, and the Holy Ghost. Then the bride in like  
manner crowns the bridegroom. Lastly, the  
priest blesses them with the thrice-repeated  
words, "O Lord our God, crown them with  
glory and honour."

The use of wreaths for burials, common  
among both Greeks and Romans, on the head of  
the corpse, on the bier, on the tomb, was for  
like reasons rejected by the more rigorous  
teachers. The disciples of Christ were to seek  
an incorruptible crown, the amaranth which  
grows on no earthly soil (*Clem. Alex. Paedag.*  
ii. 8). To those who had been accustomed to  
show their honour to the dead by this outward  
sign, this refusal seemed cruel and unfeeling;  
and Christians had to defend themselves against  
the charge, "*Coronas etiam sepulchris denegatis*"  
(*Minuc. Fel.* c. 12), with the answer, "*Nec ad-  
nectimus areoscentem coronam, sed a Deo aeternis  
floribus viridem sustinemus*" (*ibid.* c. 37). Here  
also, after a time, though less formally in the  
case of the nuptial crown, the old practice was  
revived with a higher significance. The crown  
appears on tombs and paintings as the symbol  
of martyrdom; and modern Christendom repro-  
duces, without misgiving, the practice which  
the ancient Church rejected. [E. H. P.]

**CRUCIFIX and REPRESENTATIONS  
OF THE CRUCIFIXION.** It is necessary to

distinguish between the use of the crucifix as an object or instrument of devotion, and that of pictorial or other representations of the Crucifixion as a scene. Every variety and combination of the arts of sculpture, mosaic, painting, and engraving has been applied to this great subject from early times, and to all parts of it; and this distinction is one of principle as well as convenience. The modern crucifix and its use of course form no part of the subject. Within the limits of our period, all representations of the crucified Form of our Lord alone, as well as pictures, reliefs, and mosaics, in which that Form is the central object of a scene, may be considered alike symbolical, without historical realism or artistic appeal to emotion. There is doubtless a divergence in the direction of realism, and appeal to feeling by actual representation is begun, whenever the human figure is added to the symbolic cross.\* The use of the sculptured, moulded, or enamelled crucifix or crucifixion in early times, is a development of that of the cross, and the transition between them may have been a certainty from the first; but the rude efforts of earlier days, with which alone we have to do, can neither call on the imagination by vivid presentation of the actual event, nor awaken feeling by appeal to the sense of beauty, nor distress by painful details of bodily suffering. While the primitive rules of representation were adhered to, as they are to this day in the Greek Church, the picture or icon dwells on the meaning of the event rather than its resemblance, and shadows forth, rather than represents, the God-Man in the act of death for man. These rules were first infringed by, or naturally collapsed in the presence of, increased artistic power. The paintings of Cimabue and Giotto, and the reliefs of N. Pisano, brought the personality of the artist into every work, and introduced human motive and treatment, in the artistic sense of the words. To those whose minds are drawn to ascetic thought and practice, it has always been natural to meditate, and to communicate their thoughts upon, the bodily sufferings of the Saviour of mankind. This was done by Angelico and others naturally and freely before the Reformation; since that period a somewhat polemical and artificial use has been made of this line of thought; and painting and sculpture have been applied to embody it accordingly in the Roman Catholic Church. It may be remarked, before retiring within our proper limits of time, that the use of blood, by Giotto and his followers down to Angelico, has doctrinal reference to the Holy Communion, and to Scriptural promises of cleansing by the blood of Christ.<sup>b</sup> Giotto is less in-

\* De Rossi (vol. II. tav. v. p. 355) gives a cross, with two lambs apparently contemplating it, below one of the usual pictures of the Good Shepherd. *Archæol. Rom. Subt.* II. 478. "Crux, cum Christo illi fixo, neutiquam effigari olim solebat." The Crucifixion he calls "mysticis res coloribus adumbrata . . . emblematica figuræque modis; sub innocui videlicet agni iuxta crucis lignum placide consistens typus." See Bottari, *tav. xxi. xxi.* See, however (ib., *tav. cxcl.*), the crucifix found in the tomb of St. Julius and St. Valentine in the Catacombs; which so much resembles the mosaic crucifix of John VII. that it can hardly be of very early date. It is generally assigned to Pope Adrian, about 800.

<sup>b</sup> As in the Crucifixion over the door of the Convent of St. Maria, Florence, where the blood issues from the

joined to dwell for terror's sake on the bodily sufferings of the Passion, than to dwell with awe on its mystery as a sacrifice for man. But the rise of mediæval asceticism, and its attribution of sacramental efficacy to bodily pain, bore painters with it as well as other men. And in later times, when Christian feeling on the subject was lost, many men seem to have considered the final scene of the Redemption of Man chiefly as a good opportunity of displaying newly-acquired powers of facial expression and knowledge of anatomy.

If Hallam's division of periods be accepted, which makes the end of the 5th century the beginning of the Middle Ages, the public representation of the Crucifixion may be said to be a mediæval usage in point of time. Further, Martigny (*Dict. des Antiq. Chrétiennes*, p. 130, a. v.) claims for France the honour of having possessed the first public crucifix-painting which ever existed; for which he refers to Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Martyr.* I. 23), and which he says must have been at least as old as the middle of the 6th century. But he says above, probably with great correctness, that all the most eminent Crucifixions known were objects of private devotion, instancing the pectoral cross of Queen Theodolinda and the Syrian MS. of the Medusan



Theodolinda's Crucifix.

Library at Florence, both hereafter to be described. The official or public use of the cross as a symbol of Redemption begins with Constantine, though of course it had been variously employed by all Christians at an earlier date. [Cross.]

Crucifixes, according to Guericke, did not appear in churches till after the 7th century. Such images, probably, in the early days of the Church, would produce too crude and painful an effect in the Christian imagination, and to that of the more hopeful Pagan they would be intolerable; not only because his feelings would recoil from the thought of the punishment of the cross, but from superstitious terror of con-

fect, in a conventional form, as a crimson cord, which is twisted strangely beneath about a skull. (*Ruskin, Mod. P.* vol. II. p. 126.)

meeting the Infelix Arbor with a Divine Being. The Graffito Blasfemo of the Palatine illustrates this (see woodcut); but Christian teachers may have refrained from any addition to the cross, as a symbol of divine humiliation and suffering, from purely charitable motives. The cross itself may have been felt to be temporarily unwelcome to persons in certain stages of conversion.

If we set aside the various monograms of His name, and the emblematic fish, which is an anagram of it, there are but two classes of representations of our Lord,—those which point to His divinity and lordship over all men, and those which commemorate His humanity and sufferings for all men. The earliest of the former class is the Good Shepherd; the earliest of the latter the Lamb: and both are combined in the painting given by De Rossi, vol. ii. tav. v. The symbolic Lamb, as will be seen (Gen. iv. 4, xlii. 8; Exod. xii. 3, xlix. 38; Is. xvi. 1; 1 Pet. i. 18; Rev. xiii. 8), connects the Old Testament with the New, and unites in itself all types and shadowings of Christ's sacrifice, from the death of Abel to St. John's vision of the slain victim. It is well said by Martigny to be the crucifix of the early times of persecution; and its emblematic use grows more significant as time advances. The cross is first borne by the Lamb on its head, in the monogrammatic form (Bottari, *Sculture e Pitture sacre estratte dai Cimiteri di Roma*, &c., Rom. 3 fol. 1737-54, tav. xxi. v. 1), about the latter half of the 4th century. The simple cross occurs thus in the 5th century (Bottari, tav. xxii.). In the 6th century the Lamb bears the cross (Araghi, ii. lib. iv. p. 559, *Roma Subterranea*), and rests sometimes on a book, sometimes at the foot of an altar (Ciampini, *Vetera Monumenta*, vol. i. tab. xv. p. 26; vol. ii. tab. xv. p. 58), above which is the cross; and then it is represented "as it were slain," with evident reference to the Paschal feast (Ciampini, *V. M. t. li. tabb. xv. xlv.*). Towards the end of the 6th century the Wounds of the Cross are represented on the sides and feet of the Lamb. In Ciampini (*De Sacris Aedificiis*, tab. xiii.) the Lamb is raised on a throne at the foot of an ornamented cross, the throne itself bearing resemblance to an altar-table.

The famous Vatican Cross (for which, and for the Cross of Velletri,\* see Cardinal Borgia's monographs, Rome, 4to. 1779 and 1780) is the 6th century type of symbolic representation. A medallion of the Lamb bearing the cross, and with a nimbus, is placed at its central point of intersection, and it is accompanied by two half-length figures of our Lord, with the cruciform nimbus at the top and foot of the vertical limb. Two others at the horizontal ends are supposed to represent Justin II. and his Empress Sophia. The upper half-length of the Lord holds a book in the left hand, and blesses with the right; the lower one holds a roll and a small cross. The embossed lily-ornaments are of great beauty,

and there is an inscription on the back, which Borgia reads thus:—

"Ligno quo Christus humanum subdidit hostem  
Dat Romanæ Justine opem"

As it is impossible to determine which is the earliest representation of the Crucifixion or crucifix now in existence or on trustworthy record, a few of the oldest known may be briefly



Perpendicular of Vatican Cross.

described here. They will be found in woodcut in Angelo Rocca, *Thesaurus Pontificiarum Rerum*, vol. i. p. 153, though the copies have been made by a draughtsman skilled in anatomy, who has quite deprived them of the stamp of antiquity, which their originals undoubtedly possessed. The first and second are said by Rocca to be the workmanship of Nicodemus and St. Luke. The

\* The Cross of Velletri, which Borgia attributes to the 5th or 10th century, contains the symbols of the four Evangelists. The Vatican Cross is photographed in M. St. Laurent's paper in Méron's *Revue Archéologique* (see *infra*). The result reflects great credit on the accuracy of Borgia's illustration; and M. St. Laurent speaks highly of Ciampini and others.

most is evidently of the time of Charlemagne. The Crucified is clothed in a long tunic, and bears a crown of radiatory bars, closed at top, rising from the circlet. A chalice is at its feet, and A  $\omega$  on the title overhead.

The head of the second, attributed to St. Luke, is crowned, and surrounded by a nimbus. It is almost entirely naked,—the waistcloth, at least, seems to have been purposely contracted: this of itself would place it at a late date.

The third example is historical. It is called the Crucifix of John VII., and represents a mosaic in the old Basilica of St. Peter's. Rocca dates it 706. It bears the cruciform nimbus with the title INRI. It is clothed in a long tunic, the form and folds of which are most graceful, and bear a great resemblance to the painted crucifix found in the Catacombs, assigned to Pope Adrian III. 884.

The fourth is the celebrated Crucifix of Charlemagne, given to Leo III. and the Basilica of St. Peter's, and dated 815. It is clothed in an ample waistcloth, the wound in the side is represented, and the head surrounded by a cruciform nimbus. Four nails are used in all these crucifixes.

A crucifix is described by the Rev. F. H. Tozer, which, as he considers, has a decided claim to be considered the most ancient in existence, and which he saw in the monastery of Xeropotama at Mount Athos. It is a reputed gift of the Empress Pulcheria (414—453), and has been spared no doubt for that reason. It is a supposed fragment of the true cross, and consists of one long piece of dark wood and two cross-pieces, one above the other, the smaller intended for the superscription. The small figure of our Lord is of ivory or bone. Near the foot is a representation of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in gold plate, and set with diamonds and sapphires of extraordinary size and beauty. Below that, the inscription *Κωνσταντίνου Εὐφροσύνης καὶ τῶν τέκνων*. Another exists at Ochrida in Western Macedonia, disused, and of unknown history. Mr. Tozer considers that it belonged to a disciple of Cyril and Methodius, and may probably be connected with the latter. He mentions a third, also probably connected with the Apostle of Bohemia, in the Museum at Prague (see Murray's *Handbook of South Germany*), and another as existing in Crete (see Pashley's *Travels*). These are the only crucifixes he knows of as existing in the Greek Church. The Iconoclastic controversy, he observes, took the same course with the crucifix as with other representations, painted or carved: and when it died away into compromise on the distinction between icons and images, the crucifix was treated as an image. This does not necessarily apply to pictures in MSS.; but the carved form may have been the more easily dislodged in the Iconoclastic controversy of 720, because it had not been long introduced, since it did not exist till the 7th century. "To the keener perception of the Greeks" (says Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vi. 413) "there may have arisen a feeling, that in its more rigid and solid form the Image was nearer to the Idcl. There was a tacit compromise" (after the period of Iconoclasm); "nothing appeared but painting, mosaics, engravings on cup and chalice" (this of course accounts for works like the Cross of Velletri, the Diptych of

Rambona, and others), "and embroidery on vestments. The renunciation of sculpture grew to a rigid passionate aversion . . . as of a Jew or Mohammedan." There can be no doubt that the first step in a progress which has frequently ended in idolatry was made in the Quinisext Council, or that in Trullo, at Constantinople in 691. It is the challenge to Iconoclasm. It decrees (can. 82) that, as the antitype is better than type or symbol in all representation, the literal representation of the Lord shall take the place of the symbolic Lamb on all emblems of His sacrifice, and ordains thus: *Τὸν τοῦ αἵροντος τὴν ἁμαρτίαν κόσμου Ἀμνοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, κατὰ τὸν ἀνθρώπινον χαρακτῆρα καὶ ἐν τοῖς εἰκόσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀντὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἁμνοῦ ἀναστηλοῦσθαι ὀρίζομεν.*<sup>d</sup> [Compare AGNUS DEI.]

A very early crucifix of the 6th century seems to be mentioned in the following passage, which is produced by Binterim (*Denkwürdigk.* iv. part i. 48) without reference, but which he may have seen in some unpublished record. He is speaking of the church of Hoya in the bishopric of Liege, destroyed by the Huns in the 4th century, and restored A.D. 512, at the time of the first synod of Orleans. This church "a suis civibus reedificatur, et in longum versus Orientem extenditur usque ad gradus Chori sub crucifixo, altari tamen antiquo semper remanente," &c. Further, he quotes Aegidius as stating that Robert, Provost of Liege, "sub crucifixo sepulchrum accepit." This only proves the existence of crucifixes at the time of the writers, especially as the original altar is spoken of as remaining, without mention of cross or crucifix, at the end of the choir which contained it. Had the name or date of the author of the passage quoted been known, it would have been of great importance; but it may be, and its Latin might indicate that it is, from some late chronicler, familiar with the appearance of the church, and using the words as meaning no more than "under the present crucifix, or rood above the altar-screen." Dr. Binterim finds no argument on it as to the date of the German change from cross to crucifix, and the passage may be let pass. The "Santo Volto," "Vultus de Luca," or Crucifix of Lucca (corrupted by William Rufus, for imprecatory purposes, into the "Face of St. Luke"), is carved in cedar-wood, and is attributed to Nicodemus, and supposed to have been conveyed miraculously to Lucca in 782. It is said to be of the 6th century, and is certainly one of the earliest crucifixes in existence. It bears the Lord crowned as king, and vested in a long pontifical robe as priest, and thus combines symbolic treatment with realism, perhaps in the way afterwards intended by the Council in Trullo. The idea is that of the Crucified King of Men, and the work is an assertion of the combined deity and humanity, and of the submission to death of the Lord of humanity. A crucifix greatly resembling this was found during some operations at Christchurch, Oxford, and is now preserved in the Bodleian: it was probably an outer ornament of some Evangelium. We understand M. St. Laurent to consider these

<sup>d</sup> The author of this paper can remember no representation of the Crucifixion as existing either at the Convent of Mount Sinai or that of Mar Saba.



examples to date from the 12th century (*Iconographie de la Croix et des Crucifixes*; Didron's *Annales Archeologiques*, t. xxii, pp. 5, 137, 213, 357, and t. xxiii, pp. 5, 174, a most valuable and exhaustive summary of our whole subject, admirably illustrated).

The steps of the progress from symbolic to literal representation will be noticed immediately; but two more Crucifixions of great and undoubted antiquity (the first having a claim to be considered the most ancient in existence) remain to be briefly noticed. Both confirm to a certain extent the remark insisted on or suggested by many Roman Catholic writers, that the private use of the crucifix in devotion dates from very early times. The first is the famous Syriac Evangelarium in the Medicean Library at Florence, widely known for the probably unique detail of the soldiers, not casting dice, but playing at the world-old game of "Mora" on their fingers, for the garment without seam. It is represented in Assemani's *Catalogus Bibl. Medic. Florentine*, 1742, tav. xxiii. The whole MS. is one of the most interesting documents in the world; with many illuminations, performed with that indescribable grimness of earnestness which was the root of Eastern asceticism, and which still lingers in the handywork of the stern Arcagnuoli,




Upper half of Crucifixion MS. of Rabula.

or the brothers Orgagna. Assemani calls it "vetustissimus codex qui in eadem bibliotheca extat," and it is described by Prof. Westwood in his *Palaecographia Sacra*, and dated 586 by its writer, the monk Rabula. It is composed with instinctive skill in two groups, upper and lower. At the top are the sun and moon; one a face, the other a crescent. The upper group, which is semi-circular or rather cyclonidal in its shape, consists of the three crosses, supported on their right by the Virgin Mother and another female figure, on the left by three more women. The soldiers with the spear and the sponge stand on each side next to the central and largest cross. Over the head of the former is the name AOFINOC. The Lord wears the long robe, the thieves have waistcloths, and large drops of blood, in conventional form, are falling from their hands. Four nails are used in each. At the foot of the cross the upper and lower group are joined by the soldiers playing for the coat. In the centre, below the cross, is a Holy Sepulchre (represented in all early Byzantine and Italo- or Gothic-Byzantine work as an upright structure of much the same shape as a sentry's box). It is supported on the left by a woman, the Blessed Virgin, and an angel; on the other by St. John, another apostolic figure in the act of blessing, and other

adoring women. The base of the composition, as it were, is formed by a group of soldiers, overthrown by the stroke of visible substantial rays from the sepulchre; the stone also lies on the left. The designer seems to have thought much of the fact of its being rolled away, and he has accordingly drawn it as a disk like a grindstone. Grotesque and archaic as it is, this work is composed exactly like Orgagna's or Michael Angelo's "Last Judgment," Titian's "Assumption," or Raffaele's "Transfiguration"—i. e., of two great upper and lower groups, tied together and supported on both sides; nor could any work better illustrate the lingering of Byzantine tradition in sacred subjects. A full description is given by Professor Westwood in his *Palaecographia Sacra*, also by Dom Guéranger, *Inst. Liturgiques*, vol. iii. app.

Of the four Crucifixions given by Gori in vol.



Diptych of Rumbona.

lii. of his *Thesaurus Diptychorum* (pp. 116, 128, 203, 216), that at p. 203, called the "Diptych of Rumbona in Picenum," is the most ancient and extraordinary. It contains a medallion of the First Person of the Trinity above, with the sun and moon below on the right and left of the cross, personified as figures bearing torches. There are two titles, EGO SUM IHS NAZARENUS in rude Roman letters, with a smaller label, REX JU-

DEORUM, over the cross. The nimbus is cruciform, the waistcloth reaches almost to the knees, the navel is strangely formed into an eye. The Virgin and St. John stand under the arms of the cross. But the distinguishing detail is the addition of the Roman wolf and twins below the cross, with the words ROMVLVS ET REMVLVS A LVPA NUTRITI. This wonderful ivory is now in the Vatican Museum (see Murray's *Handbook*), and is in the most ancient style of what may be called dark-age Byzantine art, when all instruction and sense of beauty are departed, but so vigorous a sense of the reality of the fact remains, as to render the work highly impressive—as also in the Medici MS.

Professor Westwood (*Pal. Sac.* pl. 18) enables us to refer to a Crucifixion found in an Irish MS. written about 800. It is in the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge, and is partly copied from the *Palaeographia* by Mr. Ruskin (in *The Two Paths*, p. 27), who selects one of the angels above the cross as a specimen of absolutely dead and degraded art. This is perfectly correct, and the work is a painful object of contemplation, as it displays the idiocy of a contemptible person instructed in a decaying style, rather than the roughness of a barbarian workman like the carver of the diptych. The absurd interlacings and use of dots, the sharpening of fingers into points, and the treatment of the subject entirely as a matter of penmanship, without either devotional sense or its importance or artistic effort to realize it, make the MS. most disagreeably interesting as far as this miniature is concerned.

The plea or hypothesis of Roman Catholic writers, that actual images of the crucified body



of the Lord may have been used in the very earliest times for private devotion, is open to the obvious remark that none of them can be produced, whereas symbolical memorials of the Crucifixion are found in regular succession, both mural and in portable forms. Father Martigny argues that the notorious Graffito of the Palace of the Caesars may be a caricatured copy of some undiscovered crucifix used for Christian worship. Father Garrucci's description of it, "Il Crocifisso Graffito in casa dei Cesari," is given by Canon Liddon in his 7th *Bampton Lecture* (p. 397); and the remarks which accompany it are most important, as they show "the more intelligent and

bitter hostility of Paganism to the Church since the apostolic martyrdoms a century and a half before, when converts had also been made in Caesar's household." He shows also, incidentally, that it can hardly have been derived from any Christian emblem, as the ass's head connects it evidently with the Gnostic invective, which attributed to the Jews the worship of an ass. This Tacitus mentions (*Hist.* v. c. 4); and Tertullian (*Apolog.* 16) notices Tacitus' confusion between Jews and Christians, and appeals to his own account of the examination of the Jewish temple by Pompey, who found "no image" in the temple. For proof of the confusion of the early Christians with the Jews by the pagan world, Dr. Liddon refers to Dr. Pusey's note on the above passage in Tertullian, in the *Oxford Library of the Fathers*.

The relics of the treasury of the Cathedral of Monza, closely described and partly represented in woodcut by M. Martigny, are valuable examples of the transition between symbolic and actual representation of the Crucifixion. One of the ampullae for sacred oil is said to have been presented by Gregory the Great to Theodelinda, wife of Antharis king of Lombardy, probably some time soon after 590, about a hundred years before the Council in Trullo. It is circular, and the head of the Lord, with a cruciform nimbus, is placed at the top. Below, to right and left, are the two thieves, with extended arms, but without crosses; and below them two figures are kneeling by a cross which seems to be budding into leaves. Two saints or angels are on the extreme right and left, and the usual Holy Sepulchre below, with an angel watching it on the right in the act of benediction, while St. John and St. Mary Magdalene are (apparently) approaching it on the other side. Another vessel bears a figure of the Lord, clothed with a long robe, with the nimbus and extended arms, but without the cross. Finally, the reliquary of Theodelinda, so called, has the crucified Form, with the nimbus and inscription IC XC, clothed in the long tunic, with the soldiers, two figures apparently mocking Him, and the Virgin and St. John on the right and left. The clothed figure indicates symbolical treatment, since it must have been well known that the Roman custom was to crucify naked; and Martigny argues that the Graffito, which is clothed, must therefore have been copied from some Christian picture. But from this time, or from that of the Council of 691, the artistic or ornamental treatment begins. The earliest Crucifixions are narrative, not dramatic; the Resurrection being so frequently introduced into the same composition, as if without it the subject would be altogether too painful for Christian eyes. And, indeed, till the first efforts of Pisan sculpture and Florentine painting, the importance of the event represented withdrew all attention to the personality of the artist. In works of after days the painter's power is all. Their range of excellence is as wide as the difference between the tender asceticism of Fra Angelico, and the mighty sorrow of Michael Angelo, and the intense power, knowledge, and passion of the great canvass of Tintoret in the Scuola di San Rocco at Venice. The treatment of this picture resembles that of the most ancient works. All its consummate science is directed to bringing every detail of the scene into a great unity, while

attention is expressly withdrawn from the face of the Lord, which is cast into deep shadow. (See Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, vol. ii.) In all ancient work the Lord's face is abstracted and expressionless: any attempt to represent bodily pain belongs to modern work of the baser sort, which forms no part of our present subject.

For the details and accessories of the Crucifixion, whether things or persons, they have been for the most part enumerated and described. The nails are always four in number in ancient works, two for the feet and two for the hands. The crossed legs and single large nail or spike belong to the artistic period. Martigny refers to St. Cyprian (*De Passion. Dni.* inter Opusc. p. 83, ed. Oxon.) as speaking of the nails which pierced our Lord's feet in the plural number. St. Cyprian, he says, had seen the punishment of the cross. The *suppedaneum* or rest for the feet occurs in the crosses of Leo III. and of Velletri, not in the Diptych of Rambona. The Graffito indicates its presence. It seems to have been occasionally left out, in deference to those passages in Holy Scripture which allude to the disgrace or curse attaching to one "hanging" on the tree. The title of the cross, which is given with slight differences in St. Matt. xxvii. 37, Mark xv. 26, Luke xxiii. 38, John xix. 9, varies greatly in different representations. It is omitted in the crosses of Lucca and Velletri. Early Greek painters reduce it to the name of Christ, IC XC, or substitute the A and ω. The sign ΦC (φως) occurs, as well as LVX MVNDI, frequently accompanied by the symbols of the sun and the moon, as a red star or face and crescent, or in the Rambona ivory [see page 515] as mourning figures bearing torches. They are introduced as emblematic of the homage of all nature, or in remembrance of the eclipse of the Crucifixion.

The Blessed Virgin and St. John appear in the Medicean MS., and very frequently in ancient works; the soldiers rather less so, though they occur in the above MS. and the reliquary of Monza. The typical figure of the first Adam rising from the earth as a symbol of the resurrection of the body, with the Hand of Blessing above indicating the presence of God, is given in Ciampini (*De Sacr. Aedif.* tab. xxiii. p. 75). The skull, whether human or that of a lamb, placed at the foot of the cross, either as an emblem of sacrifice or in reference to the place Golgotha, is of late use, and is almost the only late addition of symbolic detail.

The rare addition of the soldiers casting lots is said to be found in an ivory of the 8th century from Cividule in Friuli (Mozzoni, *Tavole crono-*

*logiche della Chiesa universale*, Venezia, 1856-63). The only other representation of it is in the Medici MS. The wolf and twins are in the Rambona diptych alone. The types of the four Evangelists are on the back of the Cross of Velletri, in the Gospel of Egbert, of Trier, *infra*, and on numerous crosses of later date. Some additional inscriptions have been mentioned, as well as the addition (in the Vatican Cross) of medallion portraits. Considerable liberty in this matter seems to have been allowed in the earliest times, as is indicated by Constantine's introduction of the words of his Vision; and still more strongly in an instance referred to by Borgia, in Anastasius (tom. i. n. 2, ed. Vignolii), of a cross given by Belisarius to St. Peter—"per manus Vigilii Papae"—of gold and jewels, weighing 100 lbs., "in qua scripsit victorias suas."

But even the Vatican Cross yields in interest to two German relics of the same character, lately described and well illustrated in No. 45 of the *Jahrbucher des Vereins von Alterthumsfreunden im Rheinlande*, p. 195, Bonn, 1868. The first of these is the Station-Cross of Mainz. It is of gilded bronze, of the Western form (*Commissa*), and rather more than one foot in height. Herr Heinrich Otte refers it to the end of the 12th century, a date far beyond our period. But its interest is paramount, more particularly from the evident intention of the designer to make it embody a whole system of typical instruction, and to leave it behind him as a kind of sculptured document, or commentary, connecting the Old and New Testaments. Thus, at the middle or intersection of the arms of the cross, the Lamb is represented in a medallion, his head surrounded with a plain nimbus. On the back of the cross in the same place there is a square plate, with an engraved representation of Abraham offering up Isaac, the angel, and the ram. Round the latter is the beginning of a hexameter line—† Cui patriarcha suum—which is completed round the medallion of the Lamb in front, thus: † Pater offert in cruce natum. In like manner, four engravings on each side at the extremities of the cross refer to each other, and are described by corresponding halves of hexameters. The New Testament subjects are all in front, with the Lamb in the centre, as antitypes: the Old Testament or typical events or persons are at the back. Thus on the spectator's left at the back of the cross is an engraving of Moses receiving the Tables of the Law on Mount Sinai, with the words *Qui Moysi legem*. Corresponding to it on the right front is the Descent of the Holy Spirit, with *dat alumnis Pneumatis ignem*. The remainder as under—

Head.		Motto.	
Back . . . . .	Elijah carried up to heaven.	† Qui levat Eliam	
Front . . . . .	The Ascension.	† propriam sublimat usiam (ὀψίαν).	
Back (right hand of spectator) .	Samson and gates of Gaza.	† Que portas Gaze	
Front (left ditto) . . . . .	The descent into Hades.	† vis aufert claustra Jebene.	
Foot.			
Back . . . . .	Jonah and the whale.	† Qua redit absumptus	
Front . . . . .	Resurrection.	† surgit virtute sepultus.	

The decorative scrollwork is rather sparingly disposed with great judgment, and on the spike, ferule, or metal strap probably intended for fixing the cross on a staff for processional or other purposes [see CROSS, DRACONARIUS] is an engraving of the probable designer and donor,

THEODERIC ABBAS. The graphic power and exceeding quaintness of the Scriptural engravings is that of the finest miniatures of the 12th or 13th century.

The second of these most interesting works, inferior as a work of art from its barbaric wild-

ness and the preference for ugliness so often observed in Northern-Gothic grotesque, is of even greater interest as a transitional cross, especially when viewed in relation to the changes enforced by the decree of the Council in Trullo, A.D. 691. This is the Station-Cross of Planig, near Kreuznach; of the same size and form as that of Mainz, but referred by Otte to the 10th century. The ancient symbol of the Lamb is preserved on the back of this crucifix, which displays the human form in front, as in many other Romanesque crosses of bronzed copper. On this combination—perhaps a compromise between the feeling of the older times and the more modern spirit of the Quinisextine Council—Otte quotes Durandus, *Rationale*, lib. i. c. 3, n. 6: "Non enim agnus Dei in cruce principaliter depingi debet; sed homine depicto, non obest agnum in parte inferiori vel posteriori depingere." He also gives the express words of Adrian I., in his letter to Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in 785: "Verum igitur agnum Dominum nostrum J. C. secundum imaginem humanam a modo etiam in imaginibus pro veteri agno depingi jubemus." (*De Consecr. Dist. iii. c. 29*; see Labbe, vi. 1177.) He refers also to the splendid work on Rhenish antiquities called *Kunstdenkmäler des christlichen Mittelalters*, by Ernst aus'm Werth, Leipzig (Weigel), 1857, taf. xxiv.–vi., for the Essen and other roods, which much resemble those of Kreuznach and Mainz, combining the Lamb with the human form, and adding personifications of the sun and moon which remind us of the Diptych of Rambona, and the symbols of the four Evangelists, as in the Crucifix of Velletri. Space forbids us to give accounts of these most interesting relics, but the subject appears to be treated with exhaustive fulness and illustrated to perfection in the two German works referred to. The Planig-on-Nahe rood, however, is entitled to a briefly-detailed description. In front is the crucified form, severely archaic in treatment; the long hair is carefully parted and carried back; the head is without nimbus; and the limbs are long, stiff, and wasted, the ribs being displayed, as is so commonly done in mediaeval crucifixes, to complete the illustration of the text, "They pierced my hands and my feet: I may tell all my bones." A triple serpentine stream of blood runs from each hand, and also from the feet, being there received in a cup or chalice, the foot of which is a grotesque lion's head. The back of the cross bears on its centre the Lamb with cruciform nimbus; below it a medallion of the donor, "Ruthardus Custos;" and four other bas-reliefs, now wanting, occupied the four extremities of the arms, and almost certainly represented the four Evangelists. As in the Diptych of Rambona, the navel resembles an eye. Scarcely inferior to these is the 10th century miniature of a single crucifix with the title IHS NAZAREN REX IUDEORUM, and the sun and moon above the cross-beam, within circles, and represented with expressions of horror,—seated in chariots, one drawn by horses, the other by oxen. And it is impossible to omit the Crucifixion picture from the Gospel of Bishop Egbert of Trier, 975–993 (in Mooyer's *Onomasticon Chronographicon, Hierarchia Germanica*, 8vo. Minden, 54), now in the Stadtbibliothek there. Here the Lord is clad in

a long robe to the ankles; the robbers are also clad in tunics so close to the form as to give the appearance of shirts and trousers. Above are the sun and moon, hiding their faces. The cross has a second cross-piece at top, forming a tau above the Western cross. The robbers are on tau-crosses; suspended, but with unpierced hands; the passage in the 22nd Psalm being referred to the Redeemer alone. Their names, Desmas the penitent, and Cesmas the obdurate, are above their heads. The Virgin-Mother and another woman stand on the right of the cross. St. John on the left. The soldier "Stephaton" is presenting the sponge of vinegar: \* two others are casting lots below. This detail reminds us of the great Florentine miniature of the monk Rabula, excepting that the game of Mora is there substituted for dice.

These works are somewhat beyond our period; yet as a paper on Crucifixes must contain some account of the things whose name it bears, and the first eight centuries supply us with so few examples of what are popularly called crucifixes, a short inroad into early mediaevalism may be allowed. The Iconodulist transition formally made at the Council in Trullo was well suited to the Northern mind, and to the sacramental theory of pain; but it fell in also with that tendency to personification advancing on symbolism, which the Western races inherit, perhaps, from ancient Greece, and which Mr. Ruskin, in his late *Oxford Lectures*, points out as the idolatrous tendency of Greek art. With Cimabue and Giotto, and from their days, artistic skill and power over beauty are brought to bear on the crucifix, as on other Christian representations, for good and for evil. Of the cautious and gradual compromise of the Greek Church we have already spoken. [R. St. J. T.]

#### CRUET. [AMA: AMPULLA.]

**CRYPTA.** In the well-known passage of St. Jerome in which he describes the Sunday visits he and his schoolfellows at Rome paid to the graves of the apostles and martyrs, he uses the term *cryptae* to designate what we now call the *catacombs*. "Dum essem Romae puer . . . solebam . . . diebus Dominicis sepulchra apostolorum et martyrum circumire, crebroque *cryptas* ingredi quae in terra profunda defossae ex utraque parte ingredientium per parietes habent corpora sepulchrorum." Hieron. in *Ezech.* c. xl. We find the word again used metaphorically in Jerome's preface to Daniel, "Cum et quasi *per cryptam ambulans* rarum desuper lumen aspicerem." The word is employed in the same specific sense by Prudentius, *Peristeph. Hymn. ii.*—

"Hand procul extremo culta ad pomeria valla  
Mersa latebrosis *crypta* latet foveis.  
Hujus in occultum gradibus via prona reflexis  
Ire per anfractus luce latente docet."

The classical use of *crypta* for an underground passage or chamber, whether the drain of a *cloua*, or a subterranean arcade, or a storehouse for fruit or corn, or a tunnel, such as that of Pausilipo at Naples, shews the appropriateness of the term. (See for examples Facciolati, *Lexicon*.) *Crypta*

\* "Longinus" is always the lance-bearer. See *Medici* (Laurentian) Crucifix, *supra*.



seems to have been sometimes used in Christian times as synonymous with *coemeterium*. Thus we have in the church of St. Prassede an inscription commemorating the translation thither from the catacombs of the relics of more than two thousand saints, in which occur the words "in coemeteriis seu cryptis." We may, however, mark this distinction between the two words that *coemeterium* is a word of wider signification, including open-air burial-grounds, while *crypta* is strictly limited to those excavated beneath the surface of the ground. Padre Marchi, after an elaborate investigation of the inscriptions in which the word *crypta* occurs, endeavours to demonstrate that it was employed to indicate a limited portion of a subterranean cemetery, including several burial chapels or *ambula*, so that the relation of the *cubiculum* to the *crypta*, and again of the *crypta* to the *coemeterium*, was that of a part to the whole. (*Museo storico primitivo*, pp. 156 sq., 188 sq.) His chief authority for this conclusion is a passage of Anastasius, *Vita S. Marcellini*, § 30, which appears to draw this distinction between the *cubiculum* in which the body of Pope Marcellinus was buried, and the *crypta* of which it formed part. There are also inscriptions which support Marchi's view that a *crypta* was a smaller division of a *coemeterium*. One from that of Priscilla records that Gregory lies "in the eleventh crypt," "in undecima crypta Gregorius." Others speak of "new crypts" constructed in a cemetery; e.g. an inscription now in the Vatican "in cimiterium Balbianae in crypta nova;" one from St. Cyriacus given by Boldetti, "in crypta nova retro sanctus." But Mich. Stef. de Roma has shown satisfactorily, *Rom. Mitt.* i. 23 sq. that Marchi presses the supposed distinction too far, and that it is very far from holding good generally. The truth is that *crypta* was a word of general meaning, and embraced every kind of subterranean excavation, whether smaller or more extensive.

We sometimes meet with the expressions *cryptas arenarum*, or *cryptas arenarias*, in connection with the interment of Christian martyrs. *Roma, Rom. Mitt.* pp. 192, 194, 481, 300, &c. These would seem to indicate the galleries of a deserted *posolana* pit, as places of sepulture. But it has been shown in the article CATACOMBS that, though the subterranean cemeteries very frequently had a close connection with these quarries, and were approached through their adits, the *ambula* themselves were seldom or never used for interment, for which indeed they were unfit without very extensive alteration and adaptation. The passages referred to, which are chiefly found in the not very trustworthy "Acts of the Martyrs," have probably originated in a confusion between the catacombs themselves and the quarries with which they were often so closely connected. [K. V.]

OTTEIPHON ON THE TIGRIS (Council of), A.D. 424, under Taballaha, abp. of Seleucia, on the opposite bank of the river, where the Nicene faith was received, and with it the canon to which the council of the east of the church westwards had been given (Mansi iv. 441-2). [E. S. F.]

CUBICULUM. In addition to the use of this word to designate the family grave chambers in

the subterranean cemetery at Rome (for which see CATACOMBS, p. 310), we find it employed to denote what we should now call the side chapels of the nave of a church. The first instance of its use in this sense is in the writings of Paulinus of Nola. Writing to his friend Severus, Ep. xxiii. § 12, he describes the church recently erected at Nola, and particularizes these side chapels, which were evidently novel features in church arrangement. There were four on each side of the nave, beyond the side aisles (*porticus*), with two verses inscribed over the entrance. Their object was to furnish places of retirement for those who desired to pray or meditate on the word of God, and for the sepulchral memorials of the departed. The passage is: "Cubicula intra porticus quater longis basilicis lateribus inserta, secretis orationum, vel in lege Domini meditationum, praeter memoriam religiosorum ac familiarium accommodatas ad pacis aeternae requiem locos praebent, omne cubiculum bis per liminum frontes versibus praenotatur." They differed from the side chapels of later ages in containing no altars, as originally there was but one altar in a church. (Remondini, tom. i. p. 412.) Paulinus also speaks of these chapels under the name of *cellae* or *cellulae*, e.g. when speaking of a thief who had concealed himself in one of them all night, he says:

"Ocellis de multis, quae per latera undique magnis, Appositis lectis iunctis omnes apudcellis  
Hospitum."—*Poetae*, xlv. v. 478 sq.

*Cubicula* is also of frequent occurrence in the *Leber Pontificatus* of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, as synonymous with *oratoria*. In the description of various *oratoria* erected by Symmachus A.D. 490-514, we find, § 79, "quae cubicula omnia a fundamento perfecta construxit." Of Sergius, A.D. 687-701, we read, § 163, that he repaired the decayed chapels around St. Peter's. "Hic tectum et cubicula quae circumquaque ejusdem basilicae quae per longa temporum stillicidia et rudibus fuerant durioribus studiosius innovavit et reparavit." And it is recorded of Leo III. A.D. 795, that he also rebuilt the ruinous *cubicula* attached to the same basilica (§ 412). Perhaps the earliest existing example is Rome of such a chapel attached to the body of a church is that of St. Zeno in the church of St. Prassede, built by Pope Paschal I. about A.D. 817. In an early description of the basilica of San Lorenzo fuori le Mura, given by De Rossi, *Bullett. di Arch. Crist. Giugno*, 1864, p. 42, from a MS. in the Vienna Library, we find the word used in a similar sense: "Est parvum cubiculum in porticu ad occidentem ubi parant Hieronymus martyri." Paulinus also describes *cubicula* or *cellae* of this nature in the porticoes of the atrium of the church of St. Felix. They were intended for private prayer. The altar of the basilica could be seen from them by means of windows. They were ornamented with scriptural paintings:

"Metanda bonis habitatione domus  
Quae hoc ad sancti Justini Felicis honorum,  
Duxerat simul stadium non cura libellat."  
*Poetae*, xvi. v. 306 sq.

The last words quoted have reference to the custom, the abuse of which, degenerating into gross license, is severely laighed against by Paulinus, of holding *saetae* in the *cubicula*. Cf. Paulin. *Poetae* xvi. *De Felicio Natal.* ix. v. 341.

The word *elafroz* was used 'a Greek in the same sense. We have an example in a letter of Nilus to Olympiodorus the prefect, relating to the church he had built, *ἐν τῇ τοῦ αἵου καλλίστου καὶ εὐσεβεῖς ἐλαιοῦς θεολογικῶν ἀρχιερέων, ἱερέων καὶ κληρικών τῆς ἐκκλησίας*.

From the use of *cubiculum* as a chapel, *cubicularii* came to be employed in the sense of *chaplains*. "Hic [Leo I.] constituit et addidit supra sepulchra apostolorum ex clero Romano custodes qui dicuntur *cubicularii* quos modo dicimus capellanos. *Cubiculum enim idem erat apud antiquos quod hodie apud nos capella*." *Chiconius, Vit. et Gest. Pont. Roman. i. p. 307.*

[E. V.]

**CUCUFAS**, martyr at Barcelona, July 25 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

**CUCULLA**, *cuculus*, *cucullio*, is one of the few articles of the monastic dress specified by the founder of the Benedictines (*Reg. c. 55*); and has commonly been considered the badge of monks, e.g. in the old proverb, "*cuculla non facit monachum*." Benedict ordered the "*cuculla*," or hood, to be shaggy for winter, and for summer of lighter texture (*cf. Conc. Reg. c. 62*); and a "*scapulare*" to be worn instead out of doors, as more suitable for field-work, being open at the sides. The "*cuculla*" protected the head and shoulders, and, as being worn by infants and penitents, was said to symbolize humility; or, by another account, it was to keep the eyes from glancing right or left (*Can. Inst. i. 5*; *Sosom. Hist. Eccl. iii. 13, 14*). It was part of the dress of nuns, as well as of monks (*Pallad. Hist. Laus. 41*), and was worn by the monks of Tabenna at the mass (*Pall. H. L. 36*). If, as the words seem to say, it was their only clothing on that occasion, it must of course have been longer than a hood or cape. Indeed, "*cuculla*" is often taken as equivalent to "*casula*" (from "*can*"), a covering of the whole person; in later writers it means, not the hood only ("*cucullus*"), but the monastic robe, hood and all ("*vestis cucullata*," *Reg. Comm. S. Bened. c. 55*, *cf. Mab. Ann. v. 17*). These same monks of Tabenna or Pachomiani, like the Carthusians, drew their hoods forwards at meal times, so as to hide their faces from one another (*Pall. 48*; *Ruff. Vit. Mon. 3*). The "*cappa*" (probably akin to our "*cape*"), in Italy seems to correspond with the Gallic "*cuculla*," and both were nearly identical, it is thought, with the "*melotes*" or *shepkins* of the earliest ascetics (*Can. Inst. i. 6*; *Pall. Hist. Laus. 28*); and so with the "*pera*" (or "*psula*," according to *Al. Gazaeus, ad loc. citat.*), the "*pellis caprina dependens ab humeris ad lumbos*" (*Isidor. Orig. xii. 21*, *sp. Reg. Comm. S. Bened.*). Of course it is difficult to identify precisely the technical names for dress in various countries, and in a remote period. [I. G. S.]

**CUCUMELLUM**. A vessel mentioned among those which Paul, bishop of Ciria, delivered up to Felix (Baronius, *Annales*, an. 303, c. 12). This cucumellum was of silver, and was probably a chalice or flagon for use on the altar. Compare *AMA*. (Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v.) [C.]

**CULDEES**. [COLIDEI.]

**CUNIBERT**, bishop, deposition at Cologne (about A.D. 645), Nov. 12 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

**CUP**. [CHALICE: COMMUNION: GLASS: CHRISTIAN.]

**CUPELLA**, a small *domus* or sepulchral recess. At present we have only one instance of its use to adduce, which is given by Marchi (*Monumenti Primit. p. 114*). The inscription in which it is found records the burial of her two children, Secundina and Laurentina, by their mother Secunda. The colicisms in grammar and orthography with which it is full show that Secunda was a person of humble rank. The stone is preserved in the Museum Kircherianum. The inscription is as follows:—"Ego Secunda feci cupella bone | memorie filium meum Secun | dinam que recondit in fidem | cum fratre eum Laureu | tium in pace recondendum." *Cupella* is evidently the diminutive of *cupa*, explained by Du Cange to mean *urna*, *eros sepulchralis*. This sense is a derivative one from its classical meaning of a *large cast, butt, or vat* (*Caes. Bell. Civ. c. 11*; *Lucan. lib. iv. v. 420*; *Varro apud Non. c. ii. No. 115*). It appears in pagan inscriptions but rarely: e.g., "D. Apuleius Ionicus fecit Eutychiae sorori suae et Eutycheti filio ejus. In hac cupa mater et filius positi sunt" (*Grüter, Inscr. p. 845, No. 15*); "D. M. Otus Publicus Polytlus Tator Titi Flavi A[ugust]i papilli sui Matri | Sextae Fortunatae defu | actae locum sinit, marmu | culavit cupum adificavit de bonis ejus omnia communat." (*Dani class. 11, No. 6*). The use of the word survived till later times, and Du Cange quotes from a monkish writer "in alla *cubo* iuxta orientem sepulchrum S. Victoriae, &c." The idea has been propounded by the Rev. J. W. Burgon (*Letters from Rome*, p. 306), that we may find in *cupella*, as a place of Christian burial, the etymology of the word *capella*, *chapel*, which has so long perplexed philologists, and of which no satisfactory derivation has ever yet been discovered. The architectural term *cupola* is another form of the same root. [E. V.]

**CURCODEMUS**, dancer, martyr at Auxerre, May 4 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

**CURIA ROMANA**. [APPEAL: COUNCIL.]

**CURSE**. [ANATHEMA: EXCOMMUNICATION.]

**CURSUALES EQUI**, post-horses, i.e. horses belonging to the *curra* publicus, called also for shortness *curvus*, Gr. *ῥέμνος*. The Roman posting or postal system—the distinction between the two belongs to a late stage of civilization—was established by Augustus. According to the "Secret History" of Procopius (c. 30), the day's journey consisted of eight posta, sometimes fewer, but never less than five. Each stable had 40 horses, and as many stablemen or stabularii (who seem elsewhere to be called *hippocomi*, *Code*, bk. xii. T. ii. l. 13). Bingham gives a quite incorrect idea of the system in describing the *curiales equi* as being simply impressed for the army and exchequer. A constitution of the Emperor Constantine, A.D. 336, expressly enacts that no one but the Prefect has the right to go by any other road than that which has a "*curvus*," shewing that no mere occasional impressment is meant (sed nec per aliam viam suadi quicquam habet facultatem, nisi per quam *curvus publicus stare dignoscitur*; *Code*, bk. xii. T. ii. l. 2). But Bingham, with his almost habitual inaccuracy, seems to have com-

founded the *cursus publicus* with the *evectio* or right of gratuitously using it, which was confined to officials, to envoys, and under certain circumstances to senators (Code, *u.s.*, l. 6, and see also ll. 11, 16), and which did in such case resemble a right of impressment, though the true equivalent for impressment seems to be found in the *angariae* or *parangariae*. The cost of providing both the horses and fodder for them was supplied by the State, *i.e.* as it appears, by the provinces (the duty being deemed one which belonged to the land and not to the person, Code, bk. x. l. 4, law of Valerian and Gallienus), but it would seem that they were not bound to maintain post-carriages (*paravereda*) or horses for them, since a law of Arcadius and Honorius, A.D. 403, enjoins the rectors of the provinces to see that the curials or provincials were not compelled to provide animals which they did not owe to the post (*ib.* l. 19). Through the roguery of the officers employed the cost of fodder was, it seems, often exaggerated, whilst the animals were starved. (Code, *u.s.* l. 18; constitution of Arcadius and Honorius, A.D. 400, and see also ll. 2, 7, 19.) By way of compensation, the stable manure was left to the provinces (l. 7, of Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian). The sale of the public horses was forbidden (l. 10); those who used more horses than they were entitled to had to pay, according to circumstances, four times the price of the horses, or a pound of gold for each (ll. 15, 20). A curious constitution of the Emperor Constantine, A.D. 316, which is to be found at length in the Theodosian Code, bk. viii. T. v. l. 66, but of which only a brief extract remains in that of Justinian (bk. xii. T. li. l. 1)—anticipating the labours of “the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty towards Animals”—enacts that “Forasmuch as many with knotted and very thick sticks (*nodosis et validissimis fustibus*) at the very outset of a stage compel the public animals to exhaust whatever strength they have, *placet* that none in driving should use a stick but either a rod or a whip, with a short goad (*aculeus*) infixed to the point, which may admonish their idle limbs with a harmless tickle (*innocuo titillo*), without exacting what their strength cannot compass”—the punishment varying from loss of rank to exile according to the original Constitution; but the extract in Justinian’s Code simply threatens punishment generally (*poena non defutura*).

It seems to be considered that the clergy were exempt from the obligation to pay tax for the horses of the *cursus*, under their general exemption from *sordida munera*, extraordinary charges, the “*parangarian* prestation,” or the *translatio*, or obligation to carry goods (see Code, bk. iv. T. iii. l. 2, of Constantine, A.D. 357; T. ii. l. 5, of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, A.D. 412; Nov. 131, c. 5). It seems, however, difficult to identify the ordinary contribution for the *cursus publicus* with one of these. The opinion has probably arisen from confounding it with the liability to the “*parangaria praestatio*,” which, as above intimated, seems rather to relate to occasional impressment. Certain it is that as one of the duties belonging to the land, which were to be borne by all (*munera, quae patrimonii publicae utilitatis gratia indicuntur, ab omnibus subeunda sunt*, Code, bk. x. t. xli. l. 1, of Antonine) it does not seem by its nature to have been one from which the clergy would be exempt, and

we have proof from the story of St. Augustine having declined to accept for the Church an estate charged with the patrimonial *munus* termed the “*navicularian*,” *i.e.* that relating to the transport of corn from Africa, lest the Church should have to undertake such a duty, that no ecclesiastical immunity obtained in a precisely similar case (the Digest classes together as patrimonial *munera* those “*rei vehicularis, item navicularis*,” bk. l. T. iv. l. 1). [J. M. L.]

**CURSOR.** (1) In the days when it was dangerous for Christians to make known publicly the times and places of their assemblies, the faithful were frequently summoned by a messenger going from house to house, who was called *cursor* or *praeco*. To this custom Tertullian seems to allude when (*De Fuga in Persecutione*, c. 14) he says, speaking of the difficulty of holding assemblies, “*Non potes discurrere per singulos?*” An epitaph published by Brower, *URSACIUS CURSOR DOMINICUS* (*Annal. Trevirens.* i. 53), is generally referred to an official of this kind; but this Ursacius may have been an ordinary letter-carrier of the church. (See Ducange, *s. v.* *Cursor*.) Assemblies seem to have been, at least in some instances, announced in this way in the 4th century; for Jerome, writing to Eustochium (*Epist.* 22), speaks of a *praeco* giving notice of the Agape; and Eusebius of Alexandria (quoted by Binterim, *Denkwürd.* iv. 1, 281) speaks of the unreadiness of many to go to church when the herald called.

(2) An official to whom was specially committed the task of circulating letters of popes or other bishops; see Baronius, *Annales*, an. 58, § 102. “*Romae adhuc durant Papae cursores, qui deferunt ejus ordines ac pontificias bullas publicant.*” (*Macri Hieroglyphicon*, *s. v.* *Cursor*.) [C.]

**CURSUS.** The divine office, or series of prayers, psalms, hymns, and versicles said daily by the clergy in churches. For instance, the seventh canon of the council of Chelsea [*Calcut.*] is, “*Ut omnes ecclesiae publice canonicis horis cursum suum cum reverentia habeant*” (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 451). See HOURS OF PRAYER; OFFICE, THE DIVINE. [C.]

**CURTAIN** (*cortina, aulaeum, velum, βῆλον, παραπέτασμα, καταπέτασμα, ἀμφίθυρον*). Curtains were used in ancient churches for the following purposes. 1. To hang over the outer doorway of the church. 2. To close the doorway between the nave of the church and the sanctuary, or perhaps rather to fill the open panels or CANCELLI of the door, during the time of the consecration of the Eucharist. 3. To fill the space between the pillars of the ciborium, or canopy of the altar. 4. Curtains were also used in baptisteries.

1. The Paschal Chronicle (p. 294) mentions curtains embroidered with gold, for the doors, in enumerating the gifts of Constantine to the church at Constantinople. St. Jerome (*Epitaph. Nepot. Epist. ad Heliud.*) praises the priest Nepotianus for the care with which he provided curtains for the doors of his church: “*Erat sollicitus . . . si vela semper in ostiis.*” We find again indications of this custom in Epiphanius; and Paulinus of Nola tells us (*Poem.* xviii. 30) that those surpassed him in magnificence who offered rich curtains (*vela foribus*) for the doors, brilliant in the purity of linen, or ornamented

with coloured patterns woven into their substance. He is yet more precise in speaking of his own church of St. Felix at Nola (*Poen. xiv. 98*), where he says, "the golden doorways are ornamented with curtains white as snow." Such curtains were suspended by iron or bronze rings, the remains of which are still to be discovered in some ancient Roman basilicas, for example in those of St. Clement, St. Mary in Cosmedin, St. Laurence, St. George in Velabro, &c. The office of raising these curtains before the priests and other dignified persons was assigned to the inferior clerks (*Concil. Narbon. ann. xlii. A.D. 589*); the subdeacon as well as the acolytes in to raise the door-curtains (*vela ad ostia*) before the elders (*senioribus*). They were sometimes adorned with figures of saints or with crosses, or flowers, arranged in patterns, and with various purple ornaments.

2. It is probable that from the time of Constantine curtains were used to enclose the sanctuary, or to fill the apertures in the rails or grating (*CAENCHILIA*) which surrounded it. Athanasius (*Epist. ad Solid.*, opp. i. 847, ed. Paris, 1827), speaking of an outrage committed by the Arians, says that they carried out and burned the benches, the thrones, the table, and the curtains (*τὰ θύλα*) of the church, where the context certainly suggests that these were the curtains of the sanctuary. Theodoret (*Hist. Eccl.*) tells us that St. Basil invited the Emperor Valens to enter into the enclosure of the sacred curtains where he was himself seated; that is, into the sanctuary of his church, which was enclosed by these curtains. And St. Chrysostom, in a passage containing much information as to the manner of celebrating the eucharist in his time, says, "when the sacrifice is borne forth . . . when thou seest the curtains (*τὰ ἀμφόθρηνα*) drawn back, then think that the sky above us opens, and angels descend" (*In Epist. Rom. 3, § 5, p. 23*). Here the curtains are clearly those which closed the doorway of the sanctuary, which were drawn back after consecration, when the people communicated. Evagrius (*Hist. Eccl. vi. 21*) says that Chosroes, after his victory over Bahram (A.D. 590) sent to Gregory bishop of Antioch, among other presents, "*ἀμφόθρηνα χρυσῶν κακοῦμασιν ἡρώδης*:" that is, according to the most probable interpretation, a curtain of rich Hunnish work for the door of the sanctuary. See Ducange (s.v. *Huanuscu*), who cites the word *Huanuscu* from a letter of Charles the Great to Offa king of Mercia (*Haddan and Stubbs, III. 498*), and believes it to be equivalent to the "Sarmaticum" of Gregory of Tours (*De Vit. Patr. c. 8*). Cyril of Alexandria (*Catech. in Joann. on c. ii. v. 24*) bids the guardians of the divine mysteries not to admit the uninitiated within the sacred curtains (*τὴν ἱερὰν κακοῦμασιν*), nor to permit neophytes to draw near the Holy Table. In this case the curtain or "veil" of the sanctuary is clearly intended; the term itself is adopted from the Jewish Temple. Germanus of Constantinople (*Hist. Eccl. p. 153, ed. Paris, 1560*) says that the curtain symbolized the stone which was rolled to the door of the sepulchre.

3. Curtains were also fixed to the ciborium in such a manner as to surround the Altar (*ALTAR*, p. 65) upon certain occasions. The *lect-arcus*, or acts of four curtains, which are frequently men-

tioned in the *Liber Pontificalis* among the gifts of the popes to certain Roman churches were no doubt intended for this use. See, for instance, the life of Sergius I. (p. 150 B, ed. Muratori), who is said to have given to surround the altar of a church eight *strawels*, four white, four scarlet. Similar presents are attributed by the same authority to Leo III. Some have thought that the *RODAS* presented by various popes to Roman churches were curtains, but this does not seem probable.

4. They were also used in baptisteries, as may be seen in a very ancient mosaic at Ravenna (*Clampini, Vet. Mon. II. plate xxiii.*); and see *BAPTISM*, p. 161.

(Ducange's *Glossaries and Descriptions & Synonymes*; Suicer's *Thesaurus*; Martigny's *Dict. des Antiq. Chret.*) [C.]

**CUSTODES ECCLESIAE.** Either door-keepers, otherwise called *Ostarii*, one of the inferior orders in the ancient Church, or, more probably perhaps, the same officers who are sometimes distinguished as *Seniores Ecclesiarum*, and whose duties corresponded in certain points with those of the modern churchwardens. [see *CHURCHWARDEN*.] Bingham, iii. 13, 2. [D. B.]

**CUSTODES LOCORUM SANCTORUM.** The keepers of the holy places of Palestine, so called because of their relation to our Lord's earthly history: e.g. Bethlehem, Mount Golgotha, the Holy Sepulchre, Mount Olivet. Such an office was probably concluded by the customs which arose among Christians in early times of visiting these places for purposes of piety and devotion; and that the function of these *custodes* was accounted a religious service appears from their having been exempted, by a statute of Theodosius, in the same manner as ecclesiastics generally, from personal tribute, in regard to this their special employment (Bingham, iii. 13, 2). [D. B.]

**CUSTOS AROAE.** A name given to the archdeacon, as having charge of the treasury of the Church, and the care of dispensing the oblations of the people. In this capacity Caecilian was accused by the Donatists of having prohibited the deacons from carrying any provision to the martyrs in prison. And the 4th Council of Carthage (c. 17) directs the bishop not to concern himself personally in the care and government of widows, orphans, and strangers, but to commit the duty to his archpresbyter or archdeacon (Bingham, ii. c. 21). [D. B.]

**CUTHBERT**, presbyter, abbot of Lindisfarne, March 20 (*Mart. Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*); translation to Durham, Sept. 4 (some MSS. of *Mart. Usuardi*). [C.]

**CYCLUS ANNI.** [CALENDAR.]

**CYCLUS PASCHALIS.** [EASTER.]

**CYMBAL.** The word *cymbalum* seems occasionally to be used for a bell, or some concave instrument used instead of a bell. Thus Gregory the Great (*Dialo. i. 9*) speaks of a *cymbalum* being struck by way of passing-bell; and Bernardus (*Retionale*, i. 4, § 2) of monks being called to the refectory by the sound of a *cymbalum* which hung in the cloister. [C.]

**CYPRIANUS.** (1) The famous bishop of Carthage, martyr under Valerian, A.D. 258



Sept. 14 (*Cal. Carth., Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae, Usuardi*); Oct. 2 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Bishop, martyr with Justina, Sept. 26 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr in Africa under Hunneric, Oct. 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*).

(4) Abbat of Perigord, commemorated Dec. 9 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [C.]

CYPRUS (Council of), A.D. 401, as Pagi shews (*ad Baron. ib. n. 20*) under St. Epiphanius, at the instigation of Theophilus of Alexandria, prohibiting the reading of the works of Origen. [E. S. F.]

CYRIACA, martyr, A.D. 282, is commemorated July 7 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

CYRIACUS. (1) Martyr in Achaia, Jan. 12 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(2) Deacon, martyr at Rome under Maximin, March 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Usuardi*); again on Aug. 8 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Usuardi*), supposed by some to be the day of his translation by Pope Marcellus (see Sollier's note on Usuard, Aug. 8); July 15 (*Cal. Byzant.*). Sometimes written *Cyricus* or *Cerycus*.

(3) Martyr at Tomi, June 20 (*Mart. Hieron., Bedae*).

(4) The Anchorite (A.D. 448–557), Sept. 29 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

CYRICUS. (1) Martyr in the Hellespont, Jan. 3 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Antioch, June 16 (*Mart. Hieron., Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CYRIL. (1) Bishop of Alexandria, is commemorated Jan. 28 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*); June 9 (*Cal. Byzant.*); with Athanasius, Jan. 18 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Bishop of Jerusalem, March 18 (*Cal. Byzant., Ethiop.*).

(3) Martyr in Syria, March 20 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(4) Bishop and martyr in Egypt(?), July 9 (*Mart. Hieron., Rom. Vet., Usuardi*).

(5) Martyr at Philadelphia, Aug. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [C.]

CYRILLA, daughter of Decius, martyr under Claudius, Oct. 28 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Usuardi*). [C.]

CYRINUS, or QUIRINUS. (1) Martyr at Rome under Claudius, is commemorated March 25 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Rome under Diocletian, April 26 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr at Milan under Nero, June 12 (*Mart. Bedae, Usuardi*). [C.]

CYRINUS. [CYRICUS.]

CYRION, presbyter, martyr, Feb. 14 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*). [C.]

CYRUS, martyr, A.D. 292, wonder-worker and unmercenary, is commemorated Jan. 31 (*Cal. Byzant.*); translation, June 28 (*ib.*). [C.]

CYZICUS (COUNCIL OF), A.D. 376, according to Mansi (iii. 469), being the meeting of semi-Arians mentioned by St. Basil in his letter to Patrophilus, and spoken of as a recent occurrence (*Ep. ccxciv. al. lxxxi.*). "What else they did there, I know not," says he; "but thus much I hear, that having been reticent of the term *Homoousion*, they now give utterance to the term

*Homoousion*, and join Eunomius in publishing blasphemies against the Holy Ghost." [E. S. F.]

CYZICUS, THE MARTYRS OF, are commemorated April 29 [al. 28] (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

## D

DADAS, martyr with Maximus and Quintilianus; commemorated April 28 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

DAEMON. [DEMON.]

DAFROSA, wife of Fabian the martyr, martyr at Rome under Julian; commemorated, Jan. 4 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

DALMATIC. (*Δαλματική* [Δελ.]; *Dalmatica*, sc. *tunica* or *vestis*; the substantive, as in the similar case of *alba*, is seldom expressed.)

The dalmatic, which derived its name from the province where it was first manufactured, was a species of long-sleeved white tunic, with a longitudinal stripe (*clavus*) from either side of the neck downwards. ("Dalmatica vestis primum in Dalmatia provincia Graeciae texta est, tunica sacerdotalis candida cum clavis ex purpura." Isidore, *Etymol.* xix. 22.)

There are fair grounds, however, for believing that in its original form the dalmatic, as worn by men, was a short-sleeved or sleeveless tunic, equivalent to the colobion (*χιτών ἀχειριδωτός*, Sozomen, iii. 14).<sup>a</sup> This is shown by the way in which the two words are used synonymously, as in Epiphanius (*Hæc. xv. vol. i. p. 32*, ed. Petavius), *Δαλματικάς, εἴτουν κολοβίωνας, ἐκ πλατυσῆμων διὰ πορφύρας ἀλουργοῦφεῖς κατεσκευασμένας*. (So too Joannes Damascenus, in Cotelier, *Eccl. Graec. Mon. Ined.* i. 284.) Again, in a most important early document, to which we shall subsequently refer, the edict of Diocletian fixing the maximum price of articles throughout the Roman empire, the two words are used as equivalents (Waddington, *L'édit de Diocletien*, p. 38). Nor need any difficulty be felt from the occurrence of passages which speak of the substitution of the dalmatic for the colobion. If the above theory be correct, such passages will merely refer to the adding of long sleeves to the previously sleeveless tunic; and the change having been once made, it would be natural to employ the word colobion to denote that form of the garment implied by the name, and to retain the neutral word dalmatic to indicate the modified form; and indeed a passage from the *Life of Silvester I.* to which it will be necessary to allude subsequently, seems to support the above view, . . . ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τὸ τῶν βραχιόνων γυμνὸν ἐψέγετο, Δαλματικά μανίκεια μᾶλλον συνέβη ὀνομασθῆναι εἶπερ (leg. ἤπερ) κολόβια (*Vit. Silvestri*, p. 266, ed. Combefis). It is of course also just possible that this term may have been susceptible of slightly different meanings in different countries.

We first meet with the dalmatic as a secular dress, of a stately or luxurious character, worn

<sup>a</sup> Such was also the *Levito* [al. *Lebiton*] or *Levitonarium* (words having no connection with *Levite*) of the Egyptian monks. (See Binterim, iv. 1. 214.)

by persons in high position. Thus there would necessarily be something exceptional in the use of it, and then like other articles of Roman secular dress it became adopted by the Church as a dress for ecclesiastics. We shall cite first sundry allusions to the dalmatic in the *Historiae Augustae Scriptores*. Lampadius charges Commodus [ob. 192 A.D.] with unseemly behaviour<sup>b</sup> in that he appeared in the streets in a dalmatic (*Vita Com. c. 8*; see also Capitolina, *Vita Pert. c. 8*). Heliogabalus [ob. 218 A.D.] also was fond of appearing abroad thus clad (Lampadius, *Vita Heliogab. c. 28*). See also Trebellius Pollio, *Vita Claudi, c. 17*.

The edict of Diocletian already cited furnishes us with much interesting information as to the different varieties of this garment in use in the Roman empire at the end of the 3rd century A.D. It was made of various materials, wool, silk, linen (*adamas, lanugineus, idem*); sometimes the ornamental clavi were present (*Ad. Exorn. variorum*), sometimes absent (*Idem*). Dalmatics both for men's and women's use are mentioned; those for the former, as we have already stated, bearing the title *Δαλματικὴν ἄρβυλον* from *arabellus*. Three different qualities are given for each sex, the price varying both according to the quality and the place of manufacture, of which Scythopolis, Tarsus, Byblos, Laodicea, &c. are mentioned.

It may be not uninteresting to add that the price of these various sorts varied from 10,000 to 1500 denarii; the denarius, it should be remembered, being of the debased currency of the earlier part of Diocletian's reign, and in value about 1½d. (cp. *op. cit.* pp. 30, 37, &c.).

Three centuries later we find the dalmatic worn as part of a senator's dress in the case of Gordianus the father of Gregory the Great, who was of that order (Joannis Diaconi *Vita S. Gregorii*, iv. 83); and the father and the son are both spoken of as wearing the planeta and dalmatic (cf. c. 84, *Patrol.* lxxv. 259).

In later times the dalmatic has been a dress worn by sovereigns at their coronation and on other great occasions. [See CORONATION.]

The ideas, then, of dignity and stateliness were associated with the dalmatic as a secular dress. The earliest notice of its ecclesiastical use is, if the document be genuine, in the *Acta Martyrum* of St. Cyprian, of whom it is said (c. 5) that when led out to martyrdom "as lacrimis byrre expoliavit . . . et cum se dalmatica excolasset et discalceis tradidisset in linea stetit." Here then, where the dress is evidently that ordinarily used by the bishop (it indeed a distinction between the everyday dress of the Christian ministry and that used by them in divine service had yet arisen), we find first the under linen garment (*linen*), over this the dalmatic, and finally the *birrus* or cloak.

<sup>b</sup> It is not quite clear in what the impropriety consisted. If we are right in supposing that the dalmatic of this time had short sleeves, there would be an obvious unbecomingness in a person of rank being seen abroad without an upper garment. Others who hold that even then the dalmatic was a long-sleeved dress, refer the cause of the offence to the implied offensiveness of the wearer (cf. *Anten. Vitis*, vii. 12. "Tunicis ut vitum prolixis ultra brachia, atque in primis manibus, ac prope in digitis flammae utque in laetis induratis fulli"); and others to the foreign nature of the garb.

About fifty years later we come to something more definite in the already cited order of Pope Silvester I. [ob. 335 A.D.] that deacons should for the future wear dalmatics instead of colobis. It is a matter of small moment whether this means the substitution of one vestment for another, or, as we have tried to show, a modification in the shape of the existing vestment: in either case the result is the same, the introduction of a long-sleeved in place of a short-sleeved tunic.<sup>c</sup> Walafrid Strabo [ob. 849 A.D.] tells us that "Silvester appointed that deacons should use dalmatics in the church, and that their left hand should be covered with a cloth of linen warp (*pallium lineatum*). Now at first, priests (*sacerdotes*, that is doubtless bishops and priests both) wore dalmatics before chasubles were introduced, but afterwards when they began to use chasubles, they permitted dalmatics to deacons. That even pontiffs, however, ought to use them is obvious from the fact that Gregory or other heads of the Roman see allowed the use of them to some bishops and forbade it to others. Hence it follows that at that time the permission was not given to all to do what now almost all bishops and some priests think they may do; namely, wear a dalmatic under the chasuble." (*De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*, c. 24; cf. Rabanus Maurus, *De Clericorum Institutione*, l. 7, 30; Amalarius, *De Eccl. Off.* li. 21; Pseudo-Alcuin, *De Div. Off.* c. 39; Anastasius, *Vitis Pontificum*, Silvester I. p. 35.)

It will be seen here that the ordinance has special reference to deacons, whether from the higher orders of the ministry already wearing the long-sleeved tunic, or, as Mariotti (*Vestiarium Christianum*, p. lviii.) suggests, with the view of compensating for the absence of a super-vestment among deacons.

Noticeable in the next place is the reference to permission granted or withheld by the bishop of Rome as to the wearing of the dalmatic by other bishops, so that as late as the middle of the 9th century this dress was in some special way associated with the local Roman Church, and considered the peculiar privilege of ecclesiastics of that Church, others being only allowed to use it by special permission. Of this state of things, doubtless originally due to the use of the vestment at Rome by persons of high secular position, numerous illustrations can be given. Thus in the life of Caesarius, bishop of Arles [ob. 542 A.D.], it is mentioned that on his visit to Rome, the then Pope Symmachus granted him as a special distinction the privilege of wearing the pallium [PALLIUM], and to his deacons that of dalmatics after the Roman fashion (*Vit. Cass. Arl.* c. 4, *Patrol.* lxxvii. 1016).

Another instance occurs in a letter of Gregory the Great to Aegidius, bishop of Vapincum (the modern Gap), in which he accords to him and his archdeacon the sought-for privilege of wearing dalmatics (*Epist.* li. 107). An allusion to the same thing occurs in a letter of Pope Zacharias [ob. 752 A.D.] to Austrobert, archbishop of Vienna (*Petrol.* lxxix. 956). The genuineness, however, of this letter is doubtful. One or two

<sup>c</sup> Reference may perhaps be made to Anastasius Marcellinus (xiv. 9), who, writing in the latter part of the 6th century, still speaks of the short-sleeved tunic in connection with deacons, showing that as yet the change had not become widespread.

mentum more, in which the dalmatic is associated with the Roman Church, may suffice. Eutychianus, bishop of Rome [ob. 283 A.D.], ordered it as was when a martyr was buried (Anastasia, *Vitas Pontificum*, Eutychianus, p. 28). In the Gregorian Sacramentary (p. 65), in the rubric for Maundy Thursday, we find "ingressu sacrarum induunt dalmaticas, tam pontifex quam omnes diaconi," where *pontifex* is doubtless the pope. Gregory also refers in his dialogues to the dalmatic of Paschasius, a deacon of Rome, as laid on his bier (*Dial.* iv. 40), and from a decree of the same pontiff, said to have been given at a synod of Rome in 585 A.D., we find the same custom prevailed in the case of popes, which custom is here forbidden (*Opp.* p. 1536 Migne).

Indirect evidence pointing to the same result may be gathered from the fact of the absence of any mention of the dalmatic in the Acts of the Fourth Council of Toledo (633 A.D.) among the regulations as to the dress of the Christian ministry (*Concil. Tol.* iv. can. 28, 40, 41; Labbe, v. 1714, 1716), showing that this vestment was not one then in use in Spain, as indeed might be further inferred from the style of the one solitary mention of it in the writings of Isidore, under whose presidency the council was held.

It does not fall within the province of the present article to discuss at length the regulations of a later date as to the use of the dalmatic by bishops and deacons, for the latter of whom it was the distinctive vestment at the Holy Communion (see e. g. the pontifical of Egbert, archbishop of York [ob. 786 A.D.], where we find "diaconi dalmaticis vestiti" in the form for the celebration of a mass on Maundy Thursday; p. 120, ed. Surtees Society). It still continued, however, to be used by them on other occasions. Thus Amalaricus (*De Eccl. Off.* ii. 26) speaks of the "dalmatica diaconi et sui ministri [*i.e.* the sub-deacon] quae est itineris habitus," as emblematic of the activity to be shown by them in good deeds to others.

The dalmatic thus being a vestment which even in the West had primarily only a local acceptance, we are prepared to find that in the East there is nothing which strictly speaking answers to it. The *evangelisarios* or *evangelistas*, however, is the representative of the general type of white tunic, which under whatever name we know it, alb, dalmatic, or tunicle, is essentially the same dress (Goar, *Euchologion*, p. 111).



Mosaic in the Church of St. Vitale, at Ravenna.

One or two further remarks may be made in conclusion as to the ornamental stripes or *clavi* [*CLAVUS*] of the dalmatic. As to the colour of these it is stated by Marriott that he had met with exclusively black *clavi* in all ancient pictures of ecclesiastical dalmatics prior to the year 600, as in the well-known Ravenna mosaic (see woodcut), the earliest exception being a mosaic of the date 640 (a coloured drawing of which is in the Windsor collection) in which the Apostles have red *clavi* on their tunics (*ib.* p. lix. a.). The red or purple *clavi* afterwards became common (see the passage already cited from Isidore, if indeed the reference there be to ecclesiastical dalmatics; also Rabanus Maurus l.c., Amalaricus l.c., etc.), and the later writers we have referred to (e.g. Rabanus Maurus, Amalaricus, etc.) speak of these as worn back and front, "ante et retro decedentes," but whether this was the case with the original type of the dress may perhaps be doubted. Further, these ornamental stripes are found on the borders of the sleeves; and on the left side in later days was a border of fringe, for which various writers have found appropriate symbolical reasons, into which however there is no need to enter here.\*

For the matter of the foregoing article I am mainly indebted to Marriott's *Vestiarium Christianum*, to Hefele's valuable essay, *Die Liturgischen Gewänder in der Geschichte der Kirche*, *Archäologie und Liturgik*, ii. 203 sqq., to the articles *Dalmatica* and *Colobium* in Dancie's *Glossary*. The following books have also been consulted with advantage: Ferrarius *De Re vestitaria*, Padua, 1842; Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Katholischen Kirche*, vol. iv. pt. i. pp. 215 sqq. [R. S.]

**DALMATIUS.** (1) Martyr in Italy under Maximian; commemorated Dec. 5 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) Holy Father, A.D. 368; commemorated Aug. 5 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**DAMASUS**, the pope; martyr at Rome under Maximian; Natale, Dec. 11 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi); deposition, Dec. 10 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [W. F. G.]

**DAMIANUS.** (1) Martyr in Aegae with Cosmas under Diocletian, A.D. 284; commemorated Sept. 27 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Bedae); with Cosmas, Anthimus, Leontius, and Euprepius, Sept. 27 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi); with Cosmas, "ἁγίων ἁγίων καὶ ἀνδραγαθῶν," July 1 (*Cal. Byzant.*); with Cosmas, and Theodora their mother, Nov. 1. (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) In Africa, "Passio sancti Damiani militis" (*Mart. Adonis*). [W. F. G.]

**DANCING.** Many passages in the fathers and many decrees of councils censure and prohibit promiscuous and lascivious dancing. St. Ambrose thus describes the dancing of drunken women in his time (*De Ethic. et Jejunio*, c. 18), "They lead up dances in the streets unbeknowning men, in the sight of intemperate youths, tanning their hair, dragging their unfastened garments, with their arms uncovered, clapping their hands,

\* The remark often made of the dalmatic as being "in modum crucis facta" (see e.g. Rabanus Maurus l.c.) refers of course to the appearance presented by it when the sleeves are stretched out.

dancing with their feet, loud and clamouring in their voices, imitating and provoking youthful lusts by their theatrical motions, their wanton eyes and unseemly antics." And again, commenting on the words, "We have piped unto you and ye have not danced" (Matt. xi. 17), he motions his readers that they must not suppose that the "dance" of Christians implies any immodest movement of the body; rather, it is like the solemn movement of David before the ark (*De Poenit.* ii. 6).

St. Augustine declares (*contra Parmenianum*, iii. c. ult.) that frivolous and lascivious dancing was put down by the bishops of the church; and the author of *Sermo* 215 *De Tempore* (in Augustine's *Works*) speaks sorrowfully of the revels (balationes) and dances before the very doors of the churches, which were relics of paganism. To the same practice the 80th canon of the *Codex Eccl. Afric.* refers, which prohibits the lascivious dances which took place in the streets on festival days, to the great scandal of religion, and annoyance of those who wished to worship.

St. Chrysostom also repeatedly and vehemently protests against it. He declares it to be one of the pomps of Satan renounced in baptism; he says, "the devil is present at dances, being called thither by the songs of harlots, and obscene words and diabolical pomps used on such occasions." And in another passage, speaking of the dancing of Herodias' daughter, he says, "Christians do not now deliver up half a kingdom nor another man's head but their own souls to inevitable destruction" (*Hom.* 47 in *Judam*, *Mart.* p. 613, *Hom.* 25 *de Noviss.* p. 264, ed. Paris, 1816).

The council of Laodicea, A.D. 366, forbids wanton dancing (*βαλλίσιον ἢ ἀρχαῖον*) at marriage feasts (can. 53).

The third council of Toledo (A.D. 589) prohibits dances with lascivious songs on solemn festivals, the use of which they complain of as an irreligious custom prevailing in Spain among the common people, and order to be corrected both by the ecclesiastical and secular judges (can. 23). The Decree of Reccard (Bruns's *Comptes*, l. 394) confirming these canons, speaks of these same dances as "ballematise" or "ballemachine"; words which recall the *βαλλίσιον* of the Laodicean canon, and the "balationes" of the Pseudo-Augustine, and are perhaps akin to the modern *Ball* and *Ballet*.

The council of Arde (A.D. 508) forbids the clergy to be present at marriages where obscene love songs were sung, and obscene motions of the body used in dancing (*Conc. Agathen.* can. 69). [C.]

**DANIEL.** (1) The prophet; commemorated Magabit 23 = March 19 (*Cal. Ethiop.*): July 21, *Natale*, (*Mart.* Bedae) with Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, Dec. 17 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(8) Stylites, Holy Father, A.D. 467; commemorated Dec. 11 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**DARIA**, virgin, martyr at Rome under Numerian; commemorated with Chrysantus and "qui cum eis passi sunt," Aug. 12 (*Mart. Hieron.*); with Chrysantus and others, Nov. 29 (*Mart. Hieron.*); with Chrysantus, Dec. 1 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*); with Chrysantus, Marilianus, "cum infinita multitudine martyrum," Dec. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*). [W. F. G.]

\* There are several various readings.

**DARIUS**, martyr at Nicæa; commemorated Dec. 19 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**DASIUS**, martyr at Nicomedia, with Zoticus, Gaius, and 12 soldiers; commemorated Oct. 21 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

**DATIVA**, confessor in Africa; commemorated Dec. 6, with seven others (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**DATIVUS**. (1) Martyr in Africa, with Saturninus, Felix, Apelinus, and his companions; commemorated Feb. 12 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr under Decius and Valerian with five others; commemorated Sept. 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**DAVID**, (1) "et tres pueri;" commemorated June 25 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(2) of Thessalonica; commemorated June 26 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(3) King of Ethiopia; commemorated Makarram 10 = Sept. 7 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(4) King of the Jews; commemorated Sept. 30 (*Cal. Armen.*); Takmas 23 = Dec. 19 (*Cal. Ethiop.*); Dec. 29 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(5) and Constantine; commemorated Oct. 2 (*Cal. Georgian.*).

(6) commemorated Dec. 23 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

**DAVID**. Among the Egyptians, an archimandrite, or any head of a monastery of whatever rank, was called *David*; so that when a monastic head gave letters of commendation to any one, he subscribed himself as "*David illius loci*" (*Gratian De Formatis*, quoted by Duncanson, a. v.). [C.]

**DAYS, NAMES OF.** [WEEK.]

**DEACON.** *Διακονος, diaconus*; *δίακων* (Duncanson, *Gloss.* quoting Malactas, *Hist. Patriarch.*); *diacones* (Cyprian, *Ep. ad Succesum*, and repeatedly in the decrees of councils, e. g. *Conc. Elia.* c. 18 and 76, *1 Arclat.* c. 15, *1 Tolet.* 1).

1. *Names.*—The first idea contained in the word appears to be that of service rendered in an inferior capacity. It seems too as if something of a sacred character attached to the word even before its use in the Scriptures. Thus we find *διακονεῖς γάμων*, "metaphora sumpta ab his qui pocula aut victum ministrant egentibus et petentibus" (Steph. *Thes.* in verb. *διακονεῖς*; comp. Buttman's *Lexilogos*, and Stanley, *Apostolic Age*, p. 69).

In the New Testament *διακονος* is used: 1. In the general sense of an agent or instrument. Thus the sovereign power is called *θεὸς διακονῶν* (Rom. xiii. 4), and Timothy *διακονῶν ἱεροῦ Χριστοῦ* (1 Tim. iv. 5). Sometimes "bishops and deacons" express all the officers of the Christian ministry (*οὗτοι λειτουργοὶ καὶ διακονοὶ*, Phil. i. 1). 2. But the word appears to have assumed its distinctive ecclesiastical meaning at the appointment of the Seven to superintend the distribution of the alms to the Hellenist widows, *ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῇ καθ' ἑμῶν* (Acts vi. 1-6), when the *διακονία τῶν τραπεζῶν* became distinct from the *διακονία τοῦ λόγου*. These seven are never called deacons in the Acts of the Apostles. In the only passage in which mention is made of them as a body, Philip is described as one of "the Seven" (Acts xxi. 8). It has therefore been contended that the institution of the diaconate was not



really connected with the appointment of the Seven. One theory would identify the deacons with the νεώτεροι or νεανίσκοι elsewhere mentioned in the New Testament (Acts v. 6 and 10) as performing certain subordinate offices in the church. But this theory appears to be at variance with the account given in the Acts, where it is distinctly said that, at the time of the appointment of the Seven, the distribution of the alms, ἡ διακονία ἡ καθημερινή, was performed by the apostles themselves.

A theory something like this has been adopted by later writers. In this case it is alleged that the appointment of the Seven was merely to meet a particular emergency, and "had probably no connection with the deacons in the later period of the apostolic age," though it is admitted "that they may possibly have borne the name," and that "there was in some respects a likeness between their respective duties" (Stanley, *Essays on Apostolic Age*, p. 62; comp. Vitringa, iii. 2, 5; Lightfoot, *Essay on Christian Ministry*, in *Comm. on Philippians*, p. 186, note). A passage from St. Chrysostom is brought forward in support of this theory, in which he distinctly asserts that the ordination (χειροτονία) of the Seven was neither that of deacons, nor that of presbyters, nor that of bishops (*Hom. on Acts vi.*). This passage is incorporated into a decree of the Council in Trullo (c. 16) which, referring to the institution of the Seven "deacons" (ἡ τῶν πράξεων βίβλος ἐπὶ τὰ διακόνους ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καταστήναι παραδίδωσιν), expressly distinguishes these ministers from the deacons proper who took part in the sacred ministry of the altar (ὁ λόγος αὐτοῖς οὐ περὶ τῶν τοῖς μυστηρίοις διακονουμένων ἢν ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἐν ταῖς χρείαις τῶν τραπέζων ὑπουργίας). Compare Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccles. Disciplina*, Part I. L. 1, c. 51, § 11, 12.

On the other hand there is abundant testimony that the early church in general considered the order of deacons to have originated in the institution of the Seven. Irenaeus speaks of "Nicolaum unum ex septem qui primi ad diaconium ab apostolis ordinati sunt" (*Haeres.* i. 27). Sozomen asserts that the church of Rome retained the custom of only having seven deacons, in accordance with the number of those ordained by the apostles, of whom Stephen was first (*H. E.* vii. 19), so *Constitut. Apost.* viii. 46; Hilary, *Comm. in 1 Tim.* iii. 11, apud Ambrosii *Opera*; Cyprian, *Ep.* 65, *ad Rogatian.*; *Id. Ep.* 68, *ad Pleb. Leg.*; *Conc. Neocaes.* c. 15; Epiphanius, *Haeres.* i. *De Incarn.* 4).

The name of deacon (*i. e.* servant or subordinate) was given to the third order of the ministry on account of the duties which they had to perform, ἐξυπηρετεῖσθαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, τούτῃστι διακονεῖν (*Constitut. Apost.* iii. 20); τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ὑπηρεταὶ εἰσὶ (*Conc. Nic.* c. 18). "Diaconus ita se presbyteri et episcopi ministrum noverit" (*IV. Conc. Carth.* c. 37; comp. *I. Conc. Turon.* c. 1; *Conc. Elib.* title of c. 18, and c. 33). In the last named canon, however, the heading "De Episcopis et Ministris" includes the presbyters and all other orders of the clergy.

They are also continually called Levites, from the analogy of the Mosaic Dispensation: οἱ λευῖται ὑμεῖς οἱ νῦν διάκονοι (*Constitut. Apost.* ii. 25); λευῖτες οἱ ἰδία διακονίαι ἐπικεῖνται (*Clem.*

*ad Cor.* i. 40). Jerome (*Epist. ad Evangelum*) compares the bishops, priests, and deacons with Aaron, his sons, and the Levites respectively. (*Comp. I. Conc. Turon.* c. 1, 2. Salvian, *ad Eccles. Cathol.* ii. 394.)

II. *Position of Deacons.*—They are always spoken of in conjunction with the bishops and priests in the service of the church. The canons of the councils are almost invariably addressed to the bishops, priests, and deacons as to the three orders of whom the clergy was composed, and the same rule is observed in the writings of the apostolic fathers (See Ign. *Trall.* c. 3, *Philadelph.* c. 7; Polycarp. *Philipp.* 5; *Martyr. Ignatii*, 3). In the *Constitutiones Apostolicæ* (viii. 46) they are said to be ordained in the same manner as the priests and bishops; and in another place (ii. 26, 28) a type of the threefold operations of the Holy Trinity is found in the distinctive offices of bishops, deacons, and deaconesses. In many respects, indeed, their position was put on a level with that of the priests. The same rules apply to the married deacons as to the married priests (*I. Conc. Tolet.* 1, *I. Conc. Turon.* 2). In later days the oath of purgation to be taken by a deacon was the same as that of a priest, and differed from that of the inferior orders of clergy (*Conc. Berglm.* c. 18, 19). Their share of the first-fruits (ἀπαρχαὶ) offered at the agape was the same as that of the presbyters, and was double that allotted to the πρεσβύτεροι (*Constitut. Apost.* ii. 28). Of the EULOGIAE which remained after the administration of the Eucharist, the bishop was to receive four portions, the presbyter three, and the deacon two (*Ibid.* viii. 30, 31). In some churches it would seem as if the emoluments of the deacons were even greater than those of the priests, since Jerome warns them against estimating the dignity of their ecclesiastical position by its pecuniary results: "Presbyter noverit se lucris minorem, sacerdotio esse majorem" (Hieronym. *Ep.* 85, *ad Evang.* comp. *Comm. in Eze.* c. xlviii.).

There are places also in which their office is spoken of as sacerdotal in the general sense. Thus Optatus speaks of it as the third grade: "Quid commemorem diaconos in tertio? quid presbyteros in secundo sacerdotio institutos?" (*c. Donatist.* lib. i. 35). Jerome speaks of their ordination to a priesthood (sacerdotium) in common with the bishops and priests (Hieron. *Apolog. Jovini*), and St. Augustine (*Ep.* 16) addresses one Praesidius as a fellow priest (consacerdos), of whom Jerome, in the epistle that follows, speaks as a deacon.

But notwithstanding such expressions as these their right to be considered as in any way partakers in the office of the presbyter, or priest in the narrower sense, is in many places emphatically denied. In the *Quæstiones* it is held impossible that a deacon can in any case discharge the duties of a priest (sacerdotis), since he is in no degree a partaker of the priestly office (*Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test.* inter Augustini *Opera*, N. T., 46); deacons are inferior to priests (πρεσβύτεροι, *i. Conc. Nic.* c. 18); a deacon might be ordained by one bishop only, because the ordination was only to a ministerial, not a priestly office (non ad sacerdotium sed ad ministerium consecratur, *iv. Conc. Carth.* 4); and deacons distributed the consecrated elements, not as

priests, but as the attendants upon priests (*λεπεῦσι*, *Constitut. Apost.* viii. 28); so Ambrosiaster, "quamvis non sunt sacerdotes" (*Comm. Ep. Ephes.* iv. 11).

And this inferiority of office was marked by the position given them in the discharge of the duties. While the bishops and the presbyters were seated on their thrones in the church, the deacons were to stand near them (*Constitut. Apost.* ii. 57). The first council of Nice (c. 18) strictly forbade a deacon to sit among the priests as contrary to all rule and order. So it was ordered that a deacon might only be seated by express permission in presence of a priest (*πρεσβύτερος*, *Conc. Laod.* c. 20; comp. *Conc. Agath.* c. 65, iv. *Conc. Carth.* c. 39); but the same respect was to be paid to the deacons by the subdeacons and inferior clergy (*Ibid.*). So it is said that even the deacons of the churches at Rome, though inclined to presume on their position, did not venture to seat themselves during the services (*Quaestiones*, Q. i. 10); and the testimony of Jerome confirms this: "In ecclesiâ Romae presbyteri sedent, et stant diaconi" (*Epis.* 85, *ad Evang.*). So I. *Conc. Barcinon.* c. 4. In councils their proper position was standing, as is apparent in several records of their proceedings; e. g. "considentibus presbyteris, adstantibus diaconis" (I. *Conc. Tolet.* Prooem.); "adstantibus ministris vel universo clero" (I. *Conc. Bracar.* Prooem.); and this was strictly enforced by canons; the priests should sit at the back of the bishops, and the deacons stand in front (iv. *Conc. Tolet.* 4). Deacons, however, who held ecclesiastical offices (*ὁφφίκια ἐκκλησιαστικά*) were allowed to be seated, but on no account before any presbyter, unless they represented their own patriarch or metropolitan in another city, in which case they were to take the place allotted to the person whom they represented (*Conc. Quinisext.* c. 7). Another canon provides that they should not speak at councils unless especially bidden (iv. *Conc. Carth.* c. 40). [COUNCILS, p. 481.]

Thus in every way their position appears to have been associated with the discharge of duties which were recognised as honourable in themselves, and conferring honour on those to whom they were entrusted, yet distinctly marked out as ministerial rather than sacerdotal, and carefully kept apart from those which specially belonged to the priests.

III. *Duties.*—These were of a varied nature, but appear to have been in every case suggested by those which were originally allotted to them, and to be comprehended in *διακονία τῶν τραπέζων*, as distinguished from the *διακονία τοῦ λόγου*.

1. They were stewards of the property of the church and of the funds belonging to the widows and orphans. Thus Cyprian speaks of Nicostratus as having not only robbed the church but defrauded the widows and wards (*Cyp. Ep.* 49 [al. 52], *ad Cornelium*). So Jerome calls the deacon "mensarum et viduarum minister" (*Hieron. Ep.* 85, *ad Evang.*). They were also to distribute the oblations (*εὐλογίας*) which remained after the celebration of the Eucharist among the different orders of the clergy, in the regular proportions (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. c. 31).

2. They were almoners of the charities dispensed by the church. It was part of their duty

to seek out and visit the sick and afflicted, and report to the bishop respecting such as were in affliction (*Constitut. Apost.* iii. 19). But all alms were to be distributed strictly under the direction of the bishop (*Ibid.* ii. cc. 31, 32, 34). They were also to select the aged women (*πρεσβύρας*) invited on the ground of poverty to more frequent participation in the *ἀγνάται* (*Ibid.* ii. 28).

3. The discipline of the church was in a great measure intrusted to their hands as the immediate ministers of the bishop. In times of persecution it was their duty to minister to the confessors in their prisons, and to bury the bodies of the martyrs (*Euseb. H. E.* vii. 11). They were also to strengthen the fainthearted and exhort the waverers. Thus it was one of the complaints against Novatian that he persisted in remaining in his hiding-place when exhorted by the deacons to come forth (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 43). If any for misconduct were cast out from the congregation, the deacons were to intercede for the offender, since, it is added, Christ intercedes for sinners with the Father (*Constitut. Apost.* ii. c. 16). They were also associated with the bishop in the work of seeking out and reproving offenders (*Ibid.* ii. c. 17). As deputies of the bishop they were to relieve him of the lighter cases brought for adjudication, leaving the weightier for his own decision (*Ibid.* ii. 44), and might even, in his absence, take charge of the diocese (*Bede, H. E.* ii. 20). They also appear to have been entrusted, in the absence of a presbyter, with some jurisdiction over the inferior clergy (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. 28). When any of the faithful brought letters commendatory from another diocese, they were to examine into the circumstances of the case (*Ibid.* ii. 58). They were also frequently sent on embassies from one church to another (*Ignat. Philadelph.* c. 10). They also sometimes represented their bishops in councils (*Conc. Quinisext.* A.D. 691, c. 7), though this was forbidden in the West, on the ground that a deacon being inferior to the priests (*presbyteris junior*), could not be allowed to sit with bishops in the council (*Conc. Emerit.* A.D. 666, c. 5). Thomassin however asserts that this provincial decree was never acted upon (*Nova et Vet. Eccl. Discip.* i. 2, c. 23, § 19). At all councils a deacon was to read the decrees by which the proceedings were regulated (*capitula de conciliis agendis*) before the business commenced (iv. *Conc. Tolet.* 4). It appears also to have been the duty of the deacons on these occasions to keep the doors, and call for those whose presence was required before the council (*Codex Eccl. Africanæ*, c. 100).

4. In other respects they were to be channels of communication between the bishop and the laity (*Constitut. Apost.* ii. 28). All the offerings of the people (*τὰς θυσίας ἡτοι προσφόρας, τὰς ἀπαρχὰς καὶ τὰς δεκάτας καὶ τὰ ἐκούσια*), when not made directly to the bishop, were to be presented to him through their hands (*Ibid.* ii. 27). So various were their duties in relation to the bishop that they are called in one place his ears and eyes and mouth and heart (*Ibid.* ii. 44); in another his soul and perception (*ψυχὴ καὶ αἴσθησις*, *Ibid.* iii. 19).

5. These duties were connected with the *διακονία τῶν τραπέζων*, as relating to the material needs of the community. Another class of

duties arose from the "ministry of the Table," considered in relation to the celebration of the Eucharist. Thomassin says that, although the occasion for instituting the order of deacons arose from the necessities of the common table, yet that it also had reference to the celebration of the Eucharist, "ad sacram mensam, quae tunc a civili non divellebant" (*Vet. et Nova Discip. Eccl.* i. 1, c. 51, § 4; comp. Wordsworth, *Comm.* in Acts vi. 2, and, there quoted, Bishop Pearson, "In communi victu sacramentum Eucharistiae celebrabant").

a. They were to provide for the maintenance of order in the congregations during the performance of the various services. They were to see that all the congregation took the places allotted to them, that no one lingered in the entrance, or whispered, or slept, or in any way misbehaved during the service (*Constitut. Apost.* ii. 57, viii. 11). So Chrysostom says, "if any misbehave, call the deacon" (*Hom.* 24 in Acta); and they were to be particularly careful in assigning honourable places and giving a cordial welcome to the poor and aged and to strangers (*Constitut. Apost.* ii. 58). They were to stand at the men's gate lest any should go in or out during the celebration of the Eucharist (*Ibid.* viii. 11). They also discharged the lesser offices belonging to the Lord's Table; they arranged the altar, placed on it the sacred vessels, and brought water for the hands of the officiating priest. Their duty was to minister both to bishops and priests in things pertaining to their several offices, that all things relating to the worship of God might be rightly celebrated (*Ibid.* viii. 46). These duties, however, in large churches where there were many clergy, devolved on those belonging to the inferior orders: "ut autem non omnia obsequiorum per ordinem agant multitudo facit clericorum. Nam utique et altare portarent, et vasa ejus et aquam in manus funderent sacerdotis, sicut videmus per omnes ecclesias" (*Quaestiones*, Q. 101); and in another place it is ordered that the subdeacon should pour the water on the hands of the officiating priest, ἀπο-νιψὴν χειρῶν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. 11). But there are decrees of councils strictly forbidding the inferior orders of clergy (ὑπηρέτας) to enter the Diaconicum or touch the sacred vessels (*Conc. Laodic.* c. 21, *Agath.* c. 66). In the decree of the latter council ὑπηρέτας is rendered "insacratos ministros." The second canon of the first council of Toledo orders that a deacon who had been subjected to public penance should only be received among the subdeacons, so that he might not handle the sacred vessels; and it was expressly ordered that the deacons should take the remains of the consecrated elements into the Pastophoria or Sacristy (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. 13).

It was their duty also to present the offerings of the people at the altar, proclaiming at the same time the names of those who had made them; οἱ δῆκονοι προσαγέτωσαν τὰ δῶρα τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. 12). "Publicè diaconus in ecclesiā recitet offerentium nomina, tantum offert ille, tantum ille pollicitus est" (Hieron. *Comm. in Ezekiel.* xviii.). [DIPTYCHS.]

They had also an important part to fill in the service itself. At the commencement of the Communion Office the deacon who ministered

was to stand near the bishop and proclaim with a loud voice: μήτις κατὰ τινος, μήτις ἐν ὑποκρίσει, "let none come who has ought against any one, none in hypocrisy" (*Constitut. Apost.* ii. 54, 57, § 12). The reading of the Gospel was allotted either to a deacon or to a presbyter (*Ibid.* ii. 57, § 5); though in some churches it appears to have been the special office of the deacon, "Evangelium Christi quasi diaconus lectitabas" (Hieron. *Epist. ad Sabin.*). Sozomen says of the church at Alexandria, that the archdeacon only read the Gospel, but in other churches the duty was discharged by the deacons, and in many only by the priests (Soz. *II. E.* vii. 19). The second council of Vaison admitted that a deacon, in the absence of a priest, might be permitted to read a homily of the Fathers in the church, on the ground that they who were worthy to read the Gospel of Christ were not unworthy to recite expositions of the Fathers (ii. *Conc. Vasense*, c. 2), and for this reason it was forbidden that a deacon should be appointed who could not read (*Conc. Narbon.* c. 11; comp. Cyprian, *Ep.* 34, al. 39). It was perhaps in allusion to this part of their office that the duty was assigned to them of holding the Gospels over the head of a bishop at the time of his ordination (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. 4).

The deacon appointed for the purpose was also to give the signal for the departure of the unbelievers (*Ibid.* cc. 5, 12), to recite the appointed prayers for the catechumens, the energumens, those preparing for baptism, and the penitents, and to dismiss each class in its proper order (*Ibid.* viii. cc. 6, 7, 8). He was to make the proclamation which was the signal for the kiss of peace (*Ibid.* ii. c. 57), and to recite the prayer for the universal church (*Ibid.* ii. 57, viii. 9, 10, 11, 13, 35). Thus Chrysostom (*Hom.* 14 in Rom.) speaks of the deacon offering the prayers on behalf of the people (τοῦ δήμου). In the Liturgy given in the *Constitutiones* under the name of St. James, it is ordered that two deacons should stand by the altar bearing fans [FLABELLUM] made of fine membrane, or peacock's feathers, or linen, to drive away flies or insects from the sacred elements (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. c. 12).

At the administration of the Holy Communion it was the duty of the deacons to receive the consecrated elements from the officiating minister in order to distribute them among those who were present, and to convey them to the absent (Justin Martyr, *Apolog.* viii. c. 2); "Diaconi ordo est accipere a sacerdote et sic dare plebi" (*Quaestiones*, 101). But their peculiar office was the administration of the cup; ὁ δῆκονος κατεχέτω τὸ ποτήριον (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. c. 13); "solennibus adimpletis diaconus offerre praesentibus coepit" (Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, c. 25). They were strictly forbidden to distribute the bread if a priest was present (ii. *Conc. Arelat.* c. 15), unless some necessity arose for doing so, and they were bidden to do so by the priest (iv. *Conc. Carth.* c. 38). But it was carefully noted that the deacon only acted as the subordinate of the priest (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. 28), and had no right whatever to offer the sacrifice (*Ibid.* viii. 46). Priests under censure are deprived of the privilege of consecrating, deacons of ministering (*Conc. Agath.* c. 1); and it was forbidden that they should give the consecrated



bread to the priests, on the ground that it was unseemly that those who had no power to consecrate should administer to those who had (i. *Conc. Nic.* c. 18). So Jerome says of Hilarius, the deacon, that he had no power without priests or bishops to celebrate the Eucharist, "Eucharistiam conficere" (Hieron. *contra Lucifer.*). And though the right of consecration appears to have been assumed in some places, it was strictly forbidden (i. *Conc. Arelat.* c. 15).

There are, however, two passages which may seem to favour the idea that deacons had sometimes power to consecrate. One of these is the decree of the council of Ancyra, which forbids deacons who have offered sacrifice to idols to offer either the bread or the wine, ἀπὸν τὴν ποτήριον ἀνδραφέρειν (*Conc. Ancyra.* c. 2). But this undoubtedly refers either to the offering the oblations which preceded the prayer of consecration (Thomass. *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* i. 2, c. 29, § 14), or to the distribution of the elements after consecration (Bingham, *Antiquities*, ii. c. 20, § 7; comp. Suicer, *Thesaurus*, t. 1, p. 871). The other is the speech put by St. Ambrose into the mouth of Laurentius, the deacon, when meeting his bishop, Sixtus, on the way to his martyrdom: "Cui commisisti Dominici sanguinis consecrationem, cui consummandorum consortium sacramentorum" (Ambros. *De Offic.* i. 41). But this doubtful expression seems interpreted by the words immediately preceding, "nunquam sacrificium sine ministro offerre consueveras," the "offerre consueveras" clearly referring to Sixtus himself. The "sanguinis consecrationem" probably merely means "sanguinem consecratum," and the duty attributed to the deacons was the service they always performed after consecration—ὑπηρετούμενοι τῷ τοῦ κυρίου σώματι μετὰ φόβου (*Constitut. Apost.* ii. 57; see Bingham, *Antiquities*, ii. 26, § 8).

After the administration the deacons were to take away what remained of the sacred elements into the sacristy, to recite (κηρύττειν) the Post-Communion Prayer, and dismiss the people (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. cc. 13, 35, 40). Thus it is said that Athanasius commanded his deacon κηρύξαι εὐχὴν (Soc. *H. E.* ii. 11), and κηρύττειν is mentioned among the sacred offices from the performance of which the deacons who had worshipped idols were to be suspended (*Conc. Ancyra.* c. 2). It was ordered by the fourth council of Toledo (c. 40), that the deacon (Levita) should wear a stole over the left shoulder, "propter quod orat, id est, praedicat." Chrysostom too calls the deacons κήρυκες (*Hom.* 17 in *Heb.* ix.). Thomassin says that the word κηρύττειν, used by the council of Ancyra, expressed the recital of the prayers and exhortations and the reading of the Gospels, which were done with raised voice (Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* i. 2, c. 29, § 14; comp. Suicer, *Thes.* in voc. κηρύττειν).

β. It appears that the daily services in district churches were sometimes entrusted to the deacons and priests in alternate weeks. In this case both presbyters and deacons were to assemble on the Saturday evening, that the Sunday services might be celebrated with due honour (*Conc. Tarracon.* c. 7). The council of Eliberis (c. 77) also speaks of a deacon in charge of a parish, without either priest or bishop, "regens plebem sine episcopo vel presbytero."

γ. It does not appear that preaching was among the duties which were usually entrusted to deacons, though Philip and Stephen undoubtedly did preach. Hilary, the commentator, holds that in the earliest days of the church, all the faithful both preached and baptized, but that afterwards a different course was adopted, and separate offices assigned to different members, so that in his days the deacons did not preach, though he says that at first all deacons were evangelists, and had commission given them to preach, though without any settled charge (sine cathedra) (*Comm. in Ephes.* iv. 11, in Ambrose's *Works*). Yet that some faculty of preaching was inherent in the office, at least at the command of the bishop, appears from the language of Philostorgius (*H. E.* iii. 17), where he says that Leontius ordained Aetius as a deacon, in order that he might teach in the church, but that he declined to undertake the other duties of a deacon, only accepting that of preaching (διδάσκειν ἀνεδέξατο); and though Leontius was a heretic, the words seem to indicate that this was reckoned among the ordinary functions of a deacon. On the other hand, the duty of preaching could not have belonged to them in the Western church in ordinary cases, since Caesarius, bishop of Arles, in giving permission to the priests and deacons in his diocese to read certain homilies to the people, when he himself could no longer preach to them through the infirmities of age, gives as the ground of his permission that, since they were allowed to read the Holy Scriptures in the church, it could not be wrong for them to read homilies composed by himself or by other fathers of the church (Thomass. *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* ii. 1, c. 89, § 8, 9), words adopted by the second council of Vaison, already quoted. And so Vigilantius in his letter to two deacons, Rusticus and Sebastian, speaks of their execrable pride in venturing to preach without permission of the bishop, as contrary to all precedent and canon law, "contra omnem consuetudinem vel canones" (Labbe, *Conc.* v. p. 554).

δ. They had also certain duties to perform at the administration of baptism. It was to be administered by bishops and priests only, with the assistance of the deacons (ἐξυπηρετούμενων αὐτοῖς τῶν διακόνων) (*Constitut. Apost.* iii. c. 11). They had to undertake the preliminary enquiries into the circumstances of the candidates (*Ibid.* viii. c. 32). They were to apply the unction which preceded the administration of the sacrament to the foreheads of the women (*Ibid.* iii. c. 15), and to undertake all the necessary arrangements for the male candidates (*Ibid.* iii. c. 16). [BAPTISM.] It was their duty, or that of the subdeacons, to fetch the CHRISM from the bishop before Easter (ii. *Conc. Brac.* c. 51, i. *Tolet.* 20).

But they were strictly forbidden to assume that the administration of baptism was one of the functions of their office. In the *Apostolic Canons* and *Constitutions*, the decrees concerning baptism are directed only to bishops and priests, though the other general canons are addressed to all three orders of the ministry (*Canones*, c. 39, 41, 42; *Constitut.* viii. c. 22). The *Constitutions*, too, distinctly assert that it is not lawful for a deacon to baptize (viii. c. 28, iii. c. 11, vii. c. 46). In the latter passage it is added, that if any argument is drawn from the fact of baptism being administered by Philip and



Ananias, it is for want of perceiving that these men were specially appointed for these duties by the Lord, the High-Priest. Epiphanius asserts that no deacon was ever entrusted with the administration of a sacrament (*μυστήριον ἐπιτελεῖν*; *Haeres.* 79, cap. 4). So Hilary, while asserting that all the faithful were once accustomed to baptize, adds, "nunc neque clerici vel laici baptizant" (*Com. in Eph.* iv. 11, in Ambrose's *Works*).

Yet it appears that they were permitted to baptize by command of a bishop, or when in charge of a parish without a presbyter. The right of baptizing resides generally in the bishop [BAPTISM, p. 166], but from him may be communicated both to priests and deacons (Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, c. 17). So a decree of the 5th century, speaking of the necessity of a holy life even for the laity, adds, how much more is this necessary for priests and deacons, since they may be called at any moment to offer the sacrifice or baptize? (i. *Conc. Turon.* 1). In another decree it is ordered that if a deacon having charge of a parish (*regens plebem*) without a bishop or presbyter should have baptized any, the bishop should confirm it by his blessing, "per benedictionem perficere debet" (*Conc. Elib.* 77); and again, in another, it is provided that while priests, in cases of urgent sickness, may baptize at any season of the year, deacons may only do so at Easter (*Synod. Rom.* A.D. 384? c. 7, in Bruns's *Canones*, ii. 278); and Jerome, speaking of those who in remote places were baptized by priests and deacons, places the right of both to baptize on exactly the same footing, as derived from the license of the bishop and the possession of the chrism, "sine chrismate et episcopi jussione neque presbyteri neque diaconi jus habeant baptizandi" (*Dial. contra Luciferum*, c. 4). It seems then that, at least in the Western Church, the deacons were permitted to baptize when the bishop gave them authority and sent them the chrism. Thomassin however (i. 2, c. 29, § 14), thinks they had less liberty in this respect in the Eastern Church.

c. The power of receiving penitents appears generally to have been confined to bishops and presbyters; yet this rule was not invariable. Thus Cyprian allows deacons to receive confession (*exomologesis*) and bestow the parting blessing in the case of those penitents who had obtained "libelli" and were prevented by the near approach of death from receiving absolution at the hands of a priest (*Ep.* 13, al. 18, *ad Cler.*). A decree of the first council of Toledo (c. 2) provides that those deacons who had performed public penance should be reduced to the order of subdeacons lest they should lay hands on any. But it is probable that this was not the act which conferred absolution, but only a ceremony which went before the reception of the Eucharist and prepared the penitent for its administration (Thomass. *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Disc.* i. 2, c. 29, § 8). A decree of the council of Eliberis (c. 32) provides that in certain cases of urgent necessity, and at the command of a bishop, the deacon may receive a penitent to communion. But this probably only meant that the deacons might convey the consecrated elements, which, as in the case of Seapion recorded by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 44), might be sent even by a child (Thomassin, i. 2, c. 26, § 3).

In these cases their duties were evidently only ministerial and strictly limited to the subordinate functions belonging to their office. Their right to bestow any blessing on their own authority is plainly denied (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. 28, 46). [BENEDICTION; DOMINUS VOBISCUM.]

ζ. From their bearing the chairs of priests and bishops (iv. *Conc. Brag.* Proem. c. 5), it would appear that in some churches they were expected to perform duties scarcely consistent with the dignity of their office. But their general tendency appears to have been either to claim functions which did not belong to them (i. *Conc. Arelat.* c. 15; *Conc. Quinisext.* c. 16), or to assume a precedence which may indicate that they were in some cases superior to the priests in wealth or social position. Thus they are rebuked for administering in some churches the Eucharist to priests and partaking of it even before bishops and presuming to sit among the priests (i. *Conc. Nic.* c. 18); for their pride in sitting in the first choir and compelling priests to take their places in the second (iv. *Conc. Tolet.* c. 39); for claiming precedence at councils of presbyters when they held any ecclesiastical office (*Conc. Quinisext.* c. 7); for exciting seditions against the bishop (*Constitut. Apost.* ii. 32); for bestowing the benediction at private banquets in presence of priests (Hieron. *Ep.* 85 *ad Evang.*); and for esteeming themselves, on account of their superior wealth, as of higher dignity than the priests (*Idem Comm. in Ezek.* xlviii.).

η. Deacons were strictly limited in the discharge of their office to the parishes for which they were appointed, and there are many decrees of councils forbidding them to wander elsewhere without the consent of the bishop (*Canones Apost.* c. 12; i. *Conc. Nic.* c. 15; *Conc. Quinisext.* c. 17; i. *Arelat.* c. 21; ii. *Bracar.* c. 34; *Agath.* c. 52).

IV. *Promotion to a higher order.*—It has been doubted whether in the earliest ages admission to the diaconate implied, or was a necessary preliminary to, advancement to the priesthood. That this was the case has been inferred from the words of St. Paul to Timothy—*οἱ καλῶς διακονήσαντες βαθμὴν ἑαυτοῖς καλὴν περιποιούνται* (1 Tim. iii. 13). See DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, i. 417. It is undoubtedly true:—1. That in later times *βαθμὸς* was used as a technical term denoting degrees of ecclesiastical office. So it was said of Athanasius, *πάσαν τὴν τῶν βαθμῶν ἀκολουθίαν διεξελθὼν* (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 21), and in that sense it repeatedly occurs in the decrees of councils (*Conc. Eph.* c. 6; *Chalcedon.* c. 29; *Quinisext.* c. 13). 2. That the elevation of deacons to the priesthood was part of the system of the church in after years. Thus it was ordered that deacons who maintained communication with their wives should not be elevated to the priesthood (i. *Conc. Tolet.* c. 1), "ad ulteriorem gradum non ascendat" (i. *Conc. Turon.* 2). So, in the *Questions*, the priest is spoken of as being ordained from among the deacons, "ex diaconis presbyterus ordinatur" (*Quæst. Q.* 101). And so Jerome argues the higher office of the priesthood from the fact that the diaconate was a step to the priesthood, "ex diacono ordinatur presbyter" (Hieron. *Epist. ad Evang.*). But many deacons appear to have grown old and died without promotion to the

priesthood (Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discipl.* 2, c. 33, § 5).

V. *Vestments*.—Concerning the dress of a deacon, it was ordained that when engaged in the services of the altar their apparel should not be too flowing, with a view to the ready performance of their duties, for they are like sailors and boatmen (*καὶ πλοῦται*) in a ship (*Constitut. Apost. ii. 57*). They were to wear a plain stole, "orarium," unadorned with gold or colours, on the left shoulder, the right being left free, to typify the expedition with which they were to discharge their sacred functions (*iv. Conc. Tolet. c. 40*). The manner of wearing the stole distinguished them from the priests; the stole itself was the mark of their office, since the inferior clergy were expressly forbidden to wear it (*Conc. Lond. c. 32, 33*). Due care was to be taken that this distinctive portion of the dress was clearly seen, "non licet diacono velo vel palli scapulas suas involvi" (*Conc. Antioch. c. 13*). In another decree notice is taken of certain deacons who were accustomed to wear their stoles hidden beneath their albs, so as to resemble a subdeacon's, and they are ordered to display it openly for the future on the shoulder (*i. Conc. Brac. c. 9*). Those who had been temporarily deposed for any offence were presented on their reconciliation with an alb and a stole, as symbols of their restoration to their office (*iv. Conc. Tolet. c. 28*). It was to the stole that St. Chrysostom alluded when he saw a vision of the wings of ministering angels in the fine lines that floated over the left shoulders of those engaged in the service of the altar (*καὶ δὲ αὐτῶν ἑστῶτες καὶ τοὶ αἰσθητοὶ αὐτῶν ἀπορροπαὶ ὅπως νεφελῶν*; Chrysost. *Hom. in Pil. Prodig.*). [STOLE.] The alb was to be worn only at the time of ministering at the altar, or reading the Gospels—"Diaconus tempore oblationis tantum vel lectionis albat" (*iv. Conc. Carthag. 41*; *Conc. Narbon. c. 12*), or when performing the duty of the deacon at the opening of councils (*iv. Conc. Tolet. c. 4*). And this renders more emphatic a rebuke administered to certain priests and bishops who were accustomed on great festivals to be borne on chairs or litters by deacons in albs—"albatu diaconibus" (*iv. Conc. Brac. Proem. ch. c. 5*). They also wore a DALMATIC (which see).

VI. *Number of Deacons*.—The number of deacons allotted to each church appears to have varied. The council of Neocaesarea (c. 15) ordained that there should be seven deacons and no more in every city, however large, since that number had been ordained by the apostles (*comp. Conc. Quiniart. c. 18*), and this appears to have been the normal number in many churches (*Constitut. Apost. viii. cc. 4, 46*; Euseb. *H. E. vi. 43*; Hilary, *Comm. in 1 Tim. iii. 8*). But the later practice appears to have been as stated by Sozomen, that the church of Rome retained the number of seven deacons, as instituted by the apostles, but that other churches acted according to their own convenience (*Soz. H. E. vii. 19*). The number of deacons seems, however, to have been generally small; for St. Jerome states that deacons derived a dignity not belonging to their office from their paucity in number—"Diaconus paucitas honorabilis, presbyterus turba facit contemptibilis" (*Epist. ad Rom.*).

VII. *Age*.—The age at which deacons were

allowed to be ordained was universally fixed at twenty-five (*iii. Conc. Carth. c. 4*; *Conc. Agath. c. 16*; *Conc. Quiniart. c. 16*; *iv. Conc. Tolet. c. 20*; *iii. Conc. Arel. c. 6*); but Thomassin relates that Caesarius, bishop of Arles, would not permit any deacon to be ordained in his diocese who was under the age of thirty, and who had not read four times all the books of the Old and New Testament (*Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discipl. ii. 1, c. 89, § 8*).

VIII. *Jurisdiction over*.—A deacon could only be judged by three bishops (*i. Conc. Carth. c. 11*; *ii. Conc. Carth. c. 10*), but Bruno gives a different reading of this canon of whom one was to be his own diocesan (*iii. Conc. Carth. c. 8*). See DEGRADATION, p. 542.

IX. *Diaconus in Monasteria*. In monasteries the name of deacon was sometimes given to those who discharged the office of steward and almoner—"oconomus et dispensator" [*OECONOMUS*] (Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discipl. iii. 2, c. 3, § 4*; *3, c. 29, § 23*). [P. O.]

X. *Cardinal Deacon*.—A cardinal deacon (*diaconus cardinalis*) was in ancient times a deacon who was permanently attached (inordinarius) to a particular church (Gregory the Great, *Epist. v. 2*; see CARDINAL, p. 289).

The name cardinal seems also to have been given to the deacon to whom seniority or pre-eminence among his fellows had been assigned by competent authority. So Gregory the Great, writing to Liberatus, a deacon at Cagliari (*Epist. i. 81*), warns him not to set himself above the other deacons, unless he had been made cardinal by the bishop. Under Charlemagne a cardinal deacon of the city of Rome (*diaconus in cardine constitutus in urbe Romae*) is mentioned with special distinction (*Capitul. ann. 806, c. 23, p. 458\**, Baluze; and *Capitulare, l. c. 153, p. 728*).

XI. A deacon was assigned to each of the seven REGIONS into which the city of Rome was ecclesiastically divided; these were called *Regimentary Deacons* (*diaconi regionarii*). The acolytes of each region were under the authority of the regimentary deacon (Mabilion, *Com. Proev. in Ord. Rom. p. xix.*).

XII. *Stationary Deacons* were those who ministered to the pope on his going to any STATIOS where an office was to be said.

XIII. *Diaconi Testimonales* were those deacons who always lived with and accompanied a bishop, for the avoiding of scandal (*ii. Conc. Truv. c. 12*). See SYNCELLUS. [C.]

DEACONESS (*ἡ δίακονος, διακονισσα, Diaconissa, Diacona*). I. An order of women in the Primitive Church who appear to have undertaken duties in reference to their own sex analogous to those performed by the deacons among men. Their office was probably rendered more necessary by the strict seclusion which was observed by the female sex in Greece, and in many Oriental countries. The word itself is only once used in the New Testament, in the place in which St. Paul speaks of Phoebe as *διακονισσα τοῦ ἐκκλησιασμοῦ* (*Rom. xvi. 1*); but it was usually supposed by ancient commentators that the "women" mentioned by St. Paul in the passage in which he enumerates the qualifications of a deacon (*1 Tim. iii. 11*) were really deaconesses, whether, as the A.V. assumes, a run of deacons (Chrysost.,

Theophylact, Theodoret, Oecumen., quoted by Wordsworth, *Comm. in loco*), or women-deacons (Lightfoot, *Essay on Christian Ministry in Comm. on Philippians*, p. 189).

II. *Qualifications for the Diaconate.*—It has been thought that these deaconesses were widows in the earlier days of the Church, on the ground of the injunction of St. Paul that no widow should be taken into the number under sixty years of age (1 Tim. v. 9, cf. Thomass. *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* i. l. 3, c. 50, n. 10; Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. c. 78, § 11). But it does not appear certain that St. Paul is in this place speaking of deaconesses (cf. Wordsworth, *Comm. in loco*). And it appears certain that virgins were admitted to the office. Thus Pliny speaks, in his epistle to Trajan, of two handmaidens (*ancillae*) whom the Christians called “ministrae.” The *Apostolic Constitutions* (vi. 17) say that the deaconess should be a chaste virgin (*παρθένος ἀγνή*) or else a widow (cf. Just. *Novell.* vi. 6). The 4th council of Carthage (c. 12) speaks of widows and consecrated virgins (*sanctimoniales*) who are selected to discharge the duties of deaconesses. Epiphanius gives three classes from whom they are to be chosen, the virgins, the widows of one husband, and those who lived in continence with one husband (*Expositio Fidei*, n. 21). The council in Trullo also provides that the wife of a bishop who has retired into a convent on the consecration of her husband may, if found fit for the office, be admitted to the diaconate (*Conc. Quinisext.* c. 48). Gregory Nyssen (*Vita Macrinae*) speaks of his sister Macrina, and of one Lampadia, as being virgins and deaconesses. Sozomen (*H. E.* viii. 23) speaks of a noble virgin named Nicarete whom Chrysostom urged without effect to become a deaconess; and of one Olympias, a young widow, who was ordained to the same office (*Id.* viii. 9). Thus it seems evident that the deaconesses cannot be absolutely identified either with the widows or the virgins of the early church, but were probably chosen from these orders as occasion served. It would even appear that, under some circumstances, married women were admitted.

The age at which they were to be admitted to their office was strictly defined. Tertullian (*De Vel. Virg.* c. 9) lays it down that they should be 60 years of age, widows of one husband, and mothers, that their own experience may enable them to give sympathetic help to others (compare Basil, *Epist. Canon.* c. 24 and Jerome, *Ep. ad Salvian.*). The council of Chalcedon (c. 15) fixes it at 40, and says they are to be chosen after strict enquiry, giving as a reason the dishonour done to the grace of God, if any, after having undertaken this service, should marry. The council in Trullo (cc. 14, 40) also assigned the age of 40 for the admission of a deaconess, and 60 for that of a widow, grounding the latter rule on the words of St. Paul (1 Tim. v. 9), thus proving conclusively that, in their opinion, he was not speaking in this place of deaconesses. Theodosius issued a decree that no woman should be admitted to the diaconate till she had attained the age of 60, and borne children (Soz. *H. E.* vii. 16). Justinian's legislation fixed the age of admission at 40 (*Novell.* 123 c. 13) or 50 (*Id.* vi. 6). Thomassin thinks that only the canons which relate to women of 60 years of age refer to deaconesses, and the others apply to widows who have merely taken the vow of continence.

But he is obliged to own that he is maintaining this opinion in the face of the decree of the council of Chalcedon (Thomass. *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* i. l. 3, c. 52, § 3, 4). Yet much appears to have been left to the bishops. Olympias is described as a young widow, and Tertullian (*De Vel. Virg.* c. 9) expresses great indignation at a case, with which he says he was himself acquainted, in which a virgin under 20 was admitted to the order of widows “in viduatu.” under which term the context proves that he is speaking of the diaconate.

From the passages already quoted it will be seen that it was always required that if widows, deaconesses should only have been once married. This was probably in obedience to the injunction of St. Paul, “the wife of one man” (1 Tim. v. 9). Other names of female servants of the Church are, *πρεσβύτιδες*, women-elders, and *πρεσβυτέραι*, aged women. In the N. T. the words appear identical in meaning (cf. 1 Tim. v. 2, and Titus ii. 3). But in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (ii. 28), the *πρεσβυτέραι*, the poorer of whom were to be invited more frequently to the Agapae, are clearly different from the *πρεσβύτιδες* who, as ministers of the church, are allotted a definite share of the first-fruits then offered, while the same proportion of the “eulogiae” is allotted in another place to those who are there called deaconesses (*διακονίσσαις*, *Ibid.* viii. c. 31). Epiphanius appears to make a distinction between the two, when he says that the deaconesses were called widows (*χήρας*), but the elder of them (*τὰς ἐτι γρηγοτέρας*) were called *πρεσβύτιδας*, and notes carefully that the word is quite different from that which designates women-presbyters (*πρεσβυτερίδας*) (Epiph. *Haer.* 79, cap. 4, cf. *Conc. Laod.* c. 11).

Probably from the difficulty of finding virgins qualified for the office, it would appear that the deaconesses were in a great measure chosen from among the widows. And thus they were often called *χήραι*, although distinct from the general body of widows belonging to the Church. Thus Epiphanius, in the passage already quoted, speaks of the order of deaconesses (*διακονισσῶν τάγμα*) who are called widows. So there is a canon speaking of the ordination of widows whom they call deaconesses, “Viduarum consecratio quas diaconas vocitant” (*Conc. Epau.* c. 21); and Basil speaks of a widow who has been taken into the number of widows, that is, received by the Church into the diaconate (Basil, *Ep. Can.* c. 3). Under this term were included all deaconesses, whether they were widows or not. So Ignatius speaks of the virgins who were called widows, *τὰς παρθέους τὰς λεγομένας χήρας* (*Ad Smyrn.* c. 13). So that it is probable that the word may have meant those living without a husband, whether in widowhood, or under a vow of continence (see Jacobson *in loco*).

III. *Duties of Deaconesses.*—The duties of the deaconesses were various. The most important related to the administration of baptism to women [BAPTISM, p. 160]. Thus the 4th council of Carthage (c. 12) speaks of them as widows or virgins selected for the purpose of assisting in the baptism of women, and who therefore must be qualified to assist the unlearned candidates how to answer the interrogatories in the baptismal office, and how to live after baptism. Epiphanius says that the order was instituted to

assist at the baptism of women. that all things might be done with proper decency (*Haer.* 79, cap. 3). In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (iii. 15, 16) it is said that the deaconess (τὴν δίδκονον) was to be chosen for ministering to women, because it was impossible to send a deacon into many houses on account of the unbelievers. At the baptism of women the deaconesses were to administer the chrism before baptism, and to undertake all the necessary arrangements for the women, as the deacon did for the men. No woman was to have any intercourse with the bishop or deacon except through the deaconess (*Ibid.* ii. c. 26). They were also to receive women who were strangers, and allot them their places in the church (*Ibid.* ii. c. 58), and to stand at the door of that part of the church which was allotted to women (*Ibid.* ii. c. 57). Thus the Pseudo-Ignatius (*Ad Antioch.* c. 12) speaks of the deaconesses who kept the doors of the church. They were to attend to the women who were sick or in affliction as the deacon did to the men (*Constitut. Apost.* iii. 19), and in time of persecution to minister to the confessors in prison (Cotel. Annot. in *Constit. Apost.* iii. 15, quoting from Lucian and Libanius). They were to exercise some supervision over the general body of widows, who were to be obedient to the bishops, priests, and deacons, and further to the deaconesses (*Constitut. Apost.* iii. c. 7). They also probably had authority over the virgins. Thus Gregory Nyssen, in the life of Macrina, says that Lampadia was set over the body of virgins in the diaconate. But the latter office appears to have been separable from the diaconate. Sozomen says that Nicarete refused either to become a deaconess, or to preside over the virgins of the Church, as if she might have accepted the one position without the other (*Soz. H. E.* viii. c. 23).

IV. *Rank and Privileges.*—There can be no doubt that deaconesses were considered to be an order in the Church. Nectarius is said to have ordained Olympias to the diaconate, δίδκονον ἐχειροτόνησε (*Soz. H. E.* viii. 9), and the same word is used in the decrees of the councils in Trullo (cc. 14, 40), and Chalcedon (c. 15). Epiphanius speaks of them as an order, τάγμα, in the Church (*Haer.* 79, cap. 3); and they were to receive the consecrated elements immediately after the male clergy, taking precedence of the widows and virgins, and the lay people (*Constitut. Apost.* viii. c. 13). Their ministry is said to be dependent upon that of the deacons (*Ibid.* ii. c. 26). A form of ordination by the bishop is also given in which the words ἐπιθήσεις τὰς χεῖρας, which express the act of ordination, are the same as those employed in the office for the ordination of deacons, which the whole form greatly resembles (*Ibid.* viii. 19, 20).

Thomassin understands deaconesses to be meant in a decree of the 2nd council of Carthage (c. 3), which forbids a virgin to be consecrated by a presbyter, "puellarum consecratio a presbytero non fiat" (ii. *Conc. Carth.* c. 3), or, as modified by the 3rd council (c. 36), without the consent of the bishop (*Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* i. l. 3, c. 50, § 11, 12).

There is however a somewhat remarkable passage in a decree of the council of Nice, which, after speaking of the Paulianist clergy who were to be reordained on their admission to the

Catholic Church, goes on to say that the deaconesses who had assumed that office, or habit, since they had no imposition of hands, could only be reckoned among the laity (1 *Conc. Nic.* c. 19). But this appears simply to refer to certain women among the Paulianists who had assumed the habit or office of deaconess without imposition of hands, and who therefore could not be reordained but simply reckoned among the laity (cf. Thomassin *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* i. l. 3, c. 50, § 12). Indeed the same canon speaks of deaconesses as among the clergy (ἐν τῇ κλήρῳ) and to be received in the same manner. Thus clearly making a distinction between those among the Paulianists who had been regularly ordained, and those who had assumed the office without ordination. But the reading is doubtful (see Bruns, *Canones*, i. 19), though Thomassin, in the place above quoted, accepts it without question as authentic.

The ordination, however, was expressly understood to confer no sacerdotal functions of any kind. The 4th council of Carthage (c. 100) expressly orders that no woman should venture to baptize. It appears that certain sects of the Montanists ordained women as priests and even as bishops. In opposition to these Epiphanius, while speaking of them as an order in the Church, asserts that they were women-elders, but not priestesses in any sense (προσβυτερίδας ἡλειώσας), and that their mission was not to interfere in any way with the functions allotted to the priests (ἐπαρετέειν), but simply to perform certain offices in the care of women (Epiph. *Haer.* 79, cap. 3). Tertullian also says that it is not permitted to a woman to speak in the church, nor to baptize, nor to make the oblation (offerre), nor discharge any of the offices allotted to men (virile munus) (*Tert. de Vel. Virg.* c. 9), and is indignant at the forwardness of women who take upon themselves to teach and to baptize contrary to the express command of the Apostle (Id. *De Baptis.* c. 17). The *Constitutions* (iii. 9) emphatically deny the right of women to baptize, asserting that priestesses are ordained for female deities, and are a heathen, not a Christian institution; and that if Our Lord had wished them to baptize, he would himself have been baptized by his own mother rather than by John the Baptist. The latter argument is also used by Epiphanius, who says that if Our Lord had ordered women to exercise any priestly or ecclesiastical ministry, he would first have given that office to the Virgin Mary (*Haer.* 79, cap. 3).

V. *Celibacy.*—It is evident that the ordination of deaconesses included a vow of celibacy. The council of Chalcedon (c. 15) pronounces an anathema against those who should marry after having been ordained to the diaconate. And Justinian's legislation ordered that those who married should be sentenced to forfeiture of property and capital punishment (*Novell.* vi. 6).

VI. *Discontinuance.*—It is probable that this occasioned the discontinuance of the order. Certainly it did not last long. The council of Laodicea, A.D. 320, forbade the appointment of any of those who were called προσβυτερίδες (*Conc. Laod.* c. 11). The 1st council of Orange (c. 26), A.D. 441, simply forbids the ordination of any deaconess whatever; and again, "Viduarum consecrationem quas diaconas vocitant ab omni regione nostrâ penitus abrogamus" (*Conc. Epau.* c. 21).



The 2nd council of Orleans (cc. 17, 18) decrees that deaconesses who had married were to be excommunicated unless they renounced their husbands, but none in future were to be ordained on account of the weakness of the sex. It would appear that, in the time of the writer of certain commentaries which appear under the name of Jerome, the order was quite extinct in the Western Church, and only known by report as existing in the East. Thus he speaks of "those whom in the East they call deaconesses" (Hieron. *Comm. in 1 Tim.* iii. 11), and "In the East women deaconesses (*diaconissae mulieres*) appear to minister to their own sex in baptism and the ministry of the word" (Id. *Comm. Rom.* xvi. 1). Thomassin thinks that the order was extinct in the Western Church in the 10th or 12th century (*Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* i. l. 3, c. 49, § 8), but that it lingered on a little longer in the Church of Constantinople, though only in convents (Id. i. l. 3, c. 47, § 10).

The title of deaconesses was also given sometimes to the wives of deacons (ii. *Conc. Turon.* c. 19), and to abbesses of convents (Thomass. *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* i. l. 3, c. 47, § 10). [P. O.]

#### DEAD, BAPTISM OF AND FOR THE.

#### DEAD, COMMUNION OF THE.

The three practices thus grouped together had a common origin in the feeling that baptism was an indispensable condition of salvation; that for those who had been baptized the other great sacrament of the Church was almost as essential; that it, at least, brought with it priceless advantages to the receiver when he entered on the unseen world; that it was the *viaticum* for that last journey. The earliest trace of the feeling and its results is seen in the strange, passing allusion by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 29, to the *βαπτίζομενοι ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν*. It is not within the scope of the present paper to enter fully into the exegesis of that perplexing passage. The strange contrast which its apparent meaning presented to the received doctrine and practice of the Church made the interpreters of a later period anxious to find a way of escape, and from Chrysostom and Theophylact downward there have been those who have seen in it a reference to the profession of faith in the resurrection of the body made at baptism. It is believed, however, that this is simply a non-natural and untenable interpretation. It is better to take the words in their obvious sense, and to remember that St. Paul simply draws from the practice of which they speak an *argumentum ad hominem*, and does not, in the slightest degree, sanction the practice itself. However startling it may seem that a feeling so gross in its superstition should spring up so soon, we have to remember that it was more or less analogous to the "sorrow without hope" of which St. Paul speaks in writing to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. iv. 13), and which sprang out of the belief that those who died before the coming of the Lord were shut out from all participation in the glory of the kingdom. So it was at Corinth and, it may be, elsewhere. Men were told that by baptism they were admitted to the kingdom of God; that it was the pledge not only of immortality for the soul, but of resurrection for the body. But what would become of those who, though they had believed, were cut off by death before receiving baptism?

His answer led to the expedient of a "vicarium baptismi" (Tertull. *De Resurr. Carn.* c. 48, *Adv. Marcion.* v. 10), to which the usages of later Judaism offered, at least, some remote analogies (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. in 1 Cor.* xv.). The practice assumed among the Ebionites (Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 30) and the Marcionites (Chrysost. *Hom.* 40 in 1 Cor.) a somewhat dramatic form. The corpse was laid upon the bed, and beneath there was concealed a living man. The question "Wilt thou be baptised?" was formally put and answered, and then the rite was performed on the living as the proxy for the dead. There is no reason for thinking that the practice ever became common in the Church. Its adoption by heretical sects probably secured its condemnation. But the feeling had showed itself in another form more widely. The stronger the feeling that baptism conferred what could be conferred in no other way, the more men lamented over the non-fulfilment of the condition by those they loved. The Church allowed baptism *in articulo mortis*, it is true, even where the ordinary conditions were not fulfilled. It might, in case of necessity, be administered by a layman or even by a woman. But still death might come beforehand. What was to be done then? What was to be done in the parallel case of the baptized man dying without communion? In all parts of the Church, and for some centuries, we find traces of the prevalence of the practice of administering baptism to the corpse. It is forbidden, it is true, by Councils, but the locality and date of the Synods that prohibit it, are significant as showing how widely spread it was. We have canons against it and against the analogous practice of placing the Eucharist within the lips of the dead, in the third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397 c. 6); in the Council in Trullo at Constantinople (A.D. 692, c. 83); in that of Auxerre (A.D. 578, c. 12); in the Canons of Boniface, Bishop of Mainz (Can. 20). Gregory of Nazianzum (*Orat.* 40) utters a serious warning against it. Even when the better sense of the Church rejected the more revolting usage, there was, as has been said under BURIAL, both in the East and West, the corresponding usage, hardly less superstitious, of placing a portion of the consecrated bread upon the breast of the corpse to be interred with him, as a charm against the attacks of malignant spirits. The practice of the baptism of the dead prevailed most, according to one writer, among the Phrygian followers of Montanus (Philastr. *De Haeres.* c. 2). [E. H. P.]

#### DEAD, FESTIVAL OF THE. [ALL SOULS DAY.]

#### DEAD, PRAYER FOR THE. [CANON OF THE LITURGY: MASS.]

#### DEAD, TREATMENT OF. [BURIAL OF THE DEAD.]

DEAMBULATORIA, DEAMBULACRA, covered porticos for walking in, more particularly those surrounding the body of a church, *deambulatoria ecclesiarum*. These were sometimes of two stories. This was the case in the church built by Constantine over the Holy Sepulchre, which is described by Eusebius (*Vit. Const.* lib. iii. c. 37) as having two porticos, *διπλὰ στοὰ*, on each side of the church, corresponding to the length of the building, with upper and lower ranges of pillars. Gregory Nazianzen also (*Orat.*

16) describes the church erected by his father as having *συναδισόφοροι*. The church of St. Sophia was similarly surrounded with porticos, except towards the east, on which side they were usually wanting (Procop. *de Aedif.* lib. i. c. 8, lib. v. c. 6), and which were of two stories towards the west (Ducange, *Constantinopolis Christiana*, lib. iii. cc. 16, 17). The "deambulatoria" sometimes contained altars (Ducange *sub voc.*). The term is also used for the walks of a cloister, "deambulatoria claustrorum." [CLOISTER.] [E. V.]

DEAN. [DECANUS.]

DEATH, REPRESENTATIONS OF.—Though symbolic images involving the thought of death are by no means rare in early Christian art, they have reference almost entirely to the state of death, rather than the process, so to speak. They point to the condition of the restored soul, rather than to the painful separation of body and soul. Thus the thought and representations of death are generally without terror. The Raising of Lazarus [LAZARUS] is repeated (Bottari, *passim*) as an earnest of the Lord's power: the Resurrection accompanies the Crucifixion in early art, as in the Laurentine MS. Flowers are freely used to decorate tombs, with little change from their Pagan employment; and the bird set at liberty, the palm-branch, the car or chariot at rest, and the ship at anchor (see s. vv.), occur the two first *passim*, the others occasionally. Herzog (*Real-Encyc.*, s. v. "Sinnbilder") states that the skeleton figure of death, in its retrospective view, pointing to the change from the life and pleasure of this world is traceable to remains of Gnostic symbols. The writer of this article can remember no earlier instance of it, than Giotto's crowned skeleton at Assisi. (See Crowe and Cavalcaselle's *Italian Painters*, life of Giotto.) Orgagna and, lastly, Holbein bring down this Gothic grotesque symbol of the visible change, and outer side of the subject, to modern days.

For the apparently Pagan Chariot of Death in the Catacomb of St. Praetextatus see Perret, *Catacombes*, &c., vol. i. pl. 72; also Bottari, vol. iii. 219. [R. St. J. T.]

DEBTORS. The Jewish law in reference to debts and debtors, and to the redemption of pledges, is very peculiar. That of the Christian Church has been mainly founded on the Roman, which, originally very harsh towards debtors (see Gibbon, c. xlv., &c.), under the empire was greatly mitigated in their favour. Thus by a constitution of Diocletian and Maximin (A.D. 294), it was expressly enacted that the laws do not suffer freemen to be compelled to become slaves to their creditors by reason of their debts (*Code*, bk. iv. Tit. ix. l. 12). Under the older law there had already been introduced in favour of the debtor the expedient of the *bonorum cessio*, something between our bankruptcy, and what a few years back was distinguished from it as insolvency (see Dig. bk. xlii. Tit. iii.). It was a question among the jurists whether, if a man had once given up all his goods to his creditors, any after acquired property of his was subject to their claims. Sabinus and Cassius would have him free (*Ibid.* l. 4), thus assimilating him to the bankrupt. Ulpian took a middle, and it must be said, an unwise course, holding that the liability depended on

the quantum of the subsequent earnings, and that he was not to be disturbed in the possession of anything left or given to him by way of charity for his maintenance (*Ibid.* l. 6). Modestinus also held the liability to attach, if the property were sufficient to justify the action of the praetor (*Ibid.* l. 7). Under the Code, by a constitution of Alexander Severus (A.D. 224), the debtor was not held free from his debt till the creditor was paid in full, but the *cessio bonorum* exempted him from imprisonment and from torture (bk. vii. tit. lxxi. ll. 1, 8). It was in the option of the creditors to allow the debtors five years' delay instead of accepting the *cessio*, such option to be exercised, in case of difference of opinion, according to the figure of the debt, so that a single creditor whose claim should amount to more than the sum total of all the others had the fate of the debtor in his hands (l. 8; Const. of Justinian). An attempt having moreover been made to make the *cessio* compulsory on the debtor, the 135th *Novel* forbade this.

Debtors were under the Christian emperors admitted to the right of sanctuary in churches and their precincts, Jews only excepted, who pretended a wish to become converted in order to frustrate their creditors, and who were not to be admitted until they had paid all their debts (*Code*, bk. i. t. xii. l. 1 ff.), although the public imposts might be levied within the churches themselves, and if the collectors were subjected to violence or seditious opposition, the *defensores* and *oeconomi* of the Church were made responsible for the fiscal dues not collected (*Novel* 17, c. 7); but otherwise it was expressly enacted by a constitution of the Emperor Leo, A.D. 466 (bk. i. t. xii. l. 6), that the bishops and *oeconomi* were not to be held responsible for the debts of persons claiming sanctuary.

We may moreover observe in the 60th *Novel* a law forbidding creditors to torment their dying debtors or their families, place their seals upon the property, or interfere with the funeral, under severe penalties (c. i.); and in the 115th another which forbade the pressing by creditors of the heirs, parents, children, wives, husbands, agnates, cognates, connexions or sureties of a deceased debtor within nine days of his death, the delay not to be reckoned as time running for prescription nor otherwise to prejudice the creditor (c. v.). The 134th *Novel* forbids a custom which it speaks of as prevalent in various places, that of detaining a debtor's children as pledges, or as slaves or servants for hire, under penalty of forfeiture of the debt, damages to an equal amount, and corporal punishment (c. vii.). As to debts due to bankers, see the 136th *Novel*, and 7th *Edict* of Justinian.

Under the Ostrogothic rule in Italy, the Edict of Theodoric required debtors condemned by judicial sentence to pay within two months, under pain of the sale of their pledges (c. 124). Where, however, a creditor seized the goods of one who was not under obligation to him, he was to pay fourfold the value, if sued within the year, otherwise simply to restore the amount seized; and so of the fruits of land (c. 131). Under the Lombard law, on the contrary, by practice of seizing the person of the debtor the way of pledge seems to reappear, although the liability is confined to himself and his *guthans*, or nearest future heir (*Laws of Rotharis*, c. 149;

A.D. 638 or 643). Little, however, is found generally in the barbaric Codes on the subject.

It is not surprising to find the Church occasionally interfering either by spiritual penalties, or conversely by kindly assistance to the unfortunate, where the municipal law failed to take effect for their relief. A signal instance of ecclesiastical assistance to a debtor is that which forms the subject of Augustine's 215th or 268th letter, addressed to his congregation, to which he appealed to repay Macedonius, who had suffered by his kindness to one Fascius, a debtor who had taken sanctuary.

An Irish Synod of the middle of the 5th century (450 or 456) enacted the excommunication of fraudulent debtors, as if they were heathens, till they paid their debts (c. 20). In the collection of Irish canons, supposed to belong to the end of the 7th century, there is a whole book (xxxii.) "of debts and pledges, and usury," and another (xxxiii.) "of sureties and rates." There is however no reason for supposing that enactments like this ever took effect beyond the limits of Ireland.

From the letters of Gregory the Great, (A.D. 590-603) we obtain some glimpses of the condition of debtors at the heart of Christendom, towards the end of the 6th and beginning of the 7th century, and of the behaviour of the Church towards them. Two of his letters (*Epistt.* ii. 56 and iii. 43) are occupied with the case of a Syrian named Cosmas, a poor debtor, whose sons, according to his account, were detained by his creditors as pledges for his debts, and whom he was anxious to benefit.

Several other instances to the same effect occur in the same collection. A letter (*Epist.* v. 35) to Secundinus, bishop of Taormina, is written in favour of one Sincerus, whose wife was pressed to pay the debts of her late father. See also *Epist.* vii. pt. 2, 37 and 60. Compare SANCTUARY; USURY. [J. M. L.]

DECALVATIO. [CORPORAL PUNISHMENTS, p. 472.]

DECANATUS = 1. the office of dean; 2. the district of a rural dean; 3. sometimes a farm or monastic grange, in late charters. [A. W. H.]

DECANIA, the district under a DECANUS [p. 539], temp. Car. Calvi. The word was used in later times also for a monastic farm or grange (Du Cange). [A. W. H.]

DECANICIUM (Δεκανίκιον). The PASTORAL STAFF borne before the Patriarch of Constantinople on solemn occasions: delivered to him in the first instance by the emperor (Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s.v.). Pancirolus however (*Thesaurus* i. 85) states that the decanicium (or *dicanitium*) was a silver mace. [C.]

DECANICUM, DECANIA, or DECANICA (Δεκανικόν), an ecclesiastical prison, *carcer canonicus* or *demeritorum damus*, a place of confinement in which criminous clerks were incarcerated by their bishops and other ecclesiastical superiors. The word is derived from the *decuni*, the subordinate officials—the *ραβδούχοι* or lictors of the church—who were the jailers. By a false etymology it is sometimes written *δικανικόν*. Another form, *διακονικόν*, also found, may be justified by the fact that the sacristy and other ~~and~~ ecclesiastical buildings sometimes served

the purpose of a prison. Cf. the letter of Pope Gregory II., A.D. 731-741, to the Emperor Leo Isaurus, in which, comparing the mercy of the ecclesiastical with the severity of temporal rulers, he says that when one of the clergy was proved to be worthy of punishment, instead of hanging or beheading him, the bishop hung round his neck the gospels and the cross, and imprisoned him in one of the treasuries or *diagonica*, or *catechumena* of the church (Labbe, *Concil.* viii. p. 25). The word *decanicum* is not unfrequently met with in early times: *e.g.* in the petition of Basil the deacon to the Emperor Theodosius, complaining of the cruel indignities he and his friends had been subjected to at the hands of Nestorius (*Acta Concil. Ephes.* pars i. c. 30, § 3 *et passim*; Labbe, *Concil.* iii. 425-431). "They had been stripped and beaten, and led off half-naked to the *decanicum*, where they were detained without food, and again beaten by the *decuni*."

The *Decanica* are named among the buildings of which heretics were to be deprived, in a decree of Arcadius and Honorius (*Justin. Cod.* lib. i. tit. v. c. 3); and in the *Novells* of Justinian (lxxix. c. 3, p. 211) we find a decree addressed to Mennas, Archbishop of Constantinople, ordering that officers venturing to execute a sentence of secular courts on clerics should be imprisoned in the so-called *decanica* (καθειργέσθωσαν ἐν τοῖς καλουμένοις δεκανίκοις). [E. V.]

DECANUS (in an ecclesiastical sense) =

I. A member of a guild, whose occupation was that of interring the dead [COPIATAE]: reckoned among *clerici* by St. Jerome, Epiphanius, the *Cod. Theodos.*, &c.; called also *κοπίαρης* (Epiphanius), *fossarius* (Pseudo-Jerom., *De VII. Ord. Eccl.*), *lecticarius* (Justinian, *Novel.* xliii. *Præf.*), *collegiatus* (in the laws of Honorius, &c., Justinian, Theodosius the Great), *decanus* (same laws; and *Collect. Constit. Eccl.* in *Biblioth. Jur. Canon.* p. 1243). The office was apparently instituted by Constantine at Constantinople, where it numbered in his time 1100 members, but was afterwards reduced to 950; but then again increased by the Emperor Anastasius, who also endowed it (Justinian, *Novel.* xliii. lix.; *Cod.* lib. iv. *De Sacrosanct. Eccl.*). From thence it spread to "other populous churches." The poor were to be buried by its members gratuitously, at least where it was endowed (*id. Novel.* lix.). The *δεκανοί* mentioned by St. Chrysostom (*Hom.* xiii.) were a different, and a civil, body of officials, attached to the emperor's palace. (Bingham, Du Cange, Meursius, Suicer.)

II. A presbyter appointed to preside as the bishop's deputy over a division of his diocese: called at first archipresbyter (Thomassin, l. iii. 66, § 14; Dansey, p. i. § 2), with the epithet of *vicanus* (*Conc. Turon.* II. c. 19, A.D. 567; Bruns's *Canones*, ii. 229), to distinguish him from the urban archipresbyter or protopope, and succeeding under that name to some of the functions of the older chorepiscopus: originally in the Church of France:—first called *Decanus*, and his district *Decania*,—(setting aside a canon, wrongly attributed to the Council of Agde, A.D. 506, but really of the date of Charles the Great, acc. to Dansey, and two questionable canons respectively of *Conc. Tollet.* V. A.D. 636, and VII. A.D. 646)—later than about the time of Charles the Great

(see *Capit. Car. Calvi*, tit. v. § 3; *Conc. Tolos.* A.D. 843, c. 3; Hincmar, *Opp.* i. 738, c. A.D. 878); called also *decanus ruralis* (e.g. in *Conc. Trever.* A.D. 948, c. 3), *magister* (by Hincmar, v. *Conc. Gallic.* III. 623), *decanus episcopi* (when introduced into England, a step perhaps facilitated by the existence of the civil division into tithings, about A.D. 1052, in *Legg. Edw. Confess.* xxxi., and see Du Cange, and Carpentier's *Supplem.* to Du Cange), *decanus Christianorum* (in a charter of A.D. 1092, ap. Du Cange), and commonly afterwards *decanus Christianitatis*, probably as having to do with courts Christian, i.e. with the bishop's courts. The developed functions of the office belong to a period later than that to which the present work relates. In Ireland, the peculiar institution of the court became mixed up with that of *plebanus*, or rural dean. Beyond the British isles and France, the office does not seem to have existed. (Dansey, *Horae Decanicae Rurales*, 2nd edit. 1844; Du Cange; Spelman.)

III. The chief officer of a cathedral, *decanus ecclesiae cathedralis*, as distinguished from the *decanus urbanus* and *ruralis*, or city and country archpresbyters, after the chapter of the cathedral had become a separate and corporate body [CANONICI]. The office so entitled dates in its full development only from the 10th or 11th centuries, Normandy and Norman England being the countries where it first occurs, Rouen having a dean in the 10th century, and the Dean of St. Paul's, A.D. 1086, being the first English dean. But as a cathedral officer, the *decanus* dates from the 8th century, when he is found, after the monastic pattern, as subordinate to the *praepositus* or provost, who was the bishop's vicegerent as head of the chapter. The arrangement still survives, after a fashion, in the relative positions of the provost or head, and of the dean, in Oxford and Cambridge colleges. The Council of Mayence, A.D. 813, substituted deans for provosts. And that of Aix la Chapelle, A.D. 817, subordinated the provost to the dean. A series of provosts, afterwards mostly converted into deans—at Canterbury until the time of Lanfranc, at Worcester A.D. 872–972, at Ely A.D. 878, at Lichfield A.D. 818–822, at Wells before A.D. 1088, at Beverley A.D. 1070, at several foreign cathedrals, and in some English collegiate churches—is given by Walcot (*Cathedrals*, p. 38). The change probably arose from the abandonment on the part of the provosts of the spiritual and internal direction of the chapter, through their attention to its temporal and external concerns. The functions of the dean are laid down, for the diocese of Lincoln, A.D. 1212, as sanctioned by Pope Alexander III. (Wilk. *Conc.* I. 535, 536), and for that of Lichfield A.D. 1194, by Bishop Nonant (*ib.* 497), and for that of Sarum, as adopted by Glasgow (*ib.* 741). But the office, in this full sense of the title, belongs to a period long subsequent to the date of Charles the Great.

IV. Deans of Peculiars, and other special applications of the title of dean, belong also to a like later period. As does likewise the deanery of the province of Canterbury, attached to the bishopric of London. (Thomassin; Du Cange; Walcot's *Archaeology* and *Cathedrals*.) [A. W. H.]

V. *Decanus Monasticus*.—Among monks the office seems to have existed in Asia and Egypt, at least in a rudimentary form, from almost the very commencement of coenobitism; in

subordination to the 'pater,' 'abbas,' 'hegumenos' or 'archimandrita' (Bingh. *ib.*). The 'decanus' was deputed by him to superintend the younger brethren, drilling them in self-denial and encouraging them to confess to him even their secret thoughts (Cassian, *Inst.* v. 8, 9). Especially he was to watch over the novices just emerging, their first year of probation being past, from the 'xenodochium' or strangers' room (*ib.* 7), setting them an example of obedience by himself obeying the 'praepositus' even in things impossible (*ib.* 10). Augustine speaks of the 'decanus' as having charge over ten monks (*De Mor. Eccl.* 31); Jerome, over nine; (*Ep.* 22 *ad Eustoch.*). The 'decanus' was to provide for the temporal necessities of his monks, for instance, by sending out to them the linen under-garments; (cf. Cass. *Instit.* iv. 10) to watch by night over their cells; to lead them to and from refectory; to assign to each the allotted task; and, at the close of the day, to hand over the work done to the 'oeconomus' or steward, who was to make a monthly report of it to the abbat (Jerome, *ib.* cf. Bingh. *u.s.*).

The great monastic legislator of M. Casino adopted cordially this important feature in coenobitism, prescribing more precisely the duties of the 'decanus,' and placing him next in rank to the 'prior' or 'praepositus.' Indeed, Benedict preferred deans to priors as less likely to collide with the supreme authority of the abbat (*Reg.* c. 65; cf. *Conc. Mogunt.* I. 816, 11). All monasteries, except the very smallest, for the words 'major congregatio' are taken to mean any number over twenty (Mart. in *Reg. S. Bened.* 17), were to have deans, one for ten brethren. He was to have charge of his 'decania' in all things, with this proviso, "according to the precepts of the abbat" (*Reg.* 21). He was to be appointed not by seniority, 'per ordinem,' but by merit, at the choice of the abbat, or, according to some commentators, of the abbat and seniors (*ib.*). He was to hold office for an undefined period, one year or more (Mart. in *Reg.* 31–2), in fact, "quamdiu se bene gesserit," but after three admonitions was to be deprived (*Reg.* 21). He was to guard the morals and conduct of the monks under his care, especially the dormitory (*Reg.* 22; cf. *Reg. Magist.* 11); and to hear their confessions (*Reg.* 46).

In subsequent adaptations of the Benedictine Rule the office of Dean is defined still more precisely. By the rule entitled 'Magistri,' his badge of office was to be a wand 'virga,' or rather a crook, symbolic of pastoral duties (*Reg. Mag.* 11, cf. Menard. in *Conc. Reg.* 28, 2). The same rule orders two deans for each decade of monks, to relieve one another, so that one or the other may be always with them (*ib.*). They were to preside at table in the refectory (*ib.*). By the rule of Fructuosus, the dean is to keep watch over the younger monks, even in minute points of deportment, to receive their most secret confessions, and to delate impenitent offenders to the abbat or prior (*Reg. Fruct.* 12). By the council of Aachen, in 817, the eldest in rank of the deans is to superintend the other deans (*Conc. Aquisgr.* 55).

According to Menard (in *Reg. S. Bened.* 21), the practice of the Reformed Benedictines as to the office of dean has varied considerably. With the Cistercians it has been unknown (*ib.*). With



the monks of Clugni, the deans administered the temporalities of the monastery, being the 'villicarum provisores' or 'suffraganei Prioris' (*ib.* c1. Du Cange, *Glossar.* s.v.). With the monks of M. Casino, the dean at one time ranked next to the abbat (cf. Alteser. *Ascetic.* ii. 9); but afterwards, the original institution of deans was revived (Menard. *ib.*). In some monasteries, according to Du Cange (*Glossar.* s.v.), there was a 'foris decanus' to look after the interests of the monastery, outside its walls; in some a 'decanus operis' or 'operariorum' over the work-people; in some, the tenants under the monastery, 'villici' or 'coloni' were called 'decani.' Hence the 'decania' or 'decanatus' came to mean sometimes a grange belonging to a monastery (*ib.*). In nunneries there were officials, 'decanae,' corresponding to the 'decani' in the older sense of the word, to maintain order and discipline (*ib.*).

See, also, Haefteni *Disquisitiones Monasticas* III. tract vi. disquis. 4, Antverpiae, 1644. *Dictionnaire du Droit Canonique*, par Durand de Maillane, Lyon, 1776, 1786.

For the growth and development of the office of 'decanus' in cathedral-monasteries see under CANONICI. [I. G. S.]

#### DECIMAE. [TITHES.]

#### DECREE. [DECRETUM.]

DECRETAL. As has been observed in a previous article [CANON LAW], a decretal in its strict canonical sense is an authoritative rescript of a pope, in reply to some question propounded to him, just as a decree is an ordinance enacted by him, with the advice of his cardinals, but not drawn from him by previous inquiry.<sup>a</sup> The very word therefore implies power and jurisdiction. Hence, though from the 4th century downwards epistles of the Bishops of Rome are extant,<sup>b</sup> the earlier specimens do not come up to the full canonical idea of decretals, inasmuch as they possessed, when issued, a moral weight rather than a legislative force. They are thus spoken of by Gieseler:—"Another source of influence to the Roman bishops was the custom of referring to them particularly, as the head of the only apostolic Church of the West, all questions concerning the apostolic customs and doctrines, which in the East were addressed indiscriminately to the bishops of any church founded by an apostle. This gave them occasion to issue a vast number of didactic letters (epistolae decretales), which soon assumed a tone of apostolic authority, and were held in high estimation in the West, as flowing from apostolic tradition." (Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.*, Second Period, chap. iii.)

As the papal power became firmly established, such epistles acquired more and more force, until at length they occupied the position tersely expressed by the canonist Lancellottus in later

days—"Decreta Pontificum Romanorum canonibus conciliorum pari potestate exaequantur" (lib. i. tit. 3). Conversely, also, the papal power itself was mainly indebted for its development to the canonical doctrine of decretals. For it was the collection of forged decretals put forth by the Pseudo-Isidore which chiefly persuaded the world that the popes had from the most primitive times been in the habit of issuing authoritative rescripts; and this being once admitted, it followed that they must still have power to act in a like manner.<sup>c</sup> Moreover, the pretended decretals were so full of assertions of the papal prerogatives, that when they were once accepted as genuine and valid, they were a sufficient justification for the issue of any subsequent document of the same sort, however extravagant. As the collection of the Pseudo-Isidore did not appear until the middle of the 9th century, it lies beyond the period to which the present work is confined. But some notice of it is required on many grounds. It contains numerous alleged decretals of very early popes, the spuriousness of which must be pointed out. It gave the chief support to the canonical idea of a "Decretal," and therefore enables us to show that that idea in its full development is probably later than 800 A.D. It contains several decretals taken from the older collections of Dionysius and of the Spanish Church, and therefore gives us occasion to notice that the idea in question, though not fully matured, was not unknown at an earlier period. It may be convenient therefore briefly to indicate the character and contents of the work.

It commences with nearly sixty letters of various Bishops of Rome, from Clement to Melchiades. These are all fictitious, and are all (according to Heinschius, cxxxi.), with the exception of two letters of Clement (which are in whole or in part more ancient forgeries), the work of the Pseudo-Isidore.

Then follow various conciliar decrees, with which we are not here concerned, but many of which are unauthentic. In a third part we have again decretals of popes down to Gregory II. In this series the first that is genuine is that of Siricius to Himerius or Eumerius, Bishop of Tarragona.<sup>d</sup> Among those that follow, some are to a certain extent genuine, or, at all events, have been taken, with more or less exactness, from existing records. Others, on the contrary, are either the invention of the compiler, or have been compounded by him out of some existing materials, or, lastly, were forgeries found ready to his hand.<sup>e</sup> Everywhere, however, unwarranted alterations and additions are to be found,

<sup>a</sup> The work is considered by Heinschius to have appeared between 847 and 853, A.D. It has been usual to trace its origin to the province of Mayence, but Heinschius attributes it to that of Rheims. The author is not certainly known (see Heinschius, ccviii. and ccxxix. et seq.). By some he has been identified with Benedictus Levita; but, according to Heinschius, he only availed himself of materials found in the collection of Benedictus. (Heins. cxliii.)

<sup>d</sup> With this the original collection of Dionysius began.

<sup>e</sup> Milman makes 39, Phillips 35, false decrees in this part of the work. It is hard to say with precision how many of the forgeries were previously in existence. On this point the careful analysis in the preface of Heinschius should be consulted. See also Phillips, p. 63, Bickell, l. 35, note. It is impossible to condense the results.

<sup>b</sup> Decretalis epistola est, quando Papa ad consultationem alicujus respondet: sive solus, sive de consilio fratrum. . . . Decretum est, quod Papa de consilio fratrum, nulla consultatione facta, super aliquâ re statuit, et in rescriptis redegit. . . . Constitutio est quod Papa proprio motu statuit, et in rescriptis redegit, sine consilio fratrum et nulla consultatione facta.—Hostiensis, *Aurea summa*, *Proem.* 14.

<sup>c</sup> As regards the 3rd century, see Phillips, p. 6, and Bickell, l. 35, note. Cornelius is the only Pope of whom any letters of that date remain.

wholly spurious letters being apparently mixed with those that have some title to be deemed authentic.<sup>f</sup> It thus appears that the work is not a pure, unmixed forgery. It rests in part on older collections. These are the Hispana collectio, the so-called Hadriano-Dionysian collection (or *Codex Hadrianus*), and some other works of less importance. Of these some account has been already given under a previous head [CANON LAW], and it is therefore unnecessary to repeat it here. As there mentioned, the work of Dionysius (subsequently sanctioned by Pope Hadrian) was the first which placed the papal epistles side by side with the decrees of Councils. This seems to have been the important step. From this time an opening was given to contend that they were on a par, and the wide circulation which the work obtained very materially assisted the pretensions founded on it. Then came the Spanish collection, which yet further contributed to invest the papal epistles with a legislative, as distinguished from a moral, authority in the Church. It carried on the series further than Dionysius had done;<sup>g</sup> and at length, in the 9th century, the appearance of the work of the Pseudo-Isidore (so called to distinguish him from the Isidore to whom the Spanish collection is attributed), with its crowd of fictitious epistles which an uncritical age received in implicit faith, put into the hands of the popes the greatest weapon which they have ever wielded. The result therefore is that previously to the year 800 A.D. the foundations were really laid for the superstructure afterwards raised; but it was chiefly due to the subsequent work that that superstructure attained its vast proportions and peculiar character. For the forgeries invented by, or enshrined in, that work, not only vastly increased the number of papal epistles, and carried them back to primitive times, but were directly framed with a view of supporting the highest claims of the Roman see. There is little or nothing in the genuine epistles which could be made the foundation of many of the later papal claims, whereas the fictitious decretals furnish a basis for the largest pretensions. It was for this reason that

<sup>f</sup> As an indication that the learned of all communions are substantially agreed at the present day as to the character of the work as a whole, it may not be uninteresting to cite the following summary of the work from the Benedictine notes to the *Bibliotheca Canonica* of Ferraris, edit. 1845: (stated to be published "Superiorum permissu et privilegio.") Under the title "Canones" the collection of Pseudo-Isidore is thus spoken of:—"Continet collectio præter quinquaginta Canones Apostolorum ex Hadriani collectione, epistolas Romanorum Pontificum a Clemente usque ad Silvestrum, quarum omnium ipse Isidorus auctor fuit, exceptis duabus Clementis ad Jacobum literis; tum canones plurium concillorum, in quibus falsa habetur Constitutio Constantini ad Silvestrum; postremo Pontificum literas ab ipso Silvestro ad Gregorium M. aliis cum epistolis ac monumentis, quorum pars ex aliis collectionibus sumpta vera est atque germana, præter epistolas omnes Pontificum Sæculi antiquiorum ab Isidoro confectas, exceptis S. Damasi ad Paulinum literis, pars altera cum actis concilli Romani sub Julio et Concilli I. V. et VI. sub Symmacho, excogitata et inventa est." See another account, also from a Roman Catholic point of view, in Phillips' *Du Droit Ecclésiastique*, chap. I. § 8.

<sup>g</sup> Phillips (p. 29) seems to think that some decretals purporting to proceed from the earliest popes had been added to the collection of Dionysius at the end of the 7th century, thus carrying the series backward also, and paving the way for Pseudo-Isidore.

they were brought at once into prominence, and that from the time of their appearance decretals, as distinguished from other sources of ecclesiastical law, play so large a part in the works of the canonists.

"The false decretals," says Milman (*Lat. Christ.* book v. chap. 4), do not merely assert the supremacy of the popes—the dignity and privileges of the Bishop of Rome—they comprehend the whole dogmatic system and discipline of the Church, the whole hierarchy from the highest to the lowest degree, their sanctity and immunities, their persecutions, their disputes, their right of appeal to Rome.<sup>h</sup> They are full and minute on church property; on its usurpation and spoliation; on ordinations; on the sacraments, on baptism, confirmation, marriage, the Eucharist; on fasts and festivals; the discovery of the cross, the discovery of the reliques of the apostles; on the chrism, holy water, consecration of churches, blessing of the fruits of the field; on the sacred vessels and habiliments. Personal incidents are not wanting to give life and reality to the fiction. The whole is composed with an air of piety and reverence: a specious purity, and occasionally beauty, in the moral and religious tone. There are many axioms of seemingly sincere and vital religion. But for the too manifold design, the aggrandisement of the see of Rome and the aggrandisement of the whole clergy in subordination to the see of Rome; but for the monstrous ignorance of history, which betrays itself in glaring anachronisms, and in the utter confusion of the order of events and in the lives of distinguished men—the former awakening keen and jealous suspicion, the latter making the detection of the spuriousness of the whole easy, clear, irrefragable—the False Decretals might still have maintained their place in ecclesiastical history.<sup>i</sup>

*Authorities.*—Gieseler, *Text Book of Eccles. History*; Heinschius, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ et Capitula Anquilrami*, Lipsiæ, 1863, which is now probably the standard work on the subject; Bickell, *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*, Giessen, 1843; Milman, *Latin Christianity*; Phillips, *Du Droit ecclésiastique dans ses Sources*; Walther, *Kirchenrecht*. [B. S.]

**DECRETUM, DECRETALE.** The letter of the clergy and people of a city, sent to the metropolitan and the comprovincial bishops, signifying the election of a bishop of their city [BISHOP, p. 220], whom they require to be consecrated; equivalent to τῆς χειροτονίας τὸ ψήφισμα (Palladius, *Vita Chrysos.* p. 39). Gregory of Tours (*Vita Mauriti.* c. 13, in Duncange) says that in the choice of Mauritius the electors could not "in unum venire decretum." A form for such a letter is given in the *Ordo Romanus Vulg.*, under the title, "Decretum quod clerus et populus firmare debet de electo episcopo." The proper form of one addressed to the pope himself is given in the *Liber Diurnus Pon-*

<sup>h</sup> It has been thought by Gfrörer that one motive of the fraud was to beat down the power of the metropolitans over the bishops, by making that of the pope greater and more immediate in its nature over all the clergy. See Milman's note, *ibidem*.

<sup>i</sup> It should perhaps be added that in this article the strict canonical sense of "Decretal" has been taken. The word, like other ecclesiastical terms, is sometimes used in a looser and more general sense.

*diff. Romm.* c. 3, p. 54. In the same place there follows (p. 56) a "*Decretale, quod legit diaconus designato episcopo.*" The difference between this and the foregoing *Decretum* appears to be, that the one was sent by the hands of some official of the vacant see immediately on the election of the bishop; if thereupon the pope gave his assent, the bishop became technically *designatus*, and a deacon of his church read the *Decretale* or petition for consecration (Garnier, *in loco*). Several forms of *Decreta* on the election of bishops may be found in Sirmond's *Concil. Gall.* ii. 647 ff. and in Ussher's *Vet. Epist. Hibern., Epp.* 25, 33, 40. [C.]

DEDICATION. [CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES: PATRON SAINT.]

DEDICATION, FESTIVAL OF (Ἐγκαίνια). The observance of the anniversary of dedication arose contemporaneously with the custom of the solemn dedication of churches. It was natural that an epoch so intimately connected with the religious life of the congregation should not be allowed to drop into oblivion. By a very intelligible metaphor the day of consecration was considered the birthday of the church, or congregation meeting for worship within its walls. St. Leo (*Sermo lxxxii. in Natal. Machab.*) calls it the "dies natalis" of the church. By another metaphor it was regarded as the day of the church's espousals to her heavenly Bridegroom. Most naturally therefore these anniversaries were celebrated with the same joyous feelings and outward festivities as birthdays and wedding-days. These celebrations having their first origin in the time when the Christians were a poor and barely tolerated sect, exposed continually to persecution, and when any outward pomp attracting the notice of the heathen population around would be fraught with peril, assumed a character of magnificence in their period of security and opulence. The earliest instance on record of the observance of such anniversaries is in the case of the church of "the Great Martyr" erected by Constantine on Calvary, and consecrated A.D. 335. In memory of this solemn dedication, the most magnificent the Christian world had yet witnessed, a yearly festival was held for eight days at Jerusalem, attended by immense crowds not of the citizens only but of strangers from all parts (Soz. *H. E.* lib. ii. c. 26). But the custom was certainly anterior to this, for not many years later, towards the middle of the 4th century, the observance of these anniversaries is spoken of by Gregory Nazianzen as "an ancient usage," ἐγκαίνια τιμᾶσθαι παλαιὸς νόμος καὶ καλῶς ἔχων καὶ τοῦτο οὐχ ἁπλᾶ ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλάκις, ἐκάστης τοῦ ἐνιαύτου περιτροπῆς τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμέραν ἐπαγούσης (Greg. Naz. *In Novam Dominicam. Orat.* xliii.). Two centuries later it was laid down by Felix IV. c. A.D. 530, as a law of the Church that such anniversaries should be solemnly kept for eight days, "solemnitates vero dedicationum ecclesiarum per singulos annos sunt celebrandae" (*Epistola ad Episcopos*, Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 1655). The example of Christ attending the Feast of Dedication (John x. 22), and of Solomon feasting the people for eight days at the Dedication of the Temple, 1 Kin. viii. 65, 66, were adduced as authorities for this observance. At the commencement of the next century we find the first

indication of the revelry with which these festivals were subsequently disgraced, and which made them a by-word for scandalous licence. Gregory the Great writing to Mellitus when proceeding to join Augustine in England, A.D. 601, after retracting the advice previously given that the heathen temples should be destroyed, and recommending their purification and conversion into Christian Churches, proceeds in a similar spirit to advise that the popular festivals formerly held on these consecrated sites should not be wholly discontinued, but that "as some solemnity must be conceded as a compensation," they should be transferred to the anniversaries of the day of dedication, or the natiivities of the martyrs by whose relics the churches were hallowed. On these days he recommends that huts or arbours should be erected, about the transformed temples, in which after "killing cattle to the praise of God in their eating, they should celebrate the solemnity with religious feasting" (Greg. Mag. *Epist. ad Mellitum*, Hadan and Stubbs, vol. iii. p. 37; Bede, lib. i. c. 30). In other places Gregory alludes to the eagerness with which the country folk flocked together to these festive celebrations, and the mixed crowds that were attracted by the good cheer (Greg. Mag. *Homil. in Evang.* xiv.; *Epist.* lib. i. 52, 54; *Vita*, c. 37. See also Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epist.* lib. iv. ep. 15). Such gatherings of half-leavened pagans inevitably assumed a character of gross license entirely at variance with their sacred intention. Dramatic representations were performed, drinking was prolonged to intoxication, and singing and dancing were continued far into the night. In fact they were characterized by all the revelry and licentiousness of a village fair, which in so many cases is the lineal successor of the dedication festival, changed only in its externals. These gross scandals were not allowed to pass un-reproved. The serious attention of bishops and councils was directed to them, and earnest attempts were made for their suppression. The 19th canon of the council of Châlons, A.D. 650, is directed against the custom (the prohibition indicates the practice) of bands of women singing foul and obscene songs, "turpia et obscœna cantilena," at the porches or churchyard walls on the dedication festivals (Labbe, *Concil.* vi. 391 [compare DANCING]). But so thoroughly had these licentious festivals established themselves, that their authoritative condemnation proved idle, and they lived on in defiance of prelates and councils.

Gavanti lays down (*Thes. Sacr. Rit.* § 8, c. 5) that the Feast of Dedication is a festival of the first-class, of greater dignity than that of the Patron Saint or the Titulary of the Church. The reason for this superiority is assigned by St. Thomas Aquinas (*lect. 5 in Joann.* c. x.) because the dedication festival is a commemoration of the benefits conferred on the whole church, which exceed those given to any individual saint. The Feast of Dedication is a "duplex majus" and has an octave. If it happens to coincide with any greater festival the consecrator, or afterwards the bishop of the diocese, may transfer the anniversary to some Sunday, or any other day convenient for the large attendance of the country people (Gavanti *u. s.*; Bellarmine, *de cultu sanctorum*, lib. iii. c. 5, *de dedicatione et consecra-*

*tione ecclesiarum*; Ducange *sub voc.*; Bingham, *Orig.* bk. viii. c. ix. § 14; Isid. *Hispal. De Eccl. Off.* lib. i. c. 36; Gratian *Decret. De Consecr.* Dist. i. c. 17; Ivo Carnot. *Decret.* pars iii. c. 24).

After the establishment of Christianity newly founded cities were solemnly dedicated to Christ and the Saints, and the anniversary of the dedication was celebrated. This was notably the case with Constantinople, the anniversary called γενέθλιος τῆς πόλεως ἡμέρα [p. 448] being kept on the 11th of May (Ducange, *Constantinop. Christiana*, lib. i. c. 3). [E. V.]

**DEDUCTORIUM.** A name sometimes given to the pipe or channel by which the baptismal water escaped from the font (Paschasius, *Epist. ad Leonem Papam*). [FONT.] [C.]

**DEER.** [STAG.]

**DEFENSOR ECCLESIAE.** [See ADVOCATUS ECCLESIAE.] The Division into *Defensores Ecclesiae, Pauperum, Matrimonii*, &c., is one of duties, not of persons. In addition to their proper work, already described under ADVOCATUS, a law of Justinian (*Novell.* lxxiv. 4) imposed upon them also in certain cases the incidental duty of witnessing and registering espousals. Setting aside on the one hand the case of senators and persons of the highest rank, who were bound to have a regular settlement of dowry and antenuptial gift, &c., &c., and on the other that of persons of the lowest rank, who needed no written document at all, Justinian ordained that officers, merchants, professional men, and the like, if they desired their marriage to be lawful, must present themselves in church in the presence of the *Defensor Ecclesiae* [CONTRACT OF MARRIAGE, p. 488]; and that officer, with three or four of the superior clergy of the church, is to draw up and sign, with at least three of the said clergy, a dated and formal attestation of the marriage contract, one copy to be deposited in the archives of the church, others to be given if required to the parties themselves (*Bingh.* XXII. iii. 10). [A. W. H.]

**DEGRADATION, DEPOSITION, DEORDINATION, DEPRIVATION,** were terms at first used indiscriminately to signify the total and absolute withdrawal from a clergyman, by ecclesiastical sentence, of his clerical office, and the reducing of him to simple lay communion: *degradare, ab officio remove, deordinare, ab ordine cleri amoveri, καθαιρεῖσθαι, ἀπ' οἴκλου βαθμοῦ ἀποπίπτειν, πέπαισθαι τοῦ κλήρου*, being all used of the same thing; which is also expressed by "deponi ab officio communione concessa." As a punishment of clergymen, it stood midway between a temporary withdrawal of the clerical office, viz. suspension, and an exclusion from the Church altogether by excommunication. There were also various degrees of degradation itself: as *e.g.* the degradation simply from a higher order to a lower; or again, degradation from the office, but with permission to retain its title and dignity: for which, and for some minor variations, see Bingham, XVII. iv.

1. The proper judge to inflict such a sentence, in the case of an inferior clerk, was the BISHOP [p. 228], acting with his presbyters and with his church in the earliest times, but from the 4th century the bishop practically was the judge. An appeal, however, was allowed from the beginning to the provincial synod; see *e.g.*, *Conc. Nicaen.*

and *Conc. Sardic.*, and also under APPEAL. And the provincial Council of Seville (*Hispal.* II. A.D. 619, c. 6) endeavoured to restore the older practice also, and insist on the bishop acting *ab initio* with his council—"Solus honorem dare potest, auferre solus non potest." The rule however gradually came to be, that three bishops were required to degrade or try a deacon, six in the case of a priest, and twelve in that of a bishop. [See APPEAL.] The synod of the province indeed was alone the tribunal which could depose a bishop, and subsequently a priest also.

2. As to the crimes for which clergy were to be degraded, it may be taken for granted that they were liable to the penalty for all such immoral acts as would involve excommunication in the case of a layman. But in addition to these, there are special offences against clerical discipline to which various canons attached the like penalty, such as digamy, usury, having recourse to a secular tribunal, keeping hawks or hounds, meddling with secular business, frequenting taverns needlessly; besides such matters as more immediately related to their duties, as, *e.g.* altering the form of baptism, despising fasts and festivals, not rightly keeping Easter, &c. The 58th Apostolic Canon (*al.* 57) deposes for negligence in pastoral care, *παθυμία*. See BISHOP, PRIEST, DEACON.

3. There must always have been some ceremonial in the infliction of such a sentence, although the elaborate details of later customs are not traceable in early times, and date in their formal fulness from the Roman Pontifical and from a Bull of Boniface VIII. Martene (*De Rit. Ant. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 2) has collected what can be gathered of earlier practice. Liberatus' *Breviarium* supplies his earliest instance. The principle on which the later practice was formed was so natural in itself, that something of the kind no doubt was the rule from the first. Since the clerical office was conferred with the accompaniment of delivering to each order certain appropriate instruments, and with the adoption also of certain vestments, there could be no more effectual or natural symbol of the taking away of its office than the taking away of these appropriate instruments and vestments. In the case mentioned by Liberatus, accordingly, an archbishop is deprived by taking away his pall. The more elaborate and later ceremonial in the Pontifical and in Boniface's bull gives each separate article and then solemnly takes it away, with a form of words for each, and this either privately, "before the secular judge," or on some public and elevated stage; ending by scraping the thumb and hand of the degraded clerk, to signify the removal from him of unction and blessing. The Donatists it appears proceeded to shave his head bald also. That some words as well as acts were used from the beginning may likewise be taken for granted (see *e.g.* Socrates, *H. E.* i. 24, speaking of the deposition of Eustathius). Regular and minute ritual forms are of a late date. They may be found in Martene and in Böhmer, as quoted below.

4. After degradation, there still followed in stricter times, and for bad cases, confinement to a monastery and penance, as may be seen in *e.g.* Gregory the Great's letters; the clerk being still *quasi* subject to ecclesiastical law, although now a layman only.



(Bingham, xvii.; Martene, *De Ant. Rit. Eccl.* lib. iii. c. 2; Böhmer, *Jus Eccles. Protest.* lib. v. tit. xxxvii. § 974, tom. v. pp. 715-766.)

[A. W. H.]

**DEICOLAE** (compare COLIDEI). A name sometimes applied to monks, as in the *Epistle* of Martin of Braga to King Miro, in D'Achery's *Spicilegium*, iii. 312 (Ducange, s. v.). [C.]

**DEI GRATIA.** The bishops of the Church, regarding themselves as called to their office by the will of God, have from ancient times been in the habit of using formulae implying a divine call. Thus Pope Felix II. (A.D. 356) calls himself "per gratiam Dei episcopus" (Hardouin, *Concilia*, i. 757). Aurelius says that he holds his office "dignatione Dei" (*C. Carth.* iii. c. 45; A.D. 397). Other bishops used equivalent expressions, as "Dei" or "Christi nomine, miseratione, misericordia." The German bishops have used, from the 7th century onward, the form "Dei gratia," to which in later times some such phrase as "apostolicae sedis gratia" or "providentia" was added. Zallwein (*Principia Juris Eccl.* iv. 278) believes this addition not to be earlier than the middle of the thirteenth century, and Thomassin (*Vetus et Nova Eccl. Discip.* pt. i. bk. i. c. 60, § 10), will not allow that it was used in Germany before the beginning of the fifteenth; but the germ of it is certainly found in the writings of Boniface, the apostle of Germany, who styled himself "servus apostolicae sedis" (Hartzheim, *Concilia Germaniae*, i. 43).

A similar style was adopted by secular persons of exalted rank; thus Agilulf on his crown [*CROWN*, p. 508] is described as "Gratia Domini . . . Rex totius Italiae" (A.D. 591); and Rothar (A.D. 643), in his *Edict* for the Lombards (Walter, *Corpus Juris Germanici*, i. 683), speaks of himself as "in Dei nomine rex, anno, Deo propitiante, regni mei octavo." In England, Ethelbert of Kent, in a charter of the year 605, styles himself, "Aethilbertus Dei gratia Rex Anglorum" (Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 55), Ethelbald (A.D. 716) styles himself "divina dispensatione rex Merciorum" (*Codex Dipl.*). From the days of Pepin the form "Dei gratia" seems commonly to have been adopted by the Frankish kings. Charles the Great (A.D. 769) adopted the following style and title: "Carolus gratia Dei rex regnique Francorum rector et devotus sanctae ecclesiae defensor atque adjutor in omnibus apostolicae sedis" (Pertz, *Monum. Germaniae*, iii. 33). Selden, *Titles of Honour*, in *Works*, iii. 214; Allen, *Royal Prerogative*, p. 22, ed. 1849; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopädie*, iii. 312. [C.]

**DEITIES, PAGAN.** [*PAGANISM IN ART.*]

**DELATORES.** [*INFORMERS.*]

**DELEGATED JURISDICTION.** [*JURISDICTION.*]

**DELEGATUS.** [*LEGATE.*]

**DELPHIN.** [*CORONA LUCIS*, p. 461.]

**DEMERITORUM DOMUS.** [*DECANIA.*]

**DEMETRIA**, daughter of Faustus, martyr at Rome under Julian; commemorated June 21 (*Mart. Rom. Vct.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**DEMETRIUS.** (1) Martyr at Thessalonica, A.D. 296; commemorated Oct. 8 (*Mart. Rom. Vct.*, Adonis, Usuardi); Oct. 26 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Bishop and martyr at Antioch with Anianus, Eustosius, and twenty others; commemorated Nov. 10 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Usuardi).

(3) Saint; commemorated Dec. 22, with Honoratus and Florus (*Mart. Usuardi*, Adonis in *Appendice*).

(4) Patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 231; commemorated Magabit 12 = March 8 and Tekemt 12 = Oct. 9 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(5) "Demetrius et Basilius," commemorated Nov. 12 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

**DEMOCRITUS**, Saint, at Sinnada in Africa; commemorated July 31, with Secundus and Dionisius (*Mart. Hieron.*, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**DEMON (IN ART).** The evil spirit is always represented in early Christian art as the enemy and tempter of mankind under the form of the serpent, excepting in the Laurentian MS. [*DEMONIAC*] and in the singular diptych (in Gori, *Thesaurus*, t. iii. tab. viii.) which represents the cure of a demoniac. As Martigny observes, these cases are in all respects exceptional; but they are probably the earliest works of art in which the devil or any inferior evil spirit is represented in the human form. [But see *DEVIL*.] It might be expected that as the form of Job occurs frequently in early carvings and paintings (Bottari, tavv. xv. cv.; Perret, i. xxv. &c.) some representation of the evil one as an agent of torment might be found with him; but this seems not to be the case. The figure of the *SERPENT* (see s. v.) accompanies most representations of Adam and Eve in Bottari and elsewhere: his head is generally turned towards Eve. The first known instance of the human-headed serpent as tempter is found in the Catacomb of St. Agnes (Perret, ii. pl. xli.), if the painting be of the same date as the catacomb. This point involves great difficulties, which time and inquiry seem rather likely to aggravate than to diminish. For the Serpent threatening the Doves see *DRAGON*; and Gori, *Thesaurus Diptych.* iii. p. 160. [R. St. J. T.]

**DEMONIACS.** The Church inherited from both Jews and heathens the belief that demons, i.e. "unclean" or "evil" spirits, could take possession of the bodies and the souls of men, women, children, and subject them to a cruel bondage. The history of our Lord's miracles naturally tended to confirm and deepen the belief. Abnormal physical or mental states, which could not be otherwise explained, were referred to demoniacal possession as a sufficient cause. From one point of view, indeed, it was held as a dogma that every child born into the world was thus under the power of an evil spirit, of the chief of evil spirits, and from an early period a formula of exorcism was employed as a preliminary rite to baptism, and the work of catechist and exorcist was thus brought into close connection [*BAPTISM*; *EXORCISM*]. In the present article, however, it is proposed to deal only with those in whom the condition was more or less chronic, and who were brought therefore under a continuous course of treatment.

It is clear from the narratives of the New Testament, and from the records of the Church, that the class consisted chiefly though not exclusively of those who in our own time would be classified as insane. They were known as the *δαίμονιζόμενοι*, the N. T. name more frequently

as the *ἐνεργούμενοι* (*energumēni*), men operated on, exercised by, unclean spirits, less frequently as *χειμαζόμενοι* (*hyemantes*)\* or *κλυδωνιζόμενοι*, those who are tossed to and fro by the storms and billows of uncontrollable impulse. The boundary-line between mental and moral disorder is at all times difficult to trace, and the name is at times extended, as by the Pseudo-Dionysius (*de Eccles. Hierarch. iv. 3*), to those who were the slaves of lust or other master-passions, probably to those in whom the moral evil assumed the character of a possession, overpowering the ordinary restraints of prudence and self-control. For the most part, however, the *energumēni*, as demoniacs, may be identified with those who suffered from some form of insanity. The symptoms described by Cyprian, sleepless nights, panic fears, restless agitation (*de Idol. Vanit. p. 239*); the outward appearance of the demoniacs as portrayed by Chrysostom (*Hom. IV. De incomprehens. Nat. Dei*), squalid, foul, with hair dishevelled, and in rags, all point to the same conclusion. It is not within the scope of this article to discuss the theory which referred all these phenomena to an actual possession of the human nature by a malignant spiritual power. It is enough to say that it was postulated in the whole treatment of such cases by the Church. The suggestion of a more scientific view that the symptoms originated in excess of bile, or the inflammation of a tissue, or other physical cause, was rejected as the whisper of unbelief, itself the suggestion of the demons, who wished thus to deprive men of the prayers and incantations which were the only effectual weapons against them (*Hom. Clem. ix. 12*). Men dwelt with exultation on the power which their prayers, and the utterance of the Divine Name, and the laying on of hands, had to drive the demon howling and blaspheming from his usurped abode (Cyprian, *de Idol. Vanit. l. c.*; *ad Demetr. c. 15*). It might have seemed, looking at the matter from the modern, scientific stand-point, as if the Christian Church had itself got into a hopelessly wrong groove, from which no good results were to be expected, which tended to stereotype the delusions that fed the madness, and were utterly at variance with any rational treatment. It will be found, however, it is believed, that partly in spite of the theory, partly in consequence of it, the treatment of the insane in the early ages of the Church assumed before long a true therapeutic character, and brought them under influences which tended, in the natural course of things, to bring them to a sound mind. Cases of instantaneous expulsion of the demon, like those described by Cyprian, became less frequent; and, where the mastery of a strong will had for a time calmed a paroxysm of frenzy, were followed by a relapse. Putting aside the case of the symbolic or hypothetical exorcism which preceded baptism, we have to think of the *energumēni* as brought, by virtue of the theory, within the range of sympathy and care. Instead of being left, as in most eastern countries, to go wild, like the Gadarene and

other demoniacs of the N. T., when the insanity was not dangerous, or to be brutally chained and fettered if it was, they were marked out as objects of pity and of special prayer (*Constt. Apost. viii. 7*). They occupied a fixed place in the porch of the church, and so were brought within the soothing influence of psalms and hymns and words of comfort (Dionys. *de Eccles. Hierarch. iv. 3*). With them, as fellow-sufferers, might sometimes be found the lepers of the neighbourhood; sometimes also those whose loathsome depravity had made them defiled like the leper, and incapable of human society like the demoniacs (*C. Ancyra. c. 17*). When the prayer was over they were brought to receive the benediction of the bishop (*Constt. Apost. viii. 7*). The church itself became a kind of home for those who otherwise would have been homeless. There the exorcists paid them a daily visit, and gave them food, and laid their hands upon them (*4 C. Carth. c. 90, 92*). There, if the nature of the case required it, they were brought under a discipline of abstinence that might subdue the impulses of passion (*Hom. Clement. ix. 10*). There they were employed in industrial tasks that were suited to their condition, such as sweeping the pavement of the church (*4 C. Carth. c. 91*) or lighting its lamps (*C. Elib. c. 37*).<sup>b</sup> If they were in the *status* of catechumens they might be admitted to baptism at the hour of death, even though there had been no complete cure (*Constt. Apost. viii. 32*; Cyprian, *Epist. 76*; *1 C. Arausica. c. 15*; *C. Elib. c. 37*). If they were already among the faithful they might even, if the insanity did not take a violent form, be admitted to communion (Cassian, *Collatt. vii. 30*; Timoth. Alex. *Respons. c. 3*), and that daily. It is almost needless to say that they were excluded, even after recovery, from ordination. The exorcists were instructed to repeat their prayers and other forms of adjuration *memoriter* (Isidor. Hispal. *Epist. ad Landefred.*). They were often identical with the catechists, and were therefore more or less experienced in the work of teaching (Balsamon on *C. Laod. c. 26*). The influences thus brought to bear upon the real or supposed demoniacs were, it is submitted, calculated to soothe and encourage, to bring them under the influence of sympathy. Even the ceremonial imposition of hands, over and above the sacramental associations connected with it, and their power to soothe the paroxysms of suicidal remorse, may have had what we have learnt to call a mesmeric effect, calming the over-excited brain, through the tones of pity, into something like tranquillity. It is not too much to claim for the Christian Church, whatever may be thought of its theory of madness, the credit of having taken some practical steps, and those steps the first, towards a rational treatment of the insane. Here, also, as in the institution of hospitals, love and pity were not without other fruits than those they sought for, and ministered to the attainment of a truth at which they did not aim. [E. H. P.]

DEMONIAC, HEALING OF (IN ART). One instance only is known to Father Martigny

\* The word *χειμαζόμενοι* and its Latin equivalent are sometimes explained as pointing to the position which the demoniacs occupied in the outer porch of the church, exposed to the inclemency of cold or rain. The meaning given in the text rests, however, on better authority. Oomp. Suicer, s. v. *χειμαζόμενοι*.

<sup>b</sup> The canons of the Council of Elvira cited in the text forbid the practice, probably on account of some inconvenient results; but the prohibition shows that it was common.

of a representation of this miracle; it is one of the instances of single sufferers, perhaps that of the youth after the Transfiguration. The evil spirit issues in human form from the head of the possessed (Gori, *Thez. Nipotyck.* t. iii. tab. viii.).



Our Lord holds a cross on His shoulders and His hand is extended using the Greek benediction. Another example is in the Laurentian MS.; see woodcut. [R. St. J. T.]

**DENIS, COUNCIL OF ST.** (*ad S. Dionysium*, near Paris), A.D. 768, was rather a national council of bishops and nobles, at which Pipin shortly before his death divided his kingdom between his sons Carl and Carloman (Labb. vi. 1720, 1721.) [A. W. H.]

**DENARIUS.** [PETER'S PENCE.]

**DENUNTATIO MATRIMONII** [MARRIAGE.]

**DEO DICATUS.** One of the terms by which persons who devoted themselves to religion were designated. Thus Hatto or Ahito, bishop of Basle (*Capitulaire*, c. 16) forbade even *Deo dicatus* to meddle with the service of the altar [compare *DEVOTA FEMINA*]; and Lucifer of Cagliari, describing the conduct of his enemies, says (in the tract *Morinudum esse*, etc.) that they tortured and slew even dedicated persons (*Deo dicatos*). [C.]

**DEO GRATIAS.** *Τὸ Θεὸν χάρις*, "Thanks be to God!" A response of the people, frequently occurring in divine service from very ancient times, derived no doubt from the apostolic use of the phrase (1 Cor. xv. 57; 2 Cor. ii. 14). The best-known instance of its use is probably that in which it forms the response of the people to the *Ite, missa est* of the priest at the end of the liturgy.

According to the Mozarabic rite the people said *Deo gratias*, "Thanks be to God," at the naming of the passage to be read as the "Prophecy" in the Liturgy. Bona mentions this phrase as being also occasionally used instead of *Amen*, or *Laud tibi Christe* when the Gospel **COMM. ANT.**

was ended (*De Reb. Liturg.* ii. vii. 4). St. Augustine notices it as a common mode of greeting among the monks in his time, for which they were ridiculed and insulted by the Agonistici, as they called themselves, among the Donatists (*Aug. in Psalm.* cxxii. p. 630). The expression appears to have been frequently used on other occasions by way of acclamation. When Evodius was nominated as Augustine's successor the people called out for a long time—"Deo gratias, Christo laudes" (*Aug. Ep.* 110, *de Actis Evodii*). [C.]

**DEPORTATIO.** One of the usages of the Gallican Church was that a bishop on his way to be enthroned was borne in a chair by the hands of his fellow-bishops. Thus Wilfrid of York, who was consecrated in Gaul, is said (*Life* by Eddius, c. 12) to have been borne to his throne by the hands of the bishops who were present, "more eorum," i.e. after the Gallican custom [*BISHOP*, p. 225]. Gregory of Tours perhaps alludes to this custom when he says (*Hist. Franc.* iii. 2) that the assembled bishops and people placed (*locaverunt*) Quintianus in the episcopal throne of Clermont. A "chairing" of the bishop on the shoulders of certain persons of rank, the first time he entered his cathedral, was customary in several of the French churches in the middle ages (*Martene, De Ant. Eccl. Rituus*, l. viii. 10, § 19). [C.]

**DEPOSITION.** [DEGRADATION.]

**DEPOSITION, IN HAGIOLOGY** (*Depositio*). The word *depositio* is explained in the sermon of Maximus, *De Depositione S. Eusebii* (in the *Works* of Ambrose, ii. pt. 2, p. 469) to mean, not the day of burial, but that on which the soul lays down the burden of the flesh; and it is probably with this idea that it is used in calendars and martyrologies. For instance, in the *Mart. Hieron.* we have on March 21 "*Depositio Benedicti Abbatis*;" in the *Mart. Bedae* on the same day, "*Natale Benedicti Abbatis*," as if *Depositio* were exactly synonymous with *Natale*, which confessedly means the death-day of a saint.

Yet on July 11, the day on which the Translation of St. Benedict is placed by Bede and Ado, the *Mart. Hieron.* has again *Depositio*. We may infer that the word was at least occasionally used to designate the day on which the relics were entombed.

Papebroch, in his *Conatus Chronologico-Histor. ad Catal. Pontif. Roman.* (*Acta Sanctorum*, May, vol. iv.), contends strongly that *Depositio* is used for the day of death; *Elevatio*, *Cultus*, or *Translatio* for that of burial.

In early calendars the word *Depositio* is said to be confined to bishops [*CALENDAR*, p. 258]. (*Blutern's Denkwürdigkeiten*, vi. pt. 3, p. 370 ff.) [C.]

**DEPRECATORIAE.** In an ancient codex quoted by Ducange (s. v.), *litterae deprecatoriae* are explained to be simple "letters of request" given by presbyters, who were unable to grant the formal "dimissory letters" (*formatae*) of bishops. [*COMMENDATORY LETTERS: DIMISSORY LETTERS*.] [C.]

**DEPRIVATION.** [DEGRADATION.]

**DEPUTATUS** (*Δεωυρδτος*). The Greek Church distinguishes between persons properly

in *orders*, set apart for a certain work by the imposition of the bishop's hands, and those merely nominated to certain offices without imposition of hands. Deacons, subdeacons, and readers belong to the former class; to the latter, those who discharge purely subordinate offices under the direction of the clergy; as the *Theori*, who have the charge of the sacred vessels and vestments; the *Camisati* [CAMISIA], who attend to the thuribles and water-vessels in the service of the altar; and the *Deputati*. The office of the latter is, in processions to precede the deacon who bears the Book of the Gospels, or the oblations, carrying lighted tapers and, also, if necessary, to clear the way for the bishop through the crowded church. (Permaneder in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexicon*, iii. 107, who quotes Morinus, *De S. Eccl. Ordinationibus*, pt. ii. p. 66, ed. Antwerp, 1695).

These *Deputati* thus corresponded with the *Ceroferarii* or *Cereostatarii* of the Latin Church; and in the form of their appointment (Goar's *Euchologion*, p. 237) their office is said to be that of bearing the lights in the holy mysteries. See ACOLYTE. [C.]

**DESCENSUS.** A word sometimes used to signify the vault [CONFESSION] beneath the altar containing relics of saints. Anastasius, for instance (*Hist. Eccl.*, an. 5 *Leonis Isaur.*), uses it as equivalent to the *κατάβασις* of Theophanes, from whom he is compiling. [C.]

**DESECRATION OF CHURCHES AND ALTARS** (*Exsecratio*). So indelible a character of holiness was thought to be stamped upon a church or an altar by the act of consecration, that nothing short of destruction, or such dilapidation as to render them unfit to serve their proper ends, could nullify it (Barbosa, *De Off. et Potest. Episcop.* pt. ii.). A church might, however, be so *polluted* as to need RECONCILIATION (*q.v.*) by the perpetration in it of homicide or other revolting crime; and if the relics which had been deposited at consecration were removed, the church and altar lost this sacred character until these were restored; with the relics and the renewal of masses, the whole effect of consecration returned (Vigilius, Pope 538–555, *Ad Euthereum*, *Epist.* ii. c. 4). Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 6) mentions an instance in which a church, in consequence of a homicide having been perpetrated in it, lost the privilege of Divine Service (*officium perdidit*). Compare CHURCHYARD, SACRILEGE. (Martene, *De Rit. Ant.* ii. 284; Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* i. 458). [C.]

**DESERTION OF THE CLERICAL LIFE.** Several centuries elapse before we find desertion of the clerical life recognized as an offence. The Council of Chalcedon in 451, enacts (c. 7) that those who have once been received into the *clerus* are not to desert it for any military service or worldly dignity. The Council of Angers in 453 declared (c. 7) that clerics who leaving their order have turned away to secular warfare and to a lay life are not unjustly removed from the church which they have left. The 1st Council of Tours, A.D. 461, has an equivalent provision expressed in somewhat clearer language (c. 5), specifically enacting excommunica-

tion for the offence. We have an instance of the practice by a Breton Council of uncertain date (supposed about 555), recorded by Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ix. 15), in which a bishop, who let his hair grow and took back his wife, was excommunicated. Under Justinian's Code, by a constitution of that Emperor himself, A.D. 532, renewing and extending a previous one of Arcadius and Honorius, if a person deserted the clerical or monastic life for a military one (the term *militia* with its congeners, did not at this period imply necessarily the use of arms) he was punished by being made a *curialis* of the city of his birth, i.e. charged with all the burthens of the state. If there were already very many *curiales* in the city he was to be placed in any neighbouring or remote one, or even in any one of a different province which should happen to be in special want of these political beasts of burthen. If he hid himself, the *curiales* could at once enter upon his property and detain it to answer legal demands (bk. i. tit. iii. l. 53 § 1). If, on the other hand, a clerk or monk embraced an ordinary secular life, all his property passed to the church or monastery which he had deserted (*Ibid.* l. 56, § 2)—a provision confirmed as to monks by the 5th *Novel*, c. 4. The 6th *Novel*, which extends the prohibition to subdeacons and readers, transfers the benefit of the forfeiture, as respects clerics,—if indeed there be anything to forfeit,—to the *curia*, providing moreover that if the clerk in question be poor, he shall be reduced to an official condition, i.e. probably to that of a mere servant to the public offices (c. 7); and this forfeiture to the *curia* is confirmed by the 123rd *Novel*, c. 15. But as respects monks, the same *Novel* (c. 42) requires a monk who betakes himself to a secular life—being first deprived of any office or dignity he may acquire—to be sent to a monastery, to which moreover it assigns all property acquired by him after his leaving his former one. If he absconds from this, the judge of the province is to hold and admonish him.

In a letter of Pope Zacharias (A.D. 741–51) to king Pepin, the Pope decrees that those who have once been admitted into the clergy, or have desired monastic life, are not to betake themselves to military service, or to any worldly dignity (*Ep.* 7, c. 9), under pain of anathema if they do not repent and return to their former life—a provision substantially identical with that of the Councils of Angers and Tours. In Charlemagne's *Capitularies* also is a provision “that a priest ought to continue in the religious habit” (*Additio Tertia*, c. 110). See also the 31st canon of the Council of Frankfort in 794, “that clerics and monks should continue steadfast in their determination.”

Desertion of the clerical life must of course be distinguished from desertion of the clerical functions in a particular diocese or parish. See, amongst other authorities, as to bishops leaving their districts (*παρoικίας*), the so-called *Apostolical Canons*, c. 11 (otherwise 13 or 14), and the 123rd *Novel*; and as to presbyters, deacons, and other clerics so acting, *Apost. Can.* c. 12 (otherwise 14 or 15); also the 16th Canon of the Council of Nicaea. One of the temptations to the breach of discipline in question appears to have been the serving in private oratories, as to which see *Novels* 57, 58, and 131. [J. M. L.]



**DESIDERATA.** A name sometimes used for the sacraments, as being desired of all Christians. Zeno of Verona (*Invit. 8 ad Fontem*, quoted by Ducange) asks why his hearers delay "ad desiderata festinare." [C.]

**DESIDERIUS.** (1) Bishop of Vienne, martyr at Lyons; Natale, Feb. 11 (*Mart. Bedae, Adonis in Appendice, Usuardi*). According to Ado he suffered martyrdom on May 23, and was translated Feb. 11.

(2) Bishop of Ferrara; "Passio" May 23 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) The reader, martyr at Naples under Diocletian, with Januarius the bishop and others; commemorated Sept. 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vel., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. O.]

**DESPONSATIO.** [ARRHA: BETROTHAL: MARRIAGE.]

**DESPOTICAE** (*Δεσποτικαὶ ἑσπρας*). The greater festivals of the Church are so called by the Greeks; they are generally reckoned to amount to twelve, but authorities vary on this point. [FESTIVALA.] (Daniel's *Codex Liturgicus*, iv. 235.) [C.]

**DETraction** is defined to be the concealed and unjust attack in words upon the reputation of another person. It differs from *Calumnia* in that the latter is a false accusation made in the course of legal proceedings, and from *Contumelia* in its being concealed from the person affected.

This sin has been condemned both by fathers, as by St. Augustine (in hom. 41 *De Sanctis*), St. Jerome (*Ep. 2*, al. 52, *ad Nepotian*, c. 14), and St. Chrysostom (*De Sacerd.* 5, 6), and by various canons of councils (e.g. *Conc. Carth.* iv. cc. 55-60) under wider words which include other offences against the 9th commandment (Bingham, *Chr. Ant.* 6, 2, 10, and 16, 13, 3; Ferraris *sub voc.*; Thom. Aq. *Summa*, 2. 2. *quest.* 73; Soto *De Just. et Jure*, 5, 10). [I. B.]

**DEUS IN ADJUTORIUM.** The canonical Hours, according to Western usage, generally begin with the words of the 70th [69th Vulg.] Psalm.

V. Deus in adiutorium meum intende.

R. Domine ad adjuvandum me festina.

Cassian (*Collatio*, x. c. 10) tells us that this verse was frequently used by monks in their devotions before his time, but it does not appear that it was definitively prefixed to each Hour before the time of St. Benedict, who prescribed that use in his Rule (c. 9).

The Roman use at Matins prefixes the verse and response,

V. Domine, labia mea aperies.

R. Et os meum annuntiabit laudem tuam, from the 51st [50th Vulg.] Psalm; in the monastic breviaries, on the other hand, the *Domine, labia* follows the *Deus in adiutorium*.


In Compline, *Deus in adiutorium* is preceded by V. Convertite nos, Deus salutaris noster.

R. Et averte iram tuam a nobis, from the 85th [84th Vulg.] Psalm.

The verse, "O Lord, open thou our lips," &c., also occurs in the early part of the Greek morning office.

(Bona, *De Divina Psalmodia*, ch. xvi. 4; Mariene, *De Ant. Monach. Rit.* pp. 5, 21; Wetzlar and Walte, *Kirchenlexikon*, iii. 122.) [C.]

**DEVIL** (IN ART). The Early Church seems to have contemplated the spiritual enemy of God and man principally as to his functions of temptation and possession in this world. Representations of him as the final accuser and claimant of the souls of the lost, or as their tormentor in the place of his own condemnation, belong to mediæval rather than to primitive art. The present writer is not aware of the existence of any hell earlier than the mosaics of Torcello, as that painted by Methodius, even if its story be true, has altogether vanished. On the sarcophagi, and later in Anglo-Saxon and Irish MSS. more particularly, the tempter is symbolized, as so often in Holy Scripture, under the form of the SERPENT (see s. v.). One instance there is, however, given by Didron in the *Iconographie du Serpent* (*Ann. Archéologiques*, v. 2) of a Gnostic combination of human and serpentine form, with leonine head and face (see woodcut). It is taken from a bronze in the Vatican collection, and is derived, he says with certainty, from the ancient Egyptian symbol of a lion-headed serpent. But the human form and expression are so predominant as to make it appear to be an anticipation of the personified serpent of the Middle Ages, represented in the Book of Kells and other northern MSS. The Gothic or mediæval representations seem to begin in Italy with the fiend in the Chase of Theodoric, which, till lately destroyed by gradual and wanton mischance, adorned the front of St. Zenone in Verona.



In the Laurentian MS. of Rabula (A.D. 587) there is an extraordinary representation of the demoniacs of Gndara, just delivered from their tormenting spirits, who are fluttering away in the form of little black humanities of mischievous expression. [See DEMONIACS.]

[R. St. J. T.]

**DEVOTA FEMINA**, or simply **DEVOTA**.

It need hardly be said that the practice of vows made to God is recognized in the Pentateuch, and throughout the Old Testament (Levit. vii. 16, xvii. 1 and foll., Numb. vi. 2 and foll., xv. 3, 8, xxx. 2 and foll. &c.). Such vows might be of persons as well as things, as in the instance of the "singular vow" mentioned in Lev. xxi., and of the Nazirites mentioned in Numb. vi.; with which compare the applications in the case of Jephthah, (Judg. xl. 30) Samson (Judg. xiii. 5) and Sammel (1 Sam. i. 11). Certain checks are at the same time imposed on the vows of women, which are required to have at least the tacit assent of a father, if the woman be "in her father's house in her youth" (Numb. xxx. 3-5), or of a husband, if she "had at all a husband" (ib. 6-8, 10-15), "but every vow of a widow, and of her that is divorced, wherewith they have bound their souls, shall stand against her" (v. 9).

The examples of St. Paul (Acts xviii. 23, 24), and the four disciples at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 23) show that like practices were adopted by the Apostolic Church. But over and above these temporary vows, it is clear that the class of church-widows were considered as personally devoted to God. Moreover, in his mode of speaking of virgins, St. Paul clearly shews that he considers those who have authority over them to have power to "keep" them for the Lord (see 1 Cor. vii. 34, 37, 38). The *Apostolical Constitutions*, besides their abundant notices of the church-widows, shew us also the rise of a distinct class of church-virgins devoted to God in like manner. The term *devota*, however, as applied both to widows and virgins, survived both organizations and spread beyond them, and seems to serve as a transition link between them and female monachism. From the 4th century downwards there are many texts which can hardly be applied, at all events exclusively, to either institute as such, and anticipate any organized female monachism, but which clearly imply a practice of self-consecration to God on the part both of widows and unmarried women, and which serve as the foundation of the practice of the Church in later times in respect to nuns.

Thus the first Council of Valence, A.D. 374, treating "of girls who have devoted themselves to God," exacts that if they voluntarily contract "earthly" marriage, they shall not even be allowed immediate penance, and shall not be admitted to communion till they have given full satisfaction. Now it was only in the 5th century that monachism, under the Basilian rule, penetrated into Southern Gaul, so that the *puellae* in question cannot have been nuns properly so called. The same applies to the canons of the 1st Council of Toledo, A.D. 400, which enact that a "devota" who takes a husband is not to be admitted to penance during his life, unless she preserves continence (c. 16), or, with still greater severity, that if a bishop's, or priest's, or deacon's daughter, having been devoted to God, sins and marries, should her father or mother restore their affection to her, they are to be excluded from communion. The father may indeed shew cause in council against the sentence, but the woman herself is only to receive the communion after her husband's death and penance, unless at her last hour (c. 19)—a text which indeed admits the validity of the marriage.

The stamp was set on the woman's *devotio* by her taking, or rather receiving from the priest's hands, the veil, symbol of her being espoused to Christ. Hence the distinction which we find made between the gravity of marriage in the case of the veiled and unveiled; as to which see Pope Innocent I.'s 2nd letters, to Victricius Archbishop of Rouen, cc. 12, 13, and certain canons of doubtful authority, supposed to be contemporaneous "of the Roman to the Gaulish bishops," cc. 1, 2. The devotional or virginal habit might indeed be assumed, at all events in the 5th century, without actual consecration; see Leo the Great's 167th letter, A.D. 458 or 459, to Rusticus Bishop of Narbonne, c. 15.

The "virgin devoted to God" is assimilated to the monk in a canon of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, forbidding both to marry under pain of excommunication, but subject to the in-

dulgence of the local bishop (c. 15). The 2nd Council of Arles, A.D. 452, seems to confine excommunication in such cases to marriage after 25, and provides that a penance is not to be refused if asked for, but communion only to be granted after long delay (c. 52). An exaggerated strictness on the other hand pervades a letter of Pope Symmachus (A.D. 498-513) to Bishop Caesarius, of Arles. Not only does he require the excommunication of those who have sought to marry virgins consecrated to God, whether with their own will or against it, and declare that "we do not suffer" widows to marry who have long persevered in the religious purpose; but he forbids those virgins to marry "to whom it may have happened to pass their age during many years in monasteries"—enforcing, in short, virginity without even a profession.

The practice of the religious profession, both in convents and outside of them, is shewn in the Canons of the 5th Council of Orleans, A.D. 529, which excommunicates alike, together with their husbands, both girls who in convents have put on the religious garment, and those who, whether girls or widows, have assumed the habit in their houses (c. 19). On the other hand, the 1st Council of Macon in 581 pronounced excommunication for life against both parties, in case of such marriages.

Towards the end of the 6th or beginning of the 7th century, in the letters of Pope Gregory the Great (A.D. 590-603), we seem to perceive a distinction between the "religious" and "monastic" habit, which may have indicated that between the simple *devota* and the nun. Writing to the Roman exarch (bk. iv. ep. 18), he speaks of women till now "in the religious and monastic habit" who have thrown off the sacred garment and veil, and married, and who are said to be under the exarch's patronage, and warns him against the iniquity of such protection. It will not have escaped attention that the "veil" in this passage seems to correspond, as in later and present Romish practice, with the specially monastic profession. On the other hand, an earlier letter of the same pope (bk. iii. ep. 24, *ad Cumanarium*), distinguishes between veiled virgins and women in convents. The incompatibility between marriage and the religious "habit" is indicated in another letter of the same pope to bishops Virgilius and Syagrius, (bk. vii. pt. ii. c. 119).

That in spite of all prohibitions, marriages with "religious" women continued to take place, and to be celebrated even in church, is evident from an edict of King Clothair II., issued at the 5th Council of Paris, A.D. 614 or 615. No one was to carry off religious girls or widows, who have devoted themselves to God, as well those who reside in their own houses as those who are placed in monasteries (thus clearly distinguishing between the two classes); and if any, either by violence or by any kind of authority should presume to unite such to himself in marriage, he was subject to capital punishment, or, under special circumstances to exile, and forfeiture of goods.

The 7th letter of Pope Zacharias (A.D. 741-51), addressed to Pepin as mayor of the palace, and to the bishops, abbots, and nobles of the Franks, refers to Pope Innocent's letter before

vestment, as to the distinction between the marriage of veiled and unveiled virgins, the former of whom are to be separated, the latter only to do "some" penance (cc. 20, 21). On the other hand, a capitulary of the 8th book (c. 411) treats as absolutely null a marriage with "a virgin devoted to God, a woman under the religious habit or professing the continuance of widowhood," re-enacting the punishment of separation and exile for the offenders. One of the 7th book (c. 338) is addressed to the case of those widows and girls who have put on the religious habit in their own houses, either receiving it from their parents or of themselves, but afterwards marry; they are to be excommunicated till they separate from their husbands, and if they will not, to be kept perpetually excluded from communion. A Lombard capitulary of 763, contains a like enactment (Periz, *Leg.* i. 1).

[J. M. L.]

**DEXAMENE**, *Δεξιμήνη*, a cistern or tank for the water needed for the replenishing of the font and the various ecclesiastical offices (Procop. *Hist. Arcum.* c. lii.). Erroneously interpreted by Buidas, *sub* rec. of the altar; and by Bingham, *Orig. bk. viii. c. vii. § 4*, of the font. [E. V.]

**DIACONIA**. (1.) The name gives to the localities in which food and alms were distributed to the poor by the deacons of the Church of Rome. Each was under the administration of one of the seven deacons, one for each region, the whole being under the superintendence of an archdeacon. Each *diacoma* had a hall for the distribution of charity, and an oratory or chapel annexed. These last remained when the original purpose of the *diacoma* had passed away, and have risen to the dignity of churches, of which there are now fourteen, each assigned to one of the cardinal deacons.

The original purpose of the *diacoma* is illustrated by the following passages from Anastasius. —*Stephan. II. § 229*: "foris muros . . . duo fecit Xenodochia . . . quae et sociavit venerabilibus Diaconis illic foris existentibus . . . id est Diaconiae S. Dei genetricis, et B. Salvastri duae." *Hudv. I. § 347*: "constituit Diaconias trans foris portam B. Agnet. Principis . . . et ibidem dispensationes per ordinem pauperibus consolari, atque elemosinam fieri [constituit]." *Infra*, § 345: "idem egregius Praesul Diaconia constituit . . . concidens eis agros vineas etc. ut de eorum redditu . . . Diaconiae proficiunt pauperes Christi reficerentur."

(2.) The word *diacoma* was also used for that part of the deacon's office which consisted in dispensing food and money to the poor. It is thus employed by Gregory the Great in a letter to John, in which he says, "to mensis pauperum et exhibendae diaconiae eligimus praeposendum;" and goes on to speak of the money received "diaconiae exhibitionis erogandum" (Greg. *Magn. Ep. ad Joann.* 24). See Suicer, *Ducange*, *Hon. Justinian. de Tringis*, p. 18. [E. V.]

(3.) In the earlier days of monachism this term was used for monastic alms-giving (Cass. *Collat. xviii. 7*; Gregor. *M. Ep. 23*). The oldest monk was entrusted with it in Egypt (Cass. *Collat. xxi. 1*); in the East the "oecumenus" or bursar (Martene in *Cass. d. xxi. 8, 9*). [L. G. S.]

**DIACONICA** (*Διακονική*). Certain short prayers or "orations" in the Liturgy are called *Diaconica*, as being recited by the attendant

deacon. They are also called *Ekpand*, as being mainly prayers for peace. In the consecration of a bishop the *Diaconica* are said by bishops. (Ménard on the *Gregorian Sacramentary*, p. 523; Noulle's *Tetralogia Liturgica*, p. 317.) [C.]

**DIACONICUM**. (1.) The vestry or sacristy of a church, so called from being the place where the deacons performed their duties in getting ready the vestments and holy vessels, heating the water, preparing and lighting the incense, and other essentials for the celebration of the Eucharist, and other divine offices. No minister of a lower grade was permitted to enter the Diaconicum (Conc. *Laod.* can. 21; *Concil. Agathensis* can. 66). The diaconicum was, as a rule, placed on the right or south side of the *apsis* or sanctuary, answering to the *prothesis* on the north, and communicating with the *apsis* by a door in the *parados* or side-wall. It also usually had an independent entrance through an external door. The diaconicum generally terminated apsidally, and was always provided with an altar (*Θυσιαστήριον*, *Αποψιθηγμένα* *Patrum*, apud Gelas. No. 3; *ἑξ ὧν ἔπαρξεν*, *Eucholog.* *Gear.* p. 245), on which the bread and wine were placed prior to their removal to the *prothesis*. Its wall was often adorned with pictures of saintly deacons, Stephen, Benjamin, &c. Within it was the treasury, *συναγωγείον*, or *συναφιδάσιον*, where the sacred vessels and other treasures of the church were kept (Cyril Scyth. in *Vita S. Sab.* apud Ducange). It was also used by the priests as a vestry, in which they changed their vestments and put on their eucharistic dress (*ἐκτελεστοντες ἀλλήσεως τὴν ἑσπέρην ἐν τῷ διακονίῳ*, *Typicon*, *Saba*, cap. ii. ap. Suicer). Relics were preserved in it (*Catalog. Patrum*, *Constantinopol.* ap. Suicer). Worshippers who for disciplinary reasons were excluded from the actual church were permitted to offer their devotions here, e.g. the Emperor Leo VI. when excommunicated for his fourth marriage (Cudrenus, *Compend. Hist.*). The diaconicum was sometimes a spacious chamber annexed to the church (*diaconicum majus*), large enough for the reception of a provincial or general synod (Council, p. 477). In the diaconicum of the church at Panama, the statue, supposed to be that of the woman with the issue of blood, removed for safety from the market-place, was erected (Philostorg. lib. vii. c. 3).

Other names by which the diaconicum was known were, *ἀνακτοράριον* (as being the hall of reception), *συναφιδάσιον*, *μεταρτίσιον* or *μεταρτίσιον* (a word of various orthography and very uncertain etymology, perhaps representing "mutatorium," as the place where the clergy changed their vestments), *συναγωγείον*, secretarium, as which see Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. viii. c. vii. § 7; Leo Allat. *De Templ. Græc. Rec.*, ep. i. § 13-15; Suicer, *sub* rec.; Ducange, *Glossar.* id. *Descript. S. Sophiæ*, ad Paul. Silentiari; Noulle, *Hist. East. Ch.*, General introd. p. 191, § 9.


(2.) *Diaconicum* also signifies the volume containing the directions for the due performance of the deacon's office, *βιβλίον τῆς Διακονίας*. Cf. Leo Allatius, *Descript. i. de Libr. Eccl. Græcor.*

(3.) The word is also used for certain prayers said at intervals in the service by the deacon *ὁὐχ ἁπαλόν*, known also as *ἐκπανά*. [*Diaconica*.] [E. V.]

**DIADEMA**. [*CROWN*: *CORONATION*.]

**DIAPASON, DIAPENTE DIATESSARON.** These are the three intervals of the octave, the perfect fifth, and the perfect fourth: the ratios which determine them are  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{2}{3}$ , and  $\frac{3}{4}$ . They were the only intervals that were considered consonances, and were always of the same magnitude in every scale whether diatonic, chromatic, or enharmonic, while the others were variable (see *CANON IN MUSIC*, p. 274). Although the system of reckoning by tetrachords continued till the time of Guido Aretinus, yet the name Diapason shows that the ancients attributed to the octave a greater degree of perfection in respect of consonance, which is also shown by the notation preserved by Alypius, where in the modes above the Dorian in pitch, for most of the higher notes (which would be the latest extension of the respective scales) the symbols representing the notes an octave below were adopted with the addition of a acute accent. It is strange that this plan was not extended over the whole "diagram" of the modes, which would have been a very material simplification, and is indeed a considerable approximation to our present system of calling all notes differing by an octave by the same name. This however appears to have escaped the notice of the early Latin authors, although they did make great simplifications. St. Gregory completed the recognition of the octave by reducing the names of notes to 7, which have remained to this day.

The fifth and fourth together make an octave ( $\frac{2}{3} \times \frac{3}{4} = \frac{1}{2}$ ), and according as the former or the latter was the lower in pitch, the octave was said to be harmonically or arithmetically divided; these divisions were also called authentic and plagal (q. v.), thus:

**Authentic:**  Here the value of G ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) is the Harmonic mean between those of C and c (1 and  $\frac{1}{4}$ ).

**Plagal:**  Here the value of F ( $\frac{2}{3}$ ) is the Arithmetic mean between those of C and c (1 and  $\frac{1}{4}$ ).

But it is worth noticing that if two harmonic means be inserted between C and c, F is one of them, which would point to the conclusion that the ancients were wrong in taking an arithmetical division at all, though it is most natural that that error should have been made by them.

This division can be made in any octave, excepting that that from F to f can only be divided authentically at c, and that from B to b can only be divided plagally at E. [J. R. L.]

#### DIAPENTE. [DIAPASON.]

**DIAPSALMA.** This is the word used in the Septuagint and recognized by other writers as the equivalent to "Selah," which occurs in the Psalms and in the Canticle of Habakkuk. See Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, sub voc. Selah, where the obscurity of the subject is fully stated. As the early Christians used the psalms in public worship so it is natural they would copy the Hebrew method of singing the psalms. The Liturgy of St. James prescribes Pss. 23, 34, 145, 117 at the Fraction, and in Ps. 34 *διάψαλμα* occurs in the LXX. where Selah is not found.

St. Jerome enters into the question at some length in his letter to Marcella, but leaves the matter in doubt; he mentions it also in his commentary on Ps. 4 and Habak. 3.

It appears to the writer that an interpretation suggested by the primary meaning of *ψάλλειν* will nearly, if not quite, reconcile the conflicting opinions and perhaps account for them; viz., that it was a direction for the instruments to play, while the chorus was silent or perhaps producing a series of notes without words, i.e., a "division,"\* or "Pneuma." It has been said that the Jews used Pneumata; if so, the adoption of them by Christians is obvious; but in any case it would seem that they were commonly in use at an early period. In consequence of the common use of various musical instruments at feasts and entertainments at which Christian morality was likely to be outraged in the period of the empire, the Christians were chary of their use in religious services, fearful doubtless of the association of ideas. Sir John Hawkins (*Hist. of Music*, p. xxvii.) gives a list of fathers who have denounced musical instruments, but he gives no references; and the writer has succeeded in verifying Epiphanius only, who speaks of the flute as a diabolical instrument. In the Eastern Church to this day instrumental music is, we believe, unknown. Thus the Pneuma may have been invented by the early Christians as the nearest approximation to the Diapsalma. [J. R. L.]

**DIARETOR.** The *Codex Eccl. Afric.* (c. 78) runs thus (Bruns's *Canones*, i. 175): "Rursus placuit, ut quoniam Hipponensium *diaretorum* ecclesiae destitutio non est diutius negligenda . . . eis episcopus ordinetur." The equivalent in the Greek version is "*φροντισταὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας*," "caretakers of the church" [INTERVENTOR], as if during a vacancy of the see, which is implied in the concluding words of the canon. Ducange (s. v.) conjectures "*directorum*," Hardouin "*diarrhytorum*." The word does not seem to occur elsewhere. [C.]

**DIASTYLA, Διάστυλα**, the CANCELLI by which the *bema* was separated from the *naos* (Sym. Thessalon. apud Ducange; *διὰ τῶν κυγκλίδων ἦτοι τῶν διαστύλων*). Goar's *Euchol.* p. 708. [E. V.]

#### DIATESSARON. [DIAPASON.]

**DICE** (*Alea*, κύβοι; Low-Latin, *Decius*; whence Fr. *Dé*). The playing at dice, or games of chance generally, never looked upon favourably by moralists or laws (see *Dict. of Greek and Rom. Antiq.*, s. v. ALEA), early attracted the notice of the censors of Christian manners. The *Paedagogus* of Clement (iii. 11, p. 497) forbids dice-playing, whether with cubes or with the four-faced dies called *ἀσπράγαλοι* (see Rost u. Palm, s. v.), out of desire for gain. Apollonius (in Euseb. *H. E.* v. 18, 11), denouncing the Montanists, asks whether prophets play at tables (*τάβλαις*) and dice. And gaming is one of the forms of vice which we find denounced by the Church in the earliest canons which remain to us. *The Apostolical Canons* (cc. 41, 42 [al. 42, 43]) forbade either clergy or laity to play with dice

\* "The lark makes sweet division."—*Romeo and Juliet* iii. 5.



on pain of degradation or excommunication. The Council of Elberis (A.D. 305) also denounced the penalty of excommunication against any of the faithful who played at dice, "that is, tables," for money (can. 79). And at the end of the 7th century the Trullan Council (can. 50) repeated the same penalties of degradation and excommunication. Nor was the civil power indifferent. Justinian (*Code*, lib. 1, *De Episc. et Cler.* l. 17; Nov. 123, c. 10) forbade the clergy of every rank from playing at games of chance (ad tabulas ludere), or even being present at them, on pain of suspension with exclusion in a monastery for three years. Another enactment (*Code*, lib. 1, *De Episc. Audien.* l. 25) commits the investigation of such offences to the bishops, and empowers them to call in the secular arm, if necessary, for the reformation of scandalous offenders; and yet another (*Id.* l. 35), complaining bitterly that even bishops did not abstain from these stolen pleasures, denounces such laxity in the severest terms. These imperial laws are all inserted in the *Nomocanon* of Photius and John of Antioch.

The laws themselves indicate that Christians and even clergy were by no means exempt from the almost universal passion for games of chance. One or two instances may serve to confirm this. Jerome relates (*De Script. Eccl. in Apol. Ep.* 105) that Synesius alleged his own irresistible propensity for gambling as a reason why he should not be made a bishop. Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* x. 16) tells us that certain nuns of the convent of St. Radegund at Poitiers accused their abbess, among other matters, of dicing; whereupon the abbess declared that she had done the same thing in the lifetime of St. Radegund († 587) herself, and that it was not forbidden either by the common law of canonical life or by their own Rule; nevertheless, she would submit to the judgment of the bishops. (Thomassinus, *Nova et Vet. Eccl. Discip.* pt. iii. lib. iii. c. 43.) [C.]

**DICEERIUM.** *Δικέριον*, *cercus bisulcus*, a two-forked wax taper used by bishops of the Greek Church in the Benediction of the people. It was also employed in the benediction of the Book of the Gospels lying on the Holy Table. The bishop was said *δικέριον σπρῳγίζειν*. The double taper was considered to symbolize the two natures of Christ.

*Τρικέριον*, *Trichēriou*, *cercus trisulcus*, was similarly used, and held to symbolize the Trinity.

Symeon the Syrian. *De Templo*, p. 222, *apud Ducange s. v. εἰκὼς*. Goar's *Eucholog.* p. 125. [E. V.]

#### DICTERIUM. [POLPIT.]

**DIDYMUS**, martyr at Alexandria; commemorated April 28 (*Mark. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(W. F. G.)

**DIES.** The word *dies* is used, like the English "day," to designate a festival: as (e. g.) the *Annives Franc.* A.D. 802, "Ipse rex celebravit diem S. Joannis Baptistae." The principal special uses of the word are the following:—

1. *Dies adraclis*, GOOD FRIDAY.

2. *Dies Aegyptiaci*. Certain "unlucky days" once marked in calendars (see the ancient calendars published by Bucher), supposed to have been discovered by the ancient Egyptians from astronomical calculations. Decrees were made

against the superstitious observance of these days (*Decret.* pt. 2, caus. 26, qu. 7, c. 16), and ancient Penitentials (see Ducange, s. v.) forbid men to avoid these days especially for blood-letting or commencing a work; indeed the superstitious preference for, or avoidance of, a day (*Decret.* u. a. c. 17) was forbidden generally. A memorial verse for showing when the Egyptian days fall is given by Durandus (*Rationale*, viii. 4, § 20).

3. *Dies boni*, "les bons jours," used for festivals (*Sidonius, Epist.* v. 17).

4. *Dies Cinerum*, the first day of LENT, or Ash-Wednesday.

5. *Dies Coenae Domini*, MAUNDY THURSDAY.

6. *Dies Consecrati*. The *Capitularium Car. M.*, (ii. c. 35), enjoins that four days at Christmas should be observed as festivals; these days are referred to in the council of Bourges, A.D. 853, c. 7, and in the *Capit. Car. Calci* at Compiègne, A.D. 868, c. 8, as *dies consecrati*, on which no courts were to be held.

7. *Dies Dominica*. [EASTER; LORD'S DAY.]

8. *Dies Magnus*, *Felicitissimus*, EASTER-DAY (*Capitularium Car. M.* v. c. 136); "dies magnus Coenae," Maundy Thursday (*Capit. Herardi*, c. 14). So ἡ μεγάλη ἡμέρα (*Conc. Ancyra*, c. 6) is used for Easter-Day. "Dies magnus" is also used for the Last Day (*Capit. Car. M.* vi. c. 378).

9. *Dies Natalis*. [NATALIS.]

10. *Dies Neophytorum*, the eight days, from Easter-Day to its octave, during which the newly baptised wore their white garment. Augustine (*Epist.* 119, c. 17) speaks of the "octo dies neophytorum" as days of special observance.

11. *Dies Palmarum*, or *in Ramis Palmarum*, PALM-SUNDAY.

12. *Dies Sancti*, the forty days of LENT. See the Theodosian *Code*, lib. ii. *De Festis*, and Baronius, ad an. 519, § 42.

13. *Dies Scrutinis*, the days on which candidates for baptism were examined, especially Wednesday in the fourth week of Lent.

14. *Dies Solis*, *Dies Lunae*, and the other days of the week; see WEEK.

15. *Dies tinctorum* or *marium*; certain days on which ceremonies were performed to avert the ravages of moths or mice (*Audouinus, Vita Eligii*, ii. 15). See Delrio, *Disquis. Magic.* lib. iii. pt. 2, qu. 4, § 6.

16. *Dies Veridicus*, is some ancient German calendars, Thursday in Holy Week, "Gründonnerstag." [MAUNDY THURSDAY.]

17. *Dies rotorum*, a wedding-day; *Leyes Lombard* lib. ii. tit. 4, § 8. [C.]

**DIETA.** The ecclesiastical CURSUS or daily office. Victor of Paris (MS. *Liber Ordinis*, c. 27, quoted by Ducange) orders his book to be carried round whenever office is said (quando *dicta* cantatur). See Belet, *De Div. Off.* c. 31; Durandus, *Rationale*, v. 3, 29. [C.]

**DIGAMY.** It has been stated under the head BIGAMY that we propose to consider under the present head whatever concerns the entering into marriage relations with two persons successively. The subject is one in respect to which a different morality has been applied to the clergy and laity. As respects each class moreover, it divides itself under two branches—which, however, it will not always be necessary to consider separately—that of successive marriages after divorce or

separation, and after the death of a husband or wife.

I. In respect of the clergy, it has been already observed under the head **BIGAMY** that the prescriptions as to bishops and deacons in 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12, and Tit. i. 6, requiring them to be husbands "of one wife," apply more probably to successive than to simultaneous marriages. The explanation of them seems to lie in those enactments of the Pentateuch (Levit. xxi. 7, 13, 14), which forbid the priest to marry a widow or divorced woman. The oldest authorities support this view. The *Apostolical Constitutions* (ii. 2) require the bishop to be the husband of a single woman once married; a prescription extended by a constitution, evidently indeed of later date (vi. 17) to presbyters, deacons, and even singers, readers, and porters; the deaconesses also were to be pure virgins, or at least widows of one husband (as to whom, see also viii. 25, no doubt later still). The so-called *Apostolical Canons* in like manner provide that if any one after baptism shall twice enter into marriage, or marry a widow or divorced woman, he cannot be a bishop, priest, or deacon, or in anywise on the list of the sacred ministry (cc. 13, 14, otherwise 16, 17, or 17, 18). It is clear from the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus (ix. 12) that by the beginning of the 3rd century the rule of monogamy for the clergy was well established, since he complains that in the days of Callistus "digamist and trigamist bishops, and priests, and deacons, began to be admitted into the clergy." Tertullian recognizes the rule as to the clergy. Thus in his *De Exhortatione Castitatis* (c. 7), he asks scornfully: "Being a digamist, dost thou baptize? being a digamist, dost thou make the offering?" And he points (*Ib.* c. 13) to certain honours paid among the heathens themselves to monogamy.

The rule of the Church, it will be observed, forbade alike to the clergy both personal digamy, and marriage with a digamous woman. St. Ambrose, in the first book of his *Offices* (c. 50), further considers the case of prebaptismal marriage,—many persons, it seems, being surprised that digamy before marriage should be an impediment to orders.

We pass from the testimony of the fathers to that of councils and popes. The so-called canons of the Nicene Council from the Arabic—which probably indeed only represent the state of the Church of Arabia at a much later period—enact the penalty of deposition against a priest or deacon dismissing his wife in order to change her for another fairer or better or richer, or "on account of his concupiscence" (c. 66, or 71 of the Ecchellensian version). The still more problematical 'Sanctions and Decrees' attributed to the Nicene fathers require, in accordance with the previously existing laws of the Church, the priest to be "the husband of one wife, not a bigamist or trigamist," and forbid him to marry a widow or dismissed woman, &c. (c. 14).

The first Council of Valence (A.D. 374) enacts that "none after this synod . . . be ordained to the clergy from among digamists, or the husbands of previously married women (internuptarum)," but decrees that nothing should be inquired into as to the status of those who are already ordained (c. 1). Compare the 4th Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), c. 69, and the 1st Council of Toledo (A.D. 400), cc. 3 and 4.

The letters of pope Innocent I. (A.D. 402-17) deal frequently with the subject, and more than once on the point already treated by St. Ambrose of the effect of prebaptismal marriage. In his 2nd to Victorinus bishop of Rouen, besides laying it down that clerics should only marry virgins (c. 4), he dwells on the absurdity of not reckoning a wife married before baptism (c. 6). The 23rd letter of the same pope, addressed to the Synod of Toledo, reverts a third time to the error of not reckoning in cases of digamy a prebaptismal marriage.

The letters of Leo the Great (A.D. 440-61) repeatedly recur to the subject. See the 4th, 5th, and 6th.

Second marriages were, however, still allowed to the inferior clergy. Thus the 25th canon of the 1st Council of Orange, A.D. 441, ordained respecting "those fit and approved persons whom the grace itself of their life counsels to be joined to the clergy, if by chance they have fallen into second marriage, that they should not receive ecclesiastical dignities beyond the subdiaconate." The same enactment is repeated almost in the same words in the 45th canon of the 2nd Council of Arles, A.D. 452. In some dioceses, however, the rule was still stricter, if full faith is to be given to a letter of bishops Loup of Troyes and Euphronius of Autun to bishop Talasius of Angers (A.D. 453), which lays it down that the Church allows digamy as far as the rank of porters, but excludes altogether exorcists and subdeacons from second marriage, whilst in the diocese of Autun the porter himself, the lowest of the inferior clergy, if he took a second wife lost his office, and, as well as a subdeacon or exorcist falling into the same "madness," was excluded from communion (see Labbé and Mansi's *Councils*, vol. vii. p. 942). As respects marriages to widows, we must not overlook a Council of uncertain place, of the year 442-4, by which a bishop named Chelidonius was deposed, amongst other reasons, for having contracted such a marriage; though he was afterwards absolved by Pope Leo. See further, against the 2nd marriages of the clergy or other marriages to widows or divorced women, the 4th canon of the Council of Angers, A.D. 453; the 4th canon of the 1st Council of Tours, A.D. 461; the 2nd canon of the Council of Rome, A.D. 465; letter 9 of pope Gelasius I. (A.D. 492-6) to the bishops of Lucania, cc. 3, 22; and two fragments of letters by him to the clergy and people of Brindisi.

Among the Nestorians of the East indeed, towards the end of the 5th century, the re-marriage of the clergy was held valid. One of their synods held in Persia, under Barsumas archbishop of Nisibis [**BIGAMY**], expressly lays it down that a priest whose wife is dead is not to be forbidden by his bishop to marry again, whether before or after his orders.\* And even in the West it is evident that instances of digamy or quasi-digamy must at the beginning of the 6th century have been so frequent in France at least as to require toleration. Thus the Council of

\* A somewhat later Nestorian synod under the patriarch Babaeus, however, seems to allow but one wife to the "Catholicus," all inferior priests, and monks. It is difficult, however, to collect the exact purport of the enactment from the short notice in Labbé and Mansi's *Councils*, vol. 8, p. 239.

Agde, A.D. 506, after the canons and statutes of the fathers had been read, determined, "as touching digamists or husbands of women before married (*internuptarum*)—although the statutes of the fathers had otherwise decreed—that those who till now have been ordained, compassion being had, do retain the name only of the priesthood or diaconate, but that such persons do not presume, the priests to consecrate, the deacons to minister" (c. 1). So the Council of Epaône, A.D. 517, c. 2; the 4th [3rd] Council of Arles, A.D. 524, c. 3; and the 4th Council of Orleans, A.D. 541, c. 10. It seems superfluous to multiply authorities as respects the Western Church, except to notice the introduction of the same legislation among new communities. Thus for England, a Council held under archbishop Theodore of Canterbury, towards the end of the 7th century, forbids the priesthood (c. 116) to the husband of a widow, whether married to her before or after baptism. The Collection of Irish Canons, supposed to be of about the same date, in its first book 'On the Bishop,' requires him to be a man "who having taken only one wife, a virgin, is content" (c. 9). And pope Gregory II. (714–30) in a capitulary to his ablegates in Bavaria, forbids a digamist, or one who has not received his wife a virgin to be ordained (c. 5). On the other hand, a Spanish canon seems to imply that quasi-digamous marriages might in that province be contracted with the advice of the bishop, since the 4th Council of Toledo, A.D. 633, enacted (c. 44) that clerics who without such advice (*sine consultu episcopi sui*) had married widows, divorced women, or prostitutes, were to be excluded from communion.

The last authority we shall quote, as embracing the East as well as the West, is that of the [5th] 6th General Council, that of Constantinople in Trullo, A.D. 691, which treats of the subject in a manner proving that the canonical injunctions against digamous or quasi-digamous marriages among the clergy were yet in many instances transgressed. Those who had become involved in second marriages, and down to a given past date had "served sin," were to be deposed, but those who, having become involved in the disgrace of such digamy before the decree, had forsaken their evil ways, or those whose second wives were dead already, whether priests or deacons, were ordered for a definite time to cease from all priestly ministrations, but to retain the honour of their seat and rank, whilst praying the Lord with tears to forgive them the sin of their ignorance. On the other hand those who had married widows, whether priests, deacons, or subdeacons, after a short period of suspension from ministerial functions, were to be restored to their rank, but without power of further promotion. For all those committing the like offence after the date assigned, the canon was renewed "which says that he who shall have become involved in two marriages after baptism, or shall have had a concubine, cannot be bishop, or priest, or deacon, or in anywise a member of the sacerdotal order; and so with him who has taken to wife a widow or divorced woman, or a harlot, or a slave, or a stage-player" (c. 3). It would probably be difficult to assign the original canon thus referred to. The text is moreover remarkable as confining the disability of second marriage to post-baptismal unions—in

direct opposition to the authority of St. Ambrose and others before referred to.

It is sufficient to state here that so long as we retain the female diaconate in sight, the same obligation of monogamy attaches to the deaconesses as to the male clergy; *e.g.*, not to speak of Epiphanius for the East, when the female diaconate reappears in Gaul during the 6th century, we find the 2nd Council of Orleans, A.D. 533, enacting that "women who have hitherto received against canonical prohibition the diaconal benediction, if they can be proved to have again lapsed into marriage, are to be expelled from communion;" but if they give up their husbands, they may be readmitted after penance (c. 17).

It must not be overlooked that the civil law of the Roman empire since the days of Justinian followed the canon law on the subject of clerical marriages. This is perhaps only implied in the Code (see bk. i. t. iii. l. 42, § 1, and l. 48), but distinctly enacted in the *Novels*. Under one or other of these, bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons were alike forbidden to receive ordination if they had been twice married, or had married widows or divorced women (6th *Nov.* cc. i. v.; 22nd *Nov.* c. xlii.; 123rd *Nov.* cc. i. xii.; 137th *Nov.* c. ii.). Readers who remarried or contracted the like marriages, could rise to no higher clerical rank (an indulgence which did not, however, extend to a third marriage), or if they obtained such irregularly, forfeited altogether their clerical position (6th *Nov.* c. v.; 22nd *Nov.* c. xlii.; 123rd *Nov.* c. xiv.). Deaconesses must in like manner, if not virgins, have been only once married (6th *Nov.* c. vi.).<sup>b</sup>

II. As respects the laity, the distinction between second marriages after divorce or separation, and after death, which is unimportant as respects the clergy, becomes an essential one. In both respects the practice of the Church, instead of being founded, as it was with reference to the clergy, on the prescriptions of the Old Testament, depends upon a more or less narrow interpretation of the New, or on more or less bold deductions from its teachings, combined with the surrounding influences of civil society. In conformity with St. Paul's views as to remarriage after death, we

<sup>b</sup> A curious offshoot from the subject of the prohibition of clerical bigamy is the extension of that prohibition to the widows of clerics. Thus, the first Council of Toledo, A.D. 400, enacted that if the widow of a bishop, priest, or deacon took a husband, no cleric or religious woman ought so much as to eat with her, nor should she be admitted to communion except *in articulo mortis* (c. 18). The 4th Council of Orleans, A.D. 511, required the widow of a priest or deacon married again to be separated from her husband, or if she remained with him, both to be excluded from communion (c. 13). The Council of Epaône (A.D. 517), somewhat more sharply decreed immediate exclusion of both, till they should separate (c. 32). The Council of Lerida (A.D. 524) according to Surius, forbade the communion to the remarried widow of a bishop, priest, or deacon, even *in articulo mortis*. The Council of Auxerre (A.D. 578) again forbade such marriages as respects the widows of the superior clergy; the Council of Mâcon, A.D. 585, extended the prohibition to those of subdeacons, exorcists, and acolytes, under pain of confinement for life in a convent of women (c. 16). Yet Pope Gregory the Great (A.D. 599–603) did not go so far, for we find him in a letter to Leo, bishop of Catania, (bk. ii. letter 34) ordering a certain Honorata, widow of a subdeacon, who on her marrying again had been shut up in a monastery to be restored to her husband.

find Hermas writing that "whoso marries"—i.e. as shown in the context, after the death of either wife or husband—"does not sin, but if he dwells by himself, he acquires great honour to himself with the Lord" (bk. ii. M. iv. § 4); but adopting the stricter view as to remarriage after divorce, declaring it to be adultery in the man even when he has put away his wife for that offence itself, and the same to be the case with the wife (*ibid.* § 1). Negatively, on the other hand, it may be observed that the epistle of Barnabas, in enumerating the works of the "way of light," does not specify monogamy (see c. 19).

The *Apostolical Constitutions* (iii. 1) speak of the marriage of a church-widow as bringing disgrace to the class, "not because she contracted a second marriage, but because she did not keep her promise (*ἐπαγγελίαν*)"—a passage clearly implying even in this case the full lawfulness of second marriage. See also cc. 2 and 3, and *Apost. Can.* 40, al. 47 or 48.

Although amongst the earlier Romans there was one form of marriage which was indissoluble, viz., that by *confarreatio*, still generally a second marriage either after death or divorce, was by no means viewed with disfavour. There are, however, certain clear indications that already in the first century of our era constancy to a single partner was in the Roman world beginning to be looked upon with favour. Thus Tacitus speaks of Germanicus's being a man "of one marriage" as one of the causes of his influence (*Ann.* ii. 73), and mentions a little further on (c. 76) that the daughter of Pollio was chosen to be chief vestal "for no other reason than that her mother remained married to the same man." The same Tacitus observes of the Germans that the best of their communities (*civitates*) were those where the women only married as virgins, so that they never had but one husband (*De Mor. Germ.* c. xix.). And it is perhaps worthy of notice that the *jus connubii*, when given to soldiers, was restricted under Philip (247-9) to the case of a first marriage, though this was probably not attributable to any moral considerations (see Muratori, *Thes. Inscr.* i. 362).

Meanwhile an intensifying spirit of asceticism was leading many in the church to a condemnation of second marriage in all cases. Minucius Felix (*Octavius*, c. 31, § 5) only professes on behalf of the Christians a preference for monogamy. Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 150-220) seems to confine the term marriage to the first lawful union (*Stromata*, bk. ii.—quoted, as well as several of the following references, in Cotelierius, *Patres Apostol.* vol. i. p. 90, n. 16). Athenagoras terms second marriage "fair seeming adultery." Tertullian (A.D. 150-226) inveighs against it with unwearied urgency, in his two books *Ad Uxorem*, in his *De Exhortatione Castitatis*, in his *De Monogamiâ*, and in his *De Pudicitia*—the last but one, however, written when he was altogether a Montanist. In the first of them, indeed, he admits that his wife will not actually sin if she marry after his death (i. 7), but argues from clerical to lay monogamy. In the *Exhortation to Chastity* (which is addressed to a man) he uses the same argument, but goes so far as to say that second marriage is a form of adultery (c. 9). Origen (184-253) so far as the Latin text of his 17th homily on

Luke can be trusted, is not much less severe. Recommending perseverance in widowhood, he says: "But now both second and third and fourth marriages, not to speak of more, are to be found, and we are not ignorant that such a marriage shall cast us out from the kingdom of God."

It would seem, however, that when these views were carried to the extent of absolute prohibition of second marriages generally by several heretical sects, the Montanists (see Augustin, *de Haeresibus*, c. 26), the Cathari (*ib.* c. 38), and a portion at least of the Novatianists (see Cotel. *Patr. Ap.* vol. i. p. 91, n. 16), the Church saw the necessity of not fixing such a yoke on the necks of the laity. The forbiddance of second marriage, or its assimilation to fornication, was treated as one of the marks of heresy (Augustin, u. s.; and see also his *De bono viduitatis*, c. 6). The sentiment of Augustin (in the last referred to passage) may be taken to express the Church judgment at the close of the 4th century: "Second marriages are not to be condemned, but had in less honour;" and see also Epiphanius, in his *Exposition of the Catholic Faith*, c. 21.

What the "less honour" consisted in may partly be inferred as respects the Greek Church, from the 'Sanctions and Decrees' attributed to the Nicene Fathers (Labbe and Mansi, *Councils*, vol. ii. p. 1029 and foll.), which distinctly authorize widowers' and widows' marriages (i. 7). Yet the blessing of the crowns is not to be imparted to them, for this is only once given, on first marriages, and not to be repeated. . . . But if one of them be not a widower or widow, let such one alone receive the benediction with the paranymphe, those whom he will.

The 7th Canon of the Council of Neocaesarea, in A.D. 314 or 315, bears that the presbyter ought not to be present at the marriage festivities of digamists, as the act would be incompatible with his assigning a penance to such persons. The canon implies, it will be seen, that the act of second marriage entailed the infliction of a penance. This appears more clearly from the 1st Canon of the Council of Laodicea, (between A.D. 357 and 367), which rules, as respects those who have "freely and lawfully" contracted a second marriage, without any secrecy, that after a short time, and some chastisement in prayers and fastings, they should be admitted to Communion. And Basil (A.D. 326-379) in his Canonical epistle to bishop Amphilocheus of Iconium fixes one year as the period of the suspension of digamists from communion.

We must thus consider that two views on the subject of simple remarriage after the death of husband or wife were abroad in the Church; one which, with Augustin, looked upon it as merely less honourable than monogamy, and deemed its actual condemnation a mark of heresy; the other, which looked upon it as in itself an offence deserving penance, however slight this might be.

The latter view found most colour as respects second marriages after what was deemed a religious profession, as that of the penitent, and of the widow. See *IV. Conc. Carth.* c. 104; *II. Arles*, c. 21; Pope Symmachus, *Epist.* 5, § 5; *V. Paris*, c. 13, and many others.

A more extraordinary instance of the enforcement of monogamy on a particular class of women is confined to Spain. The 13th Council



of Toledo, in 683, declared it to be "an execrable crime, and a work of most inveterate iniquity, after the death of kings, to affect the royal couch of their surviving consorts" (c. 5). This was confirmed some years later by the 3rd Council of Saragossa, A.D. 691, which required the widows of the kings to enter a convent for the remainder of their lives (c. 5).

The penance for ordinary digamy recurs in our own country, in the canons of a Council held under Archbishop Theodore, of Canterbury, which fixes it at two days fasting from wine and flesh-meat every week during the first year, and fasting for three consecutive Lenten, "but without dismissing the wife" (c. 26). But subject however to some such qualifications, second marriage after the death of husband or wife remained fully recognised as the right of the laity. In later times, indeed, so slight a feeling subsisted in the Romish Church against re-marriage among the laity after the death of a husband or wife, that Muratori (*Antiquitates Medii Aevi*, ii. Diss. 20), says that the Latin Church never forbade second, third, or even more marriages after the death of one of the parties, although the ancient church, especially during the 3rd and 4th centuries, bore such unions impatiently, and subjected them to penance.

It must now be observed that the feeling against second marriage traceable in early times in the records of the Church gradually extended to the Civil Law, especially as regards widows. The earliest laws which indicate this feeling appear to belong to the time of Theodosius the Great (A.D. 380-2), and are to be found in Justinian's Code, bk. v. tit. ix., *De secundis nuptiis*, and bk. vi. tit. lvi.

Substantially the Roman civil law, like that of the Church, fully recognised the right of second marriage of a surviving husband or wife, latterly confining itself to securing with especial care the rights of the issue of the first marriage. The barbaric codes do not vary materially from this point of view. See the *Edict* of Theodoric, c. 37; the *Laws* of Notharis (A.D. 638 or 643), cc. 182, 183; *Laws* of Liutprand (A.D. 724), vi. c. 74. The laws of the Wisigoths recognised fully the right of remarriage after the death of a partner among the laity. See the *Laws* of Chindaswinth, bk. iii. tit. 1, l. 4.

Among the Carolingian *Capitularies* is one forbidding marriage with widows without their priests' (*suorum sacerdotum*) consent and the knowledge of the people (bk. v. c. 40). Marriages with professed widows were declared to be no true marriages, and the parties were to be separated, without any accusation being brought against them, by the priest or the judge, and were to be sent into perpetual exile (*ib.* c. 411); though another enactment (bk. vii. c. 338) seems to limit the penalty to suspension from communion till amendment of life, or in default of such amendment, to perpetual exclusion. If, indeed, a widow who was also a penitent remarried, she and her husband were not to be suffered to enter the church (*ib.* 317, and see also *Add. Quarta* c. 88). A woman who had connexion with two brothers was never to marry again (*ib.* 381). A limit was even sought to be imposed on the number of marriages which might be contracted: "Let none take more than two wives, since the third is already superfluous" (bk. vii. c. 406).

III. We come now to a branch of the subject on which the law of the Church has seldom run precisely in the same groove as that of the state, viz., remarriage not after death of one of the parties, but after divorce or separation. Several classes of cases have here to be distinguished. The first is that in which physical separation involves the presumption or at least the possibility of death. The 22nd *Novel* fixed a period of five years, after which the wife of a captive husband, who could hear no tidings of him, might lawfully marry again (c. 7). The Wisigothic Code was less indulgent. One of its older laws enacted that no woman might marry in her husband's absence, till he was known to be dead; otherwise, on his return, both she and her second husband were to be given over to him, so that he might do with them what he chose, whether by selling them or in any other way (bk. ii. t. ii. l. 6). As respects the church, a letter of Pope Innocent I. (402-17) to Probus simply lays down that where a wife had been carried into captivity and her husband married again in her absence, on the return of the former the first marriage alone held good (*Ep.* 9). Leo the Great ruled to the same effect in his letter (A.D. 458) to Nicetas, Bishop of Aquileia. Wives whose husbands had been taken in war were bound to return to their former husbands under pain of excommunication; but the second husbands were not to be held guilty for the act of marrying (*Ep.* 159). The Council in Trullo (A.D. 692), more severe, decreed that the wife of an absent husband marrying before she was certain of his death was guilty of adultery (c. 93).

The next group of cases are those of simple prolonged physical separation. The Roman law took especial account of the case of soldiers. The 22nd *Novel* allowed the wife of a soldier after ten years' absence, during which she must have repeatedly pressed her husband by letters or messages, whilst he either repelled her importunities, or wholly neglected them, to marry again, altering in this respect a constitution of Constantine's (*Code*, bk. v. t. xvii. l. 7), which seemed to fix four years as a sufficient period of separation. But the wife was required to present a protest, apparently a written one, to the soldier's superior officers (c. 14); and the 117th *Novel* surrounded this proceeding with certain formalities, requiring moreover the wife to wait a year further after taking the step in question before she could lawfully marry again (l. 11). St. Basil on the other hand notices the case in his first canonical epistle to Amphilochius, and decrees that where the soldier's wife remarries, the circumstances should be examined into, and some indulgence shewn (c. 36). The Council in Trullo adopted this view, and authorized a soldier, who might return after a long absence and find his wife married to another, to take her back, indulgence being shewn both to the woman and to her second husband (c. 93).

Physical separation through captivity constitutes the next group. A council held under Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, towards the end of the 7th century, allows a layman, if his wife were by force carried away into captivity, and he could not recover her, to take another, as being better than to commit fornication (c. 31). After such a second marriage (which

could be contracted after a twelvemonth, c. 140), he was not at liberty to take back his former wife if married to another, but she might herself also marry another husband (c. 31). One of the later Lombard laws (A.D. 721) enacts that if any one go away for a matter of business or of trade, whether within a province or out of it, and do not return within three years, his wife may apply to the king, who may allow her to marry again (Law of Liutprand, bk. iii. c. 4).

If we now consider the case of voluntary desertion or divorce, we shall find considerable fluctuation in the rules and practice of the Church as to a second marriage following thereon. St. Paul had, indeed, admitted that desertion for the faith's sake dissolved the social obligations of marriage: "If the unbelieving depart, let him depart; a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases" (1 Cor. vii. 15). Did the not being "under bondage" imply freedom to marry again? An alleged canon of Gregory the Great is reported to have ruled that it was no sin to do so (c. 17). The same conclusion may, perhaps, be drawn, as respects heresy at least, from a canon (72) of the Council in Trullo, which not only forbids marriage between an orthodox person and a heretic, but declares it void and dissolved; and seems only by way of permission to allow that where two infidels have married, and one comes to the light of the truth, he or she may remain in union with the other. And under the canons of the English Council under Theodore, the case would be included in that of desertion generally, in which it was laid down that a layman deserted by his wife might after two years take another with the bishop's consent (c. 140). Indeed St. Basil in the 4th century had ruled in his first canonical epistle to Amphilochius that a woman who married a man deserted by his wife, if dismissed on the latter's return, had only fornicated in ignorance, and was not forbidden to marry again; though he thought it better that she should remain single (c. 46). The 93rd canon of the Council in Trullo confirmed this view,

There was indeed one case of separation, the very converse of that of a Christian husband or wife deserted by an infidel partner, which Justinian's code specially dealt with, that of the husband or wife embracing the monastic profession. This was held to give freedom to the other party to marry again, although as respects a woman, by analogy with the law in case of remarriage after death, only after the expiration of a twelvemonth. She was, however, at once to send a divorce *bonâ gratiâ* to her husband (Code, bk. i. t. iii. l. 53, § 3; and see l. 56; 5th Nov. c. 5; 22nd Nov. c. 5). The avoidance of marriage by the religious profession was however maintained, after the divorce *bonâ gratiâ* had been forbidden; see the 117th Nov. cc. 10, 12, and the 123rd, c. 40.

The great struggle was, however, on the subject of marriage after divorce. Our Lord's teaching on the subject, it will be remembered, was not only in professed opposition to the Jewish law, but in no less signal opposition to the Roman, in which the facilities for divorce were simply scandalous. The right of divorce in specified cases, and of subsequent remarriage for the innocent party, was maintained by the state for a long time under the emperors (see Code,

bk. v. t. xvii.). No limitation of time for remarriage was fixed for the man (lib. l. 8, § 5, *Constitution of Theodosius and Valentinian*, A.D. 449); but by analogy with the case of remarriage after death, the woman's right to remarry after divorce for her husband's wrong, or after a divorce by mutual consent, was limited to arise after the expiration of a twelvemonth (§ 4 and l. 9, *Constitution of Anastasius*, A.D. 497). But if she divorced herself from her husband otherwise than in the cases specified, she could not remarry within five years, and if she did, became infamous, and the marriage void (l. 8, § 4). The right of remarriage by a wife after the year was by the 22nd Novel extended to all cases of "reasonable" divorce obtained by her; the husband in the like case being always free to remarry at once (cc. 16, 18). The divorce by mutual consent, except for the sake of observing chastity, was however forbidden by the 117th Novel, c. 10.

In Italy the right of divorce and remarriage was maintained by the edict of Theodoric according to the old constitutions (c. 54), and though it cannot be traced through the Lombard laws, probably subsisted till the Carolingian conquest, when by a capitulary of the year 789, enacted for Lombardy, marriage after divorce was forbidden (bk. i. c. 42).

The Wisigothic law seems first to have admitted divorce, then sought to forbid it altogether. An "ancient" law prohibited a divorced woman from remarrying, and if she did, ordered both her and her second husband to be given over to the former one (bk. iii. t. ii. l. 1).

If we turn now to the law of the Church, we find the Council of Eliberis in 305 forbidding communion even in *extremis* to women leaving their husbands without cause and marrying another (c. 8). See also c. 9 and c. 10.

Basil in his canonical epistle to Amphilochius dwells at length on the subject of divorces (c. 9). He doubts, indeed, whether a woman living with a divorced man is to be treated as an adulteress; but she is one certainly who leaves her husband and marries again. But the deserted husband may receive absolution (*συγγνωστός ἐστί*), and the woman who lives with him is not condemned; though it is otherwise if the man himself leaves his wife (*ib.*). Such a man marrying again is an adulterer, and only in the 7th year is to be readmitted among the faithful (c. 77). To Basil's mind, a dismissed wife should remain unmarried (c. 48).

The African Council of Milevis, A.D. 416, the 17th canon of which forbids generally dismissed women to marry other husbands, hardly agrees with an Irish Council of uncertain date held under St. Patrick, which lays it down that first marriages are not made void by second ones, "unless they have been polluted by adultery" (c. 28); nor with the Council of Vannes (*Veneticum*) in 465, which enacts excommunication against those who having wives, except by reason of fornication, without proof of adultery marry other women (c. 2). The Council of Hertford in 673 seems to revert to the stricter view, enacting that a man is not to leave his wife except for fornication, nor, if dismissing her, to marry another (c. 10). The Council in Trullo declares that both the woman leaving her husband and marrying another, and the man leaving his wife and

marrying another, commit adultery, and enacts a graduated scale of penance for seven years (c. 88). On the other hand, the English Council under Theodore enacts that where a wife is unfaithful a man might dismiss her and marry another, the woman however not to be allowed to marry her lover (c. 143). And yet by a seemingly strange contradiction it is enacted that a harlot's husband may not marry any other woman during her lifetime (c. 166), the case aimed at being probably that of a marriage with a full knowledge that the woman did not mean to leave her course of life. Among the *Excerpts* from the chapters, "de remediis peccatorum," by the same archbishop, published in the *Anecdota* of Martene, we find that the penance assigned to a man dismissing his wife and marrying another is seven years "with tribulation," besides five years of lighter penance. If the wife departed, and the husband married again, his penance was for one year only.

A letter (7) of Pope Zacharias (A.D. 741-51) to Pepin as mayor of the palace, enjoins again the excommunication of laymen dismissing their wives and taking others in their place (c. 7), and reiterates the prohibition against marriage after divorce (c. 12), which we find also repeated in the replies made by Pope Stephen II. in 754 to certain queries put to him when he was at Quierri in France (c. 5).

Under Charlemagne a different spirit becomes obvious. The law is made stricter, but the rulers are above it. All injunctions to morality on the part of the popes were powerless against the passions of their Carolingian patrons. See the curious letter addressed by Stephen III. (A.D. 768-70) to Charlemagne and Carloman his son, then associated with him on the throne.

The Council of Aix in 789 (c. 42) and the Council of Friuli in 791 (c. 10), endorsing the stricter construction of our Lord's words as to divorce, enacted that after a divorce for adultery neither party should marry again. The latter, however, "by indulgence," allowed those who were separated for consanguinity's sake on discovery to marry again, if they could not remain unmarried, which it recommended them to do; but if they wilfully contracted such a marriage they were after separation to do penance all their lives and never marry again, nor could their children inherit from them (c. 8). The prohibitions against a second marriage after divorce are repeated in the Capitularies, bk. vii. cc. 73, 382 (the latter expressly including the case of adultery); bk. v. c. 300, *Add. quarta* cc. 118-161,—the prohibition being here extended to marrying again after "killing a wife without cause." And the edict of Charlemagne (A.D. 814) directs inquiry whether all men noble or ignoble, have lawful wives, "not the dismissed wives of others."

Strange to say, the Eastern empire presented at this same period a similar scandal to that of the imperial court of the west. The Emperor Constantine had sent his wife to a convent and married another, the Archbishop Joseph performing the ceremony. For so doing he was ejected by the patriarch Tarasius, but received to communion by a Constantinopolitan synod in 806 in spite of the efforts of Theodorus Studita and of the monks, and another assembly in 809,

declared the emperor's marriage to be lawful, on the shameful ground that "the divine laws can do nothing against kings."—It is somewhat curious to add that a Nestorian synod held in Persia in 804, following the stricter view, had laid it down that after a divorce for fornication neither husband nor wife could marry again.

To sum up the conclusions of this inquiry, we find—1st, that as respects the clergy, a rule borrowed from Leviticus or derived from its prescriptions was held by the church to forbid to the clergy all marriages which should on either side be of a digamous character; and that although this rule was evidently constantly infringed in practice, and its infringements oftentimes condoned in the past, it was nevertheless steadily upheld as binding throughout the whole period to which this work refers, and latterly extended or sought to be extended to the inferior clergy; the one open protest against its application being that of a Nestorian synod in Persia, towards the end of the 5th century. 2nd, that as respects the laity, notwithstanding the stricter views taken by several writers of the earlier church, the right of remarriage after the death of a husband or wife became firmly established, though in the Eastern church such marriages were subjected to some ceremonial disparagement, and were generally sought to be discouraged by penances more or less severe. 3rd, that considerable fluctuation in the views and practice of the Church seems to have prevailed on the subject of remarriage after separation or divorce, and that whilst second marriages in such cases were generally condemned by the letter of the canon law towards the end of the 8th and beginning of the 9th centuries, the sovereigns both of the East and West set such prohibitions at nought for themselves, and parted with their wives to marry others almost at their will.

(See also BIGAMY).

[J. M. L.]

**DIGNITAS.** A well-known classical word = *id*, quo quis re aliquâ dignus est, as Facciolti defines it. By degrees it was used as a generic term for ranks or offices, "*Dignitas equestris, senatoria, consularis*," and so forth. From Pliny downwards, by "*dignitates*" were frequently meant "*magistracies*." The well-known *notitia*, or "Table of dignities of the Roman Empire in the east and west," which Paucirolos thinks may have been published about the end of the reign of Theodosius the younger in its present shape, was probably commenced under Augustus (Böcking's *Notit.* p. liii.-v.). They form the subject of the 6th book in the Theodosian Code, and of the 1st and last books in that of Justinian (Gothofred *Op. Jurid. Min.* pp. 1263, 1374, and 1415-18). All, of course, were purely secular; but, in process of time, when ecclesiastics were promoted to secular offices, and ecclesiastical offices themselves began to confer as much social distinction as secular, people talked of "*dignities*" in the Church as freely as in the State. Hence, retrospectively, this term might be extended to the offices of bishop, metropolitan, archbishop, patriarch, pope, cardinal, bishop-suffragan, archpriest, archdeacon, chancellor, &c., though, as matter of fact, it was never applied to them till it had been used to denote later and more subordinate posts first. In ecclesiastical parlance, says Ducange, "when a benefice included the administration of ecclesiastical affairs

with jurisdiction, it was called a dignity." And Thomassin, to the same purpose, speaks of "procurators, deans, stewards, chamberlains, treasurers, cellarars, and sacristans, as among the 'dignities' inseparable from cathedrals and abbey" (*De Ben.* i. li. 70). True, we meet with none of these words in their received ecclesiastical meaning before the 9th century; nor was it till then, probably, that ecclesiastical offices of any kind began to be styled "dignities;" still, practically, they had been this long before. [E. S. Fr.]

**DIMISSORY LETTERS.** (*Litterae dimissoriae, formatae; διαγραφὰ ἀπολυτήριαι.*) Letters given by a bishop to one of his clerks removing into another diocese; or to a layman of his diocese desiring to be ordained elsewhere. [See *Minor*, p. 232: COMMENDATORY LETTERS.]

1. In ancient times a bishop was forbidden to receive a clerk from another diocese, or to admit to higher orders a clerk already ordained to some inferior rank, or to ordain a layman domiciled in another diocese (*alterius plebis hominem*), without the express and formal consent of the bishop of that diocese (*Conc. Nicen.* i. c. 16; *C. Sardic.* cc. 16, 19, A.D. 347; *C. Carthag.* i. c. 8, A.D. 348; *C. Taurin.* c. 7; *C. Aranc.* i. c. 8, 9; *C. in Trullo*, c. 17; *Ordo Rom.* VIII. p. 87). Monks, psalmists, and doorkeepers, were included under the designation of clerks (*C. Carth.* iii. c. 31; compare *Augustine, Epist.* 233, 240, 249). A bishop was not to hinder a presbyter of his diocese from being ordained bishop of a church to which he was elected, nor was one who had a superfluity of clerks to refuse them to a diocese where there were too few (*C. Carth.* iii. c. 45). The decision in cases of this kind seems to have rested with the metropolitan. In a case in which a bishop, Julianus, wished to reclaim a lector who belonged to his diocese by birth, though he belonged by baptism to the bishop who had ordained him, Epiphanius, it was ruled that the lector belonged to the diocese of his baptism, to which he had come as a catechumen with commendatory letters (*C. Carth.* iu. c. 44).

The rules, however, with regard to the ordination of extraneous laymen were probably never enforced with the same strictness as those which related to clerics. Origen, an Alexandrian, was ordained presbyter by the bishops of Caesarea and Jerusalem, much to the indignation of his own bishop, Demetrius; there was, however, in Origen's case a special reason—his mutilation—why he should not be ordained (*Euseb. H. E.* vi. 8, 26, 27). Jerome was ordained priest at Antioch, neither the church of his birth nor of his baptism. And there are other instances of the like kind.

The theory on which all this rests is that a bishop by the act of ordination acquired a perpetual right to the services of the clerks whom he ordained ("Quisquis comes in hac ecclesia ordinem sacram accepit, egrediendi ex ea ulterius licentiam non habet." *Greg. Mag. Epist.* v. 38), and even—in a less degree—to the services of those whom he baptised. Hence letters dimissory were not merely letters testimonial or commendatory, but properly *ἀπολυτήριαι*; instruments, that is, setting the clerk free from his allegiance to his first bishop, and transferring the same powers over him to the bishop of his adopted

diocese (Thomassin, *Nova et Vetera Ecclesiae Discipline*, ii. l. i. ff.).

2. It was probably from the same notion, of the clerks being bound by a peculiar allegiance to their bishop, that the practice arose of requiring the clergy, and "religious" persons generally, to have the sanction of the bishop before they approached their king or lord (dominus) for the purpose of asking benefices (*Conc. Aurelian.* i. c. 7, A.D. 511. This canon is, however, wanting in several MSS.). [C.]

**DINGOLVINGA, COUNCIL OF** (*Dingoltingensis*), at Dingolfing, on the river Isar, in Bavaria, A.D. 772, under Tassilo, Duke of Bavaria, passed 13 canons upon discipline and reformation of manners. *Labb. Conc.* vi. 1794, 1795; *Le Cointe, Annal. a. in an.* 770; Harsheim, *Conc. German.* i. 130. [A. W. E.]

**DIOCESE.** The word *διοίκησις*, signifying in its general sense any kind of administration, came to be specifically applied by the Romans to a Province, but to one of the lower sort, for Cicero speaks of his Province Ciliciana "cui acta sunt *διοικήσεις*; Asiaticas attribuitur fuisse" (*Epist. ad Fam.* lib. xiii. ep. 67).

At a later period, however, when Constantine remodelled the civil divisions of the empire, a *diocesis*, instead of being a minor province, contained within it several provinces. Thus, for instance, there were ten provinces in the Egyptian diocese. About the same time the word passed from the terminology of the civil government into that of the church. It was employed in a sense analogous to its secular application, and signified an aggregate not merely of several districts governed each by its own bishop, but of several provinces (*ἐπαρχίαι*) each presided over by a metropolitan. The diocese itself was under an *Exarch* or *Patriarch* (*ἐξαρχὴ*). It is in this sense that the Council of Constantinople (can. 2) speaks of the Asian and Pontic dioceses, and the Council of Ephesus of the Egyptian diocese. *Διοικήσεις ἰστέον ὅτι καλλίστη διοικήσις ἔχουσιν ἐν ἡμετέροις Βασιλικοῖς, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς διαιρέσθαι.* About the same period the word *diocesis* began also to assume the sense which has finally prevailed to the exclusion of that just mentioned, and to be used to signify the district governed by a single bishop. For the three first centuries this was commonly denoted by *ἐπαρχία*, but it now began also to be called *diocesis*, as in the Council of Carthage (see *Bing. Antiq.* bk. ix. li. § 2) we have "Placuit ut omni ut facultas, relicta principali cathedra, ad aliquam ecclesiam in diocesi constitutam se conferat." In point of fact, however, the word, which perhaps retained to a certain degree its general rather than its technical sense, is found applied in turn to every kind of ecclesiastical territorial division. For while Hincmar (*Epist. ad Nicolaum*) uses it of the province of a metropolitan ("non solum diocesis, verum etiam parochia mea inter duo regna sub duobus regibus habetur *ἐκκλησία*"), Suarez alleges other authorities to show that the



word is sometimes employed in a sense closely resembling our word *parish*, viz. the district of a single church in a diocese. It has been observed that this was a Latin, and especially an African use of the term (Thomass. l. l. c. 3).

Considered in the acceptance of the word, which has prevailed in later times to the exclusion of the others, a bishop's diocese and his power over it are thus spoken of in the 4th century—

"Εκαστον ἐπίσκοπον ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ παροικίας, διωκεῖν τε κατὰ τὴν ἐκάστῃ ἐπιβάλλουσιν ἐνυλάθειαν, καὶ πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι πάσης τῆς χώρας τῆς ὑπὸ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν ὡς καὶ χειροτονεῖν πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, καὶ μετὰ κρίσεως ἕκαστα διαλαμβάνειν. περαιτέρω δὲ μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπιχειρεῖν δίχα τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ αὐτὸν ἄνευ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν γνώμης. (Concil. Antioch. can. 9.)

It has been thought that, from every bishop having a right to erect new churches in his own diocese, and to set up a cross on the spot where they were to be placed, his diocese has sometimes been called *σταυροπήγιον* (Bing. viii. 9, 5).

The canonical rule was not only that a diocese should have but one bishop, but that a bishop should have but one diocese. In subsequent times, however, the latter part of this rule was much broken down by the practice of "commenda." This practice came into use on various grounds. One of these is thus indicated by Thomassin:—"Incursationes barbarorum juges et cruentissimae Fundanâ civitate episcopum plebemque propemodum omnem effugarant. Cum viduata tunc pastore suo fuisset Terracina, Fundanum sibi postulavit episcopum. Confirmata est a Gregorio Magno ea electio, a quo jussus est Agnellus titulum et administrationem gerere ecclesiae Terracinensis, et nihil secius veluti commendatam sibi curare ecclesiam Fundanam. 'Sic te Terracinensis ecclesiae cardinalem constituimus esse sacerdotem, ut et Fundensis ecclesiae pontifex esse non desinas'" (Thomassin, pt. ii. lib. 3, cap. 10).

In other cases a vacant diocese was simply committed to the care of a neighbouring bishop till a successor could be appointed. This was in the earlier times the most common species of commenda, and was of course temporary only.

Sometimes there was a kind of double commenda, the pope commending to the care of a neighbouring bishop a diocese whose own diocesan was occupied in administering the affairs of another church previously commended to him.

In other instances, again, where a bishop was under sentence of penance, the affairs of his church were entrusted to another, or to the metropolitan, until he was restored. "Emeritense Concilium Metropolitano commendavit ecclesias eorum episcoporum, qui ad poenitentiam secedere jussi fuerant, quod a Concilio Provinciali abfuissent" (Thomassin, pt. ii. lib. 3, c. 11).

In one instance Childeric appears to have commended a diocese to the care of an abbot (*ibid.*).

At first the bishop to whom a diocese was commended appears only to have received his actual expenses. Gregory the Great, however, when Paulus had charge of Naples during a vacancy, directed as follows:—"Praedicto Paulo centum solidos et unum puerulum orphanum quem ipse elegerit pro labore suo de eadem ecclesia facias dari" (*ibid.* c. 10).

By degrees large profits were derived from a commenda, and it thus became an object of ambition, and was bestowed by popes and sovereigns without reason and to the prejudice of the Church. In later times it became a flagrant abuse, but its worst forms belong perhaps mainly to a period beyond our present limits. It came to be held in perpetuity, instead of for a limited period, and the revenues of two or more sees were accumulated upon one person as a provision for life.

One peculiar kind of commenda must not be omitted, viz. where a part of the revenues of a church was assigned to a great lay noble, in return for his taking on himself its defence against its heathen or other enemies. Such protectorates were common in the more disturbed periods. They are styled 'commendae militares.' In the same manner and on like grounds the sovereigns retained to themselves portions of church property. But the subject of *Commendae* is too large to be discussed at length here. The learning of the whole subject will be found in Thomassin.

The limits of dioceses were probably fixed in the first instance by local or accidental circumstances.\* They differed widely in size and population. Details on these points will be found under NOTITIA. It is more important to observe that when too large they were, not unfrequently, divided, as in the following instance:—"In the Council of Lucas Augusti, or Lugo, under King Theodemir, anno 569, a complaint was made that the dioceses in Gallaecia [in Spain] were so large that the bishops could scarce visit them in a year: upon which an order was made, that several new bishoprics and one new metropolis should be erected, which was accordingly done by the bishops then in council, who made Lugo to be the new metropolis, and raised several other episcopal sees out of the old ones, as declared in the acts of that council" (Bing. ix. vi. § 16).

As his own diocese was the proper sphere of the action of a bishop, in acting in the diocese of another he was under certain restrictions. These prevailed at all times to a greater or less degree, but seem eventually to have been laid down in

\* "The Diocese," says Milman, "grew up in two ways—1. In the larger cities the rapid increase of the Christians led necessarily to the formation of separate congregations, which to a certain extent, required each its proper organization, yet invariably remained subordinate to the single bishop. In Rome, towards the beginning of the 4th century, there were above forty churches, rendering allegiance to the prelate of the metropolis. 2. Christianity was first established in the towns and cities, and from each centre diffused itself with more or less success into the adjacent country. In some of these country congregations, bishops appear to have been established, yet their chorepiscopi, or rural bishops, maintained some subordination to the head of the Mother Church; or where the converts were fewer, the rural Christians remained members of the Mother Church in the City. In Africa, from the immense number of bishops, each community seems to have had its own superior; but this was peculiar to this province. In general, the churches adjacent to the towns or cities either originally were, or became, the diocese of the City Bishop: for as soon as Christianity became the religion of the State, the powers of the rural bishops were restricted, and the office at length was either abolished, or fell into disuse."—*History of Christianity*, Book iv. ch. 1.

the later canon law as follows, viz. that a bishop may perform divine offices and use his episcopal habit in the diocese of another, without leave, but not perform any act of jurisdiction; and it has even been said, that jurisdiction cannot be exercised by a bishop of another place, though with the consent of the diocesan, except over such as willingly submit themselves to his authority. And where the holder of a benefice in one diocese resides in another, the bishop in whose diocese he resides may proceed against him for an offence, but the punishment, so far as it affects his benefice, is to be carried out by the bishop where the benefice is (Gibson's *Codex*, pp. 133, 134).

See also BISHOP: EXARCH: PARISH.

Authorities: Thomassinus, *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae disciplina*. Bingham. Ayliffe, *Parergon Juris Canonici*. Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v. Διοκλήσις and στροπομήγιον. [B. S.]

DIOCLES, martyr at Histrias (? Istria), commemorated May 24 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis; Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

DIODORUS. (1) Presbyter, martyr at Rome with Marianus the deacon and many others; commemorated Dec. 1 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) of Perga, *λεπομόδρως*; commemorated April 21 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

DIODOTUS, Saint, of Africa; commemorated, with Anesius, March 31 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

DIOGENES, Saint, in Macedonia; commemorated April 6 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

DIOMEDES, martyr at Nicaea, A.D. 288; commemorated June 9 (*Mart. Usuardi*); Aug. 16 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

DIONYSIA. (1) Martyr at Lamosacum with Peter, Andrew, and Paul; commemorated May 15 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr in Africa with seven others; commemorated Dec. 6 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

DIONYSIUS. (1) Martyr in Lower Armenia with Emilianus and Sebastian; commemorated Feb. 8 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr; commemorated with Ammonius, Feb. 14 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr at Aquileia with Hilarus the bishop, Tatian the deacon, Felix and Largus; commemorated March 16 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(4) Bishop of Corinth; commemorated April 8 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(5) Saint, uncle of Pancratius; commemorated May 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(6) Bishop and confessor under Constantius; deposition at Milan, May 25 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(7) Martyr at Sinnada with Democritus and Secundus; commemorated July 31 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(8) Saint, of Phrygia; commemorated Sept. 20 (*Ib.*).

(9) The Areopagite, bishop of Athens and martyr under Adrian; commemorated Oct. 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi, *Cal. Byzant.*); Oct. 17 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(10) Bishop of Paris, and martyr with Rusticus the presbyter and Eleutherius the deacon:

commemorated Oct. 9 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi).

(11) Patriarch of Alexandria, and martyr under Valerian and Gallienus, A.D. 265; commemorated Nov. 17 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). Maskarram 17 = Sept. 14 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(12) The Pope, under Claudius II.; deposition at Rome Dec. 26 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Usuardi); Dec. 27 (*Cal. Bucher.*).

(13) Martyr with Petrus Lampsacenus and his companions; commemorated May 18 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(14) One of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus; commemorated Oct. 22 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

DIOS, Asceta, Holy Father, under Theodosius the Great; commemorated July 19 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

DIOSCORUS. (1) Martyr under Numerian; commemorated Feb. 25 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) The reader, martyr in Egypt; commemorated May 18 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(3) Martyr at Alexandria, with Heron, Arsenius, and Isidorus, under Decius; commemorated Dec. 14 (*Ib.*). [W. F. G.]

DIOSCURUS, Patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 454; commemorated Maskarram 7 = Sept. 4, and Tekemt 17 = Oct. 14 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [W. F. G.]

DIOSPOLIS, or LYDDA, probably RAMAH (COUNCIL OF), A.D. 415, of 14 bishops under their metropolitan, Eulogius of Caesarea; where Pelagius, having been examined, by anathematizing 12 propositions that had been imputed to him, and making profession of 12 orthodox propositions in their stead, was acquitted, and declared to be in the communion of the Catholic Church (Mansi, iv. 311-20). [E. S. Fl.]

DIPPING. [BAPTISM.]

DIPTYCHS. (Δίπτυχα, *lepal déltoi, κατάλογος*; *diptycha, matriculae, nomina, tabulae*.) 1. The name of *diptych* is given to a tablet, primarily two-leaved, as the word implies, in which were contained the names of Christians, living and dead, to be recited during the celebration of the Eucharist. It would seem that the origin of the custom is to be referred to the primitive practice by which the members of a church brought offerings of bread and wine from which were taken the sacred elements. Then, before the consecration, the names of those who had so contributed were read aloud, as well as those of deceased members of the church whom it was wished specially to commemorate.

This primary use was subsequently extended so as to include the names, on the one hand, of sovereigns, patriarchs, bishops, and the like, as well as of those who had deserved well in any way of the church; while, on the other hand, in conjunction with departed saints and confessors, a special mention was thought desirable in each church of those who had previously been its bishops. The great length to which these lists necessarily grew caused the habit of reciting them fully to be subsequently abandoned, but in some form or other the practice has been retained in both the Eastern and the Roman Church.

This custom was doubtless primarily suggested as to its form by the practice which prevailed

under the Roman Empire, by which consuls, praetors, aediles, and other magistrates were wont to distribute to their friends and the people, on the day on which they entered office, tablets inscribed with their names, and containing their portraits, in token of the commencement of their magistracy. (See e. g. *Cod. Theodos. de expensis ludorum*, 15, tit. 9, § 1; Symmachus, *Epist.* ii. 81, v. 56, x. 119; Claudianus, *De Sec. Consulatu Stilichonis*, 347.) For another possible, but certainly not probable, connection of the use of Christian diptychs with an earlier heathen custom, see Casaubon's *Animad. in Athenaeum*, vi. 14.

2. *Diptycha episcoporum* (κατάλογος τῶν ἐπισκόπων; comp. CATALOGUS HIERATICUS, p. 317). We shall now, however, confine ourselves to the subject of diptychs as used in the Christian Church, and shall refer first to that class of them in which were inscribed the names of deceased prelates. Each church would of course specially commemorate its own past bishops, or at any rate the more renowned among them, and thus in these local *fasti* we may see the germs of later calendars and martyrologies. An interesting illustration of the employment of these *tabellae episcopales* is furnished by the well known case of St. Chrysostom, whom the persecution of his inveterate foes drove into exile [CHALCEDON, p. 333]; and even after his death would have refused his name a place on the diptychs as a denial of his orthodoxy: the insertion of his name in the prayers of the church, when his friends were strong enough to obtain it, is spoken of as the usual privilege of departed bishops (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 25; comp. Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 35).

Another illustration may be taken from Venantius Fortunatus (*Poem.* vii. 35, *de S. Martino*; *Patrol.* lxxxviii. 332).

"Nomina vestra legat patriarchis atque prophetis  
Cui hodie in templo Diptychus edit ebur."

The names thus engraved on the tablets were recited, as has been said, during the celebration of the Eucharist. See, for example, the proceedings of the conference at Carthage between the Catholics and Donatists (411 A.D.), where we find the remark: "In ecclesiâ sumus, in quâ Caecilianus episcopatum gessit et diem obiit. Ejus nomen ad altare recitamus, ejus memoriae communicamus, tanquam memoriae fratris" (*Coll.* iii. c. 230; Labbé, ii. 1490). See also *Concil. Constant.* ii. *Coll.* v.; Labbé, v. 478, 495.

It will be understood that such a mention has no connection with the practice of prayers for the dead, for the names thus enrolled were held to be of those included among the blest, and in fact the word 'canonization' primarily meant a mention of this kind in the CANON of the Mass (see p. 267). Conversely, a place would be denied in the diptychs to those who were suspected, rightly or wrongly, of heretical or heterodox views; and further, names wrongly inserted, whether inadvertently or through set evil design, might be subsequently removed. Thus we find Anastasius chronicling, "deinde abstulerunt de diptychis ecclesiarum nomina Patriarcharum . . . Cyri, Sergii, Pauli, Pyrrhi, Petri per quos error orthodoxae fidei pullulavit" (*Vitae Pontificum*, 'Agatho,' p. 145).

This power of refusing to a name a place in CHRIST. ANT.

the diptychs, or of removing a name once entered, would doubtless degenerate at times into the venting of personal spite, as we have seen in the case of the disgraceful attempt to rob Chrysostom of his well deserved honour. For a still stronger case Peter the Fuller is responsible, in that, on his usurpation of the see of Antioch, he removed from the diptychs the names of Proterius and Timotheus Salafatiarius, and put in their stead those of Dioscurus and Hellurus who had murdered the former (Victor Tunnunensis, *Chronicon*, 480 A.D. in Gallandi *Bibl. Vet. Patr.* xii. 225).

3. *Diptycha vivorum*.—We shall briefly consider, in the next place, the case of the mention of living persons, the origin of which, as has been already said, would appear to be found in the recital of the names of those members of a church who had furnished the elements for the holy communion. As time went on, it would be natural to add the names of those who held civil and spiritual authority, of special benefactors to a church, and generally to embrace all faithful believers; the presence of a name on the list being viewed as a recognition of Christian brotherhood, and thus, by implication, of the full church membership and orthodoxy of the person named; while, conversely, its absence implied heresy in belief or laxity in life or discipline (see Cyprian, *Epist.* 1, § 2).

This original association of the practice with the names of the offerers was maintained in later times. Thus we find Innocent I. (ob. 417 A.D.) ordering that the names of those who offered should not be recited before the oblations were made (*Epist.* 25, *ad Decentium*, c. 5); Jerome also (*Comm. in Ezech.* xviii. vol. v. 209) refers to it, "Publiceque diaconus in ecclesiis recitet offerentium nomina." For further injunctions to the same effect, see *Capit. Aquisgranense*, 53 [789 A.D.], *Capit. Francoford.* 49 [794 A.D.], in Baluze's *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, i. 231, 270. In this way too it is most natural to understand the original reference of the words in the corresponding place of the Roman canon, "qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis et gratiarum actionis."

The commemoration of the faithful living, other than the offerers, includes names of holders, first of ecclesiastical and then of civil office, in due order. We may refer, for example, to Maximus Confessor, who remarks (*Collatio cum Principibus in Secretario*, c. 5, vol. i. p. xxxiv. ed. Combès), "at the holy oblation on the holy table, after prelates, priests, and deacons, and all priestly ranks (ιερατικὸν τάγμα), when the deacon says, 'And those laics who have died in faith, Constantine, Constans, and the rest,'" and then proceeds, οὕτω δὲ καὶ τῶν ζώντων μνημονεύει βασιλέων μετὰ τοὺς ἱερομένους πάντας." We find a similar regulation in the Arabic canons of the Nicene Council, to the effect that, "on the Sabbath and festivals, when the holy elements are placed upon the altar, the deacon shall make mention, first, of the patriarch by name, then of the chief bishop, the suffragan bishop, the arch-presbyter, the archdeacon, because these are the rulers of the church" (can. 64; Labbé, ii. 312).

In documents of the Western Church, we meet with injunctions to insert on all such occasions the name of the pope. See, e. g., the order of

the Second Council of Vasio (529 A.D.), "ut nomen Domini Papae, quicumque sedi apostolicae praefuerit, in nostris ecclesiis recitetur." (can. 4, Labbé, iv. 1680: cf. *Sugg. ii. Germani et aliorum post Epist. 40 Hormisdas Papae*, ibid. 1484; where allusion is made to the omission of all names, save of the pope only, in the celebration of the Mass at Scampae, a usage of which Martene, p. 145 B, gives some later examples.)

After the mention of the names of ecclesiastics of various grades came that of the sovereign, as mentioned in the above quoted passage of Maximus; and among those who had deserved well of the church in various ways we find special mention enjoined by the Council of Merida (666 A.D.) of the names of those who had rebuilt a church (*Concil. Emeritense*, c. 19; Labbé, vi. 507).

From these *diptycha vivorum* also, as we have seen in the previous case of the *tabellae episcopales*, a name might be removed, justly or unjustly, as, e.g., in the case of Vigilius (Baluzius, *Collectio Nova Conciliorum*, 1542). Thus too we find Augustine threatening, in case of certain conduct unbecoming to the clerical office, "delebo eum de tabula clericorum" (*Serm. 356*, vol. v. 2059, ed. Gaume); and in another passage of the same father, we find him protesting against an unjust exercise of this punishment (*Epist. 78*, vol. ii. 276). Again, we find the name of Pope Felix III. erased from the diptychs by Acacius, and after his death restored by Euthymius, who erased at the same time that of Peter Mongus (Theophanes, 480-81 A.D. pp. 205, 206, ed. Classen). Felix, however, ungraciously returned this by refusing to recognise Euthymius, from his having retained the names of Acacius and Phravites (*op. cit.* 483 A.D. p. 209).

4. *Diptycha mortuorum*.—We shall now refer briefly to the diptychs containing the names of the faithful dead. And here it will be obviously seen that the essence of the practice of a recital of names at all was the wish to maintain and keep alive the spirit of Christian brotherhood; and when Christianity had taught men that, whether living or dead in the flesh, all faithful were alike living members of Christ's Church, it would be natural to add the names of those who had gone before in the faith and fear of God. How soon this became complicated with the idea of prayers for the dead this is not the place to discuss.

As to the manner in which the diptychs of the dead are introduced in Greek liturgies, we find in that of St. Mark, ὁ διάκονος τὰ δίπτυχα τῶν κεκοιμημένων (i. e. reads), and, similarly, in that of St. Chrysostom, ὁ διάκονος τῶν τε κεκοιμημένων καὶ ζώντων, ὡς βούλεται, μνημονεύει. The prayer of the priest, which follows, runs in the former case thus, καὶ τούτων πάντων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνάπαυσον, δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἁγίων σου σκηναῖς . . . . This might be illustrated by the passage of Cyprian already referred to (*Epist. i. 2*): "Non est quod pro dormitione ejus apud vos fiat oblatio, aut deprecatio aliqua nomine ejus in ecclesia frequentetur."

This commemoration of and prayer for the faithful dead is found in the Gregorian Sacramentary after the consecration, and thereupon follows a prayer, entitled in the Sacramentary *Super Diptycha* (the *Collectio* 1st *Nomina* of the Mozarabic Missal), which we cite: "Memento

etiam, Domine, famulorum famularumque tuorum Ill., qui nos praecesserunt cum signo fidei et dormiunt in somno pacis. Ipsis, Domine, et omnibus in Christo quiescentibus, locum refrigerii et lucis et pacis ut indulgeas deprecamur."

Among others, the names of deceased emperors of undoubted orthodoxy were mentioned. Thus Pope Nicholas I. (ob. 867 A.D.), in a letter to the Emperor Michael III., refers to the mention of the names of Constantine, Constans, Theodosius the Great, Valentinian, and other emperors, "inter sacra mysteria" (*Epist. 86, Patrol. cxix. 959*).

The regulation of the Council of Merida, already referred to, ordains the mention of the names of special benefactors, after they have departed this life.

Thus far we have spoken merely of names of individuals inserted in the diptychs, but, besides these, a commemoration was made of the Four Oecumenical Councils, to which practice numerous references are made in the proceedings of the Council held at Constantinople in 536 A.D. under Mennas (See, e.g., Labbé, v. 85, 165, 185; the last of which passages furnishes us with a very interesting illustration of the practice, describing how, at the reading of the diptychs, the whole multitude flocked round the sanctuary to listen; and when only the titles of the Four Holy Synods were recited by the deacon, and the names of the archbishops Euphemius and Macedonius and Leo, of blessed memory, all cried with a loud voice, "Glory be to Thee, O Lord;"; and in those of the second Oecumenical Council of Constantinople (e.g. *Collatio 2*, Labbé, v. 432). There is also a reference to this in the Code of Justinian, in a letter of the emperor to Epiphanius, patriarch of Constantinople, in which he expresses his intention of resisting any attempts to abolish this practice (lib. i. tit. 1, § 7; tom. ii. pt. 1, p. 16, ed. Beck.). Theophanes records an instance of a daring attempt to break through this custom, when Euphrasius, patriarch of Antioch, omitted the Council of Chalcedon from his diptychs, and also the name of Pope Hormisdas (Theophanes, A.D. 513, p. 258).

5. A brief remark may be made here as to sundry variations in the time when the diptychs were recited according to various uses. The primary custom would seem to be, that they were read after the oblation of the bread and wine, and before the consecration. This may be seen, for example, from numerous references in the acts of the council under Mennas, spoken of above, which prove this to have been the custom of the Church of Constantinople (see esp. Labbé, v. 185, already quoted). It would appear also that in the Mozarabic Missal and in the ancient Gallican form, the diptychs originally held this place. The same also holds true for the representative of the diptychs in our own Liturgy, the prayer for the Church Militant. In the Liturgy of Chrysostom, however, the Mozarabic Missal, and not a few others, as we now have them, the diptychs follow consecration.

In the various forms of the Roman Liturgy, and in the Ambrosian, the commemoration of the living and dead enters into the canon of the Mass, that of the living before, and that of the dead after, consecration. It has been suggested, however, that this too is a modification of an earlier state of things, from a consideration of the



wording in the Galician Sacramentary. [CANON OF THE LITURGY, p. 271.]

Sundry differences also exist as to the manner of reciting the names on the diptychs. (1) Sometimes they were read by the deacon, as is exemplified by the citations we have already given from the liturgies of St. Mark and St. Chrysostom, to which others might have been added. See also Jerome (in *Erach. l. c.*) and Maximus (l. c.). (2) In some churches it would appear that the subdeacon recited the names on the diptychs behind the altar. Thus, in an ancient Mass (*Codex Rotoldi*) published by Menard in his edition of the Gregorian Sacramentary, we find (p. 246), "Subdiaconi a retro altari, ubi memoriam vel nomina vivorum et mortuorum somnauerunt . . ." (3) Frequently the priest himself repeated the names. (4) A curious plan is that mentioned by Fulcun (*De Gestis Abbatum Lobionensis*, c. vii. in D'Achéry's *Spicilegium*, vi. 551), where the subdeacon whispered the names to the priest. (5) We find even that in some cases the tablets were merely laid upon the altar, with the names of the offerers and benefactors, of whom the priest made general mention. Thus we find a form cited by Pamelius (*Liturg. Lat. li. 180*), "Memento . . . quorum nomina ad memorandum conscriptimus, ac super sanctum altare tuum conscripta adesse videntur." The two last views, at any rate, however, are clearly quite late.

For some remarks on a plan whereby, in the church of Ravenna, a chasuble was made to serve the purpose of diptychs, see Ducange (s. v.).

The name of diptych was also given to registers in which were entered, as occasion required, the names of newly baptized persons, as then first becoming members of the Christian family (*Dion. Areop. Hier. Eccl. c. 11*). [RECTORIA.]

6. *Literature*.—For the matter of the foregoing article we are mainly indebted to Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiis Ritibus*, i. 145, sqq. ed. Venice, 1783; Ducange's *Glossaria*, s. v. *Diptycha*, *Alexy*; Bingham's *Antiquities*, xv. 3; and the *Onomasticon* (s. v.) appended to Rosweyde's *Vetus Patrum*. References may also be made to Salig, *De Diptychis Veterum*, *tem profanus, quoniam sacra*, Hales Magd. 1731; Donati, *De disticti degli on-ti-as profani e sacri*, Lucca, 1753; Gibbings, *Presentation on the Diptychs*, Dublin, 1864. [R. S.]

**DIPTYCHS, EXTERIOR ORNAMENTATION OF.**—As the most ancient consular diptych now known is referred to Stilicho in 405 (see *infra*, and Gori, vol. i. p. 128, ed. fol. Flor. 1779), and only one purely ecclesiastical one is mentioned even as conjecturally earlier than the 5th century, it will be inferred that the interest of these relics is historical rather than artistic. Martigny gives a highly reduced copy of one from Donati's *Disticti degli Antic*, p. 149, attributed to a certain Aroobindus the Younger, consul, A.D. 506, in the eastern parts of the empire, 16th year of Anastasius (Baronius, ad A.D. 506). It is beautifully engraved in folio size in Gori, v. 1. Its ornaments consist of two *œnucopias*, with the titles of the consul above them and baskets of fruit and flowers below; they are carved with leaves and connected by wreathed foliage in which the stiff conventional symmetry of Roman-Byzantine art begins to show itself. Gori calls it the Diptych of Lucca. The use of folding tablets in the services of the

church seems to have been a matter of common convenience, like their use anywhere else. But many of these carvings remain, which have evidently been altered from profane uses to ecclesiastical, and still retain the original bas-reliefs with changes and adaptations. Others, again, like that of Rambona, are entirely Christian in their origin. The most ancient of the latter class is considered by Martigny to be the property of the Cathedral of Milan (Bagati, *Memorie di S. Carlo in fa.*), and is referred to the 4th century from the character of its sculptures. He cites others, whose coverings are lost or separated from them, whether they were of wood, ivory, or metal. That of Aroobindus bears the cross, as also the Greek diptych of Flavianus Taurus Clementianus (Gori, tab. ix. and x., p. 260, vol. i.). The Rambona ivory, though only of the 9th century, is far the most interesting in existence. (See art. *CRUCIFIX* for a full description and woodcut; and Gori, *Thes. Vet. Diptychorum*, vol. iii.) It is stated by M<sup>s</sup>. Laurent, *Iconographie de la Croix et du Crucifix*, in Didron's *Annales Archéologiques*, xv. xvi-vii., to have been presented to the monastery of Rambona (March of Ancona) by Agiltrada, wife of Guy,



d. of Spoleto; and is of type more barbaric than the Lombard work of Verona, bearing great resemblance, in the large unmeaning faces and eyes of its figures, to many Irish and Saxon MSS. Many ancient diptychs have been used for bindings of more recent service-books; as a tablet which now covers a copy of the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John in the Vatican. Our Lord between two angels and the Magi before Herod can be traced in it. At the Cathedral of Vercelli, at St. Maximus in Trèves, and at Besançon, there are relics of this kind. Gori's *Thesaurus*, and Padelmi's *De Cultu S. Joannis Baptistae*, contain



ταῖς . . . ὡς οὐ χρὴ δημοσιεύειν ἐπὶ πάντων διὰ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς μυστικά. Similarly the proclamation in the *Apost. Constit.* (viii. 12) and in the Liturgies, *Μὴ τις κατηχουμένων, μὴ τις ἀκροουμένων, μὴ τις τῶν ἀπίστων.* And the phrase, "missa catechumenorum," used in St. Aug. *Serm.* xlix. A.D. 396, *Conc. Carthag.* IV. c. 84, A.D. 398, and *Conc. Ilerd.* A.D. 523, c. 4, and Jo. Cassian, *Coenob. Institut.* xi. 15, and *Conc. Valent.* A.D. 524, c. 1. So *Conc. Arausic.* I. A.D. 441, c. 19, "Ad baptisterium catechumeni numquam admittendi." And while *Conc. Laodic.* A.D. 365, c. 5, *μὴ δεῖν τὰς χειροτονίας ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ ἀκροουμένων γένεσθαι* may possibly refer to the consecration, as probably as to the election, of a bishop: St. Chrysostom certainly speaks of ordination (*Hom.* xviii. in 2 Cor.), when he refrains from detailing what takes place at a *χειροτονία*, "which the initiated know; for all may not be revealed to the uninitiated." The eucharist again was celebrated with closed doors (St. Chrys. *Hom.* in Matt. xxiii.), not to be opened to anybody, even one of the faithful, at the time of the Anaphora (*Apost. Constit.* viii. 11), and to be guarded by the deacons, lest any unbeliever or uninitiated person enter (*ib.* ii. 57). So again Pseudo-Augustin (*Serm. ad Neophyt.* i.), "Dimissis jam catechumenis, . . . quia specialiter de coelestibus mysteriis loquuturi sumus." And to the same effect, St. Ambrose (*De His Qui mysteriis Initiantur*, c. 1), Theodoret (*Quaest.* xv. in Num.), Gaudentius (*Serm. II. ad Neophyt.*), and above all the catechetical lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, which are framed expressly upon this principle, and the preface to which forbids the communication of their more advanced contents to those who are without, if any such should ask what St. Cyril had said. See also the directions to widows in *Apost. Constit.* iii. 5. Lastly, and further still, besides this general and perpetually recurring distinction between initiated (*μεμνημένοι*) and uninitiated (*ἀμύητοι*), distinctions were made between the more and the less advanced of the latter themselves: the Lord's Prayer; *Constit. Apostol.* vii. 44; St. Aug. *Enchirid.* c. 71; Theodoret, *Haeret. Fab.* v. 28, and *Epist. Div. Decret.* c. xviii.; St. Chrys. *Hom.* xx. al. xix. in Matt.; the Creed; St. Ambrose, *Ad Marcell. Epist.* 33 (20 ed. Bened.); St. Jerome, *Epist.* xxxviii. *Ad Pam-mach.* (ed. Ben.); and the doctrine of the Holy Trinity (St. Cyril Hieros. *Catech.* vi. 30), being taught only to the *competentes*, the first, in St. Augustine's time, only eight days before baptism (St. Aug. *Hom.* xlii., *Conc. Agath.* c. 13), the second at some like period, and the last mentioned during the last forty days. Catechumens also were allowed to hear the sermon, but no further, in the African Church (*Conc. Carthag.* as above), in that of Gaul (from *Conc. Arausic.* I. A.D. 441, c. 18), and in that of Spain (from *Conc. Valentin.* A.D. 524, c. 1).

II. Apart from the special discipline of catechumens, the Christian fathers, from the 2nd to at least the 5th century, habitually refrain from speaking plainly of the deeper mysteries of the faith, in writings or sermons accessible to the heathen. Origen, *e.g.* (*Cont. Cels.* i. 7, Opp. i. 325), enumerating the doctrines that were not hidden, mentions the birth, crucifixion, and resurrection of our Lord, the resurrection of the dead, and the last judgment, but omits the doc-

trines of the Holy Trinity and of the Atonement (compare St. Paul's account of the elements of the faith in Heb. vi.). St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Lect. Catech.* vi. 30; Op. i. 106, ed. 1720) tells us, that it is not permitted to speak to a heathen of the mystery of the Holy Trinity. Sozomen omits the Nicene creed from his history (i. 20), expressly because that work would probably be read by heathen readers. St. Chrysostom will not speak fully of baptism in a homily, because of the "uninitiated" among his hearers (*Hom.* xi. in 1 Cor.). St. Augustine reckons both sacraments among the "occulta" (in *Ps.* ciii.; see also *Hom.* xcvi. in Joann., and in *Ps.* cix.). Pope Innocent I. (*Ad Decentium*, c. 3) will not recite the words even of Confirmation, "ne magis prodeire videar, quam ad consultationem responderem." The last words of the *Apostolic Constitutions* forbid the making these books public (bk. viii. in *fin.*): "preach of the mysteries contained in them." So St. Cyril of Alexandria (*Cont. Julian.* vii.), and many others; while the words of Theodoret (*Quaest.* xv. in Num.) may be taken as a summary: "We speak obscurely of the Divine mysteries on account of the uninitiated; but when these have withdrawn, we teach the initiated plainly." Such topics are to be mentioned to persons in general "in enigmas and shadows, mystically, not clearly." And any statement about them is repeatedly broken off with "the faithful," or "the initiated, know." Compare also the distinction drawn by St. Cyril of Jerusalem between *περιηχεῖσθαι* and *ἐνηχεῖσθαι*. The reasons assigned for the practice are:—1. To avoid offence to the weak or to the heathen, *οὐκ ἐπειρῆ ἀσθένειαν κατέγνωμεν τῶν τελουμένων, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἀτελέστερον οἱ πολλοὶ πρὸς αὐτὰ ἐκ-διακείνται* (St. Chrys. *Hom.* in Matt. xxiii. al. xxiv.), or again, more forcibly, *οὐ χρὴ τὰ μυστήρια ἀμύητοις τραγιδεῖν, ἵνα μὴ Ἕλληνες μὲν ἀγνοοῦντες γελῶσι, κατηχούμενοι δὲ περίεργοι γενόμενοι σκανδαλίζονται* (*Conc. Alexandr.* ap. St. Athan. *Apol.* ii.). To which may be added the still more forcible words of St. Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* i. pp. 323, 324), who says that he suppressed some portions of the truth, not as grudging it, but fearing lest he should put a sword into the hand of a child. 2. Out of reverence: "Adhibuimus tam sanctis rebus atque Divinis honorem silentii" (St. Aug. *Serm.* i. inter. xl.). To which, 3. St. Augustine adds another of a more superficial kind, viz. the excitement of curiosity; saying to catechumens, "Si non excitat te festivitas (Paschae), ducat ipsa curiositas," and therefore, "da nomen ad baptismum" (*De Verb. Dom.* *Hom.* xlii.).

It must be added, in order to complete the case, first, that such a principle of reticence is not to be looked for, for obvious reasons, in the earlier Apologists in persecuting times; *e.g.* there is no trace of it in Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus (Bingh. X. v. 2). In such cases, the desire to avoid scandal to the weak, and the feeling of reverence for the truth itself, must needs, and rightly, give way to the clear necessity of a plain statement of the whole truth. Next, that the reserve in question was simply (so to say) a temporary educational expedient, and was never practised towards the "faithful" themselves, to whom the whole truth was declared in plain words; and that there are no grounds

whatever for supposing the existence of an esoteric system of doctrine, not appearing at all in any of the writings or documents of the earlier church, but brought to light in subsequent centuries, although secretly held all along.

III. So far, there can be no question made of the defensibleness of the principle of reserve, thus applied; however plain it may be, that it must speedily have become impossible to maintain the practice. It is obviously a perfectly fair proceeding, to withhold truths avowedly from those to whom it will do harm to declare them. The Alexandrian schools, however, seem to have stretched the casuistry of truthfulness to a point beyond this. Controversially, it is no doubt both allowable, and wise, to state the truth in terms as acceptable to the views and prejudices of an opponent as sincerity will permit, but certainly no further. To help a Platonist, *e.g.* to believe in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, by pointing out how far Platonism itself advances towards such a doctrine, is plainly as consistent with honesty as it is with good sense; but so to speak as to imply the identity of the two doctrines has both actually proved to be a fruitful parent of heresy, and is distinctly not honest. So again it is obviously fair to neutralize an opponent's objection by pointing out that it includes in its range that opponent's own erroneous or incomplete view as well as the orthodox faith; but only if the latter is not confounded with the former as though it were the same thing. An *argumentum ad hominem*, used as such avowedly, is of course justifiable, so that it be not put forward as the arguer's own *bonâ fide* belief. The Alexandrian school, however, seem to have "oeconomized," in managing controversies, both in fact and avowedly, in the extremer sense of the lines of argument thus suggested. St. Clement of Alexandria, for instance, lays down as a principle (*Strom.* vii. 9), that the true Gnostic, indeed, "bears on his tongue whatever he has in his mind," but it is "to those who are worthy to hear:" adding, that "he both thinks and speaks the truth, unless at any time, medicinally, as a physician for the safety of the sick, he may lie or tell an untruth, as the Sophists say." (*Οὐποτε ψεύδεται, κἀν ψεύδος λέγει*, is the Platonic way of putting it.) So also (*Strom.* vi. 15), *Ψεύσται τῷ ὄντι οὐχ οἱ συμπεριφερόμενοι δι' οἰκονομίαν σωτηρίας, ἀλλ' οἱ εἰς τὰ κυριώτατα παραπίπτοντες, καὶ ἀθετοῦντες μὲν τὸν Κύριον τὸ ὅσον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ἀποστεροῦντες δὲ τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν ἀληθῆ διδασκαλίαν*. And Origen, as quoted by St. Jerome (*Adv. Rufin. Apol.* i. c. 18), in like manner lays down a caution, implying a like principle, that "*homo cui incumbit necessitas mentiendi, diligenter attendat, ut sic utatur interdum mendacio, quomodo condimento atque medicamine, ut servet mensuram ejus: ex quo,*" he adds, "*perspicuum est, quod nisi ita mentiti fuerimus, ut magnum nobis ex hoc aliquod quaeratur bonum, judicandi simus quasi inimici Ejus Qui ait, Ego sum veritas.*" Further, St. Clement also appears to hold an esoteric traditional teaching to have been delivered to St. Peter, St. James, St. John, and St. Paul (*Strom.* i. 1, vi. 7; and v. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 1); and Origen likewise (*Cont. Cels.* i. 7) speaks of an esoteric Christian teaching, but obviously means no more by the terms, at least in this passage, than to affirm the distinction between elementary teaching and the

deeper doctrines of the faith as taught successively to catechumens. On the other hand (*Cont. Cels.* vi.) he speaks of an oral traditional knowledge, *οὐ γραπτὰ πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς, οὐδὲ ἄγνῃ*. But St. Clement's *γνώσις* was not a distinct inner system of doctrine differing from that which was to be taught to the *πολλοί*, but rather a different mode of apprehending the same truths, *viz.* from a more intellectual and spiritual stand-point. In actual fact, we find, by way of instance, St. Gregory of Neo-Caesarea, Origen's pupil, using language respecting the Holy Trinity that is confessedly erroneous, and defended by St. Basil (*Epist.* ccx. § 5) on the ground that he was "not teaching doctrine but arguing with an unbeliever," and that in such a case "he would rightly in some things concede to the feelings of the unbeliever, in order to gain him over to the cardinal points." The whole subject will be found ably and profoundly discussed in Newman's *Arians*, c. i. § iii. pp. 40-102 (3rd edition). How far the practice was borrowed from, or unconsciously furthered by, the undisguised principles and practice of Philo-Judaens on the subject, may be doubted. That writer certainly, both in actual exposition of Scripture and in avowed principle, assumes that duller souls must be taught "falsehoods by which they may be benefited, if they cannot be brought to a sound mind through the truth" (*Quid Deus sit Immutabilis*, Opp. i. 282, ed. Mangey). But there is no need for looking beyond Scripture itself for the germ and principle of a true and legitimate "oeconomy." The Alexandrian divines themselves are only responsible for pushing that principle to a degree which made it at least extremely dangerous, and sometimes barely honest. The application of esoteric meanings to Scripture facts by the same school is a parallel case of exaggerating a principle of the analogous sort, possessing a foundation of truth, into extremes that are utterly unjustifiable,

[Newman, *Arians* (as above quoted); Martigny; Bingham; Schelstrate, *De Discipl. Arcani*; Mosheim, *De Reb. Christ. ante Constantin.* § xxxiv. pp. 302-310; and a special dissertation, *De Accommodatione Christo imprimis et Apostolis tributâ*, by F. A. Carus (Lips. 1793, 4), is referred to.]

[A. W. H.]

**DISCIPLINE.** (1.) From the earliest time the Church has endeavoured, in accordance with the Lord's commands, to maintain its own purity both in life and doctrine. In the earliest ages, the penalties for transgressing the laws of the Church, in whatever respect, were of course of a purely spiritual nature, and enforced by the authority of the Church itself, which had no jurisdiction *in invitos*. The means which the Church employed for the correction of offenders within her pale were admonition, withdrawal of privileges, the enjoining of acts of mortification, and, in the last resort, exclusion from the Church altogether [EXCOMMUNICATION]. From this constant effort of the ecclesiastical authorities to correct offences, and to purify the Church from scandals by its own power arose the system of Penitential Discipline [PENITENCE], which is common to all members of the Church, lay and clerical, secular and regular.

But besides the general duty of maintaining holy life and true doctrine, which is incumbent



on all Christians, the clergy and the members of monastic orders voluntarily take upon themselves peculiar obligations, and the enforcing of these by the proper authorities constitutes a special subdivision of discipline. On the subject of Monastic and Canonical Discipline, see below.

What has been said applies to the Church in all ages, whether before or after its connection with the State. But from the time of Constantine, when the existence of Christianity in the empire was formally recognised, and the Church adopted as an institution guarded and respected by the State, we no longer find its disciplinary laws solely in its own canons and decrees, nor its punishments solely spiritual and over persons who give a voluntary submission. The several codes of the empire not only recognise generally the fact that its subjects are Christian, but frequently adopt and sanction laws enacted originally by purely ecclesiastical authority; and this in two ways. In some cases ecclesiastical laws and principles are simply adopted into the civil code, and enforced by civil tribunals and civil sanctions; in others the ecclesiastical authority [see APPEAL]—generally the BISHOP (p. 231)—is empowered to call in the secular arm to enforce its decisions; see, for instance, Justinian's *Code*, lib. 1, l. 25., *De Episc. Audien.* It is evident that this change in the relations of Church and State converted many acts, which had previously been disregarded by the civil power, into crimes, or offences against the sovereign authority, and gave a different aspect to many delicts which still remained in the cognizance of the Church. Discipline was henceforward enforced partly by the spiritual, partly by the secular arm; the State reinforced the Church with more or less vigour according to the disposition of the rulers for the time being; and the ecclesiastical authorities made constant efforts to withdraw the clergy from the jurisdiction of the civil courts altogether [IMMUNITIES OF THE CLERGY; JURISDICTION; and the articles on the several offences which have been subject to censure or punishment in the Church]. [C.]

(2.) *Monastic Discipline.*—Monastic punishments were of two kinds, corporal and spiritual, and, in each kind, more or less severe, according to the nature of the offence or the founder's ideas of discipline. Instances of both kinds occur very early in the history of monasticism. Thus Basil of Caesarea speaks of various degrees of excommunication—from joining in the chanting, from choir, and from meals (*Serm. de Mon. Instit.*), while about the same date Jerome and Rufinus make mention of fastings as a punishment (Hieron. *Ep. ad Nepotian.*; Rufin. *De Verb. Sen.* 29). Augustine speaks of offending monks (fratres) being anathematised, if incorrigible after reproofs, and of their excommunication by their superiors (præpositi) of higher or lower rank, the excommunication by the bishop being the severest punishment of all (*De Corrupt. et Grat. ad Valent.* c. 15). A passage in one of his letters implies his approval of flogging as a chastisement (*Ep. ad Marcellin.*, 159). In the writings of Cassian, early in the 5th century, monastic discipline becomes more closely defined. For slighter offences, such as coming late to prayers or work, making a mistake in chanting, breaking anything, or speaking to any other monk than the

one who shares the cell, the offender is to prostrate himself in the chapel during divine service or to make genuflexions till allowed by the abbot to cease (Cassian, *Inst.* iv. c. 16). Cassian tells a story of an Egyptian monk doing public penance for having dropped three peas, while acting as cook for the week (*Inst.* iv. 20). For graver offences, as bad language or greediness, the punishment is flogging or expulsion (*Inst.* iv. c. 16). For lingering after nocturns instead of going at once to the cell, a monk is to be excommunicated (ii. 15); no one being allowed to pray with him till he has been publicly absolved (ii. 16). Cassian speaks of a slap or buffet, "alapa," as a punishment among monks (*Coll.* xix. 1, cf. Greg. M. *Dia.og.* i. 2, ii. 4). Palladius, about the same date, in describing the monks of Nitria, relates that three whips or scourges hung from a pillar in a part of the church apparently corresponding to a chapter-house, one for the correction of robbers, one for unruly guests, one for the monks (*Hist. Laus.* 2). He speaks also of confinement in a cell (*ib.* cc. 32, 33). About half a century later the Council of Chalcedon pronounces anathema on a monk returning to the secular life (*Conc. Chalced.*, c. 7). Being, as a rule, at that date still laics, monks thus offending were anathematised, not degraded. Dorotheus, an Archimandrite in Palestine, very early in the 7th century, speaks of fasting as a punishment for monks (*Doctrina*, c. 14, ap. Ducean. *Auctuar.* i. 743). One of the strongest instances of monastic severity in the East is in the *Scala* of Joannes Climacus, sometimes called Scholasticus,\* of Mount Sinai, in the preceding century, who speaks of offenders being dragged by a rope through ashes, their hands bound behind their backs, and flogged till those who witnessed the punishment "howled;" afterwards they were to lie prostrate at the church-door till absolved after public confession (*Scala*, c. 4).

In the West, too, prior to the Benedictine rule, monastic discipline was very rigorous. Each monastery had its own code; but, probably, in Southern Europe Cassian's influence was felt largely. In the *Regula Tarnatensis*, the rule (c. 550 A.D.) of a monastery in south-eastern France, which Mabillon identifies with that of Tarnay, near Vienne (*Annal.*, tom. i. App. ii. Disquis. 5), a monk who jests is to be chidden (c. 13; cf. Bas. *Constit. Monast.* c. 13, on scurrility). In the rule of Ferreolus, bishop of Uzès, in Languedoc, about the same date, a fast of three days is imposed for jesting during lections (c. 24), and thirty days' silence for railing (c. 22). But the *Regula Cujusdam Patris*, supposed by Menard to be the rule of Columba (c. 561 A.D.), is stricter still, especially against the murmuring or refractory: even a thoughtless word is visited with imprisonment (c. 8). Columbanus, of Luxeuil and Bobbio (c. 590 A.D.), trod in the steps of his ascetic predecessor. Six blows were to be the penalty for such offences as speaking at refectory, not responding to the grace, not being careful to avoid coughing in chanting, &c. For other similar transgressions the punishment was the "impositio" of Psalms to be learned by heart, or the "superpositio," complete silence for

\* Not Joannes Scholasticus, of the same date of Antioch and Constantinople (Cave, *Hist. Litt.* a. v.).

a time (*Reg. Columban.* c. 10). Darker offences were visited with proportionate severity. Thus, for a perjury the penalty was solitary confinement on bread and water for three years (*Columban. De Penitent. Monach.* c. 32; cf. *pass.*).

The milder discipline of Benedict gradually extended itself, in the 6th and 7th centuries, from Italy even into parts of Europe already occupied by other rules, as was France by that of Columbanus. He prescribed two reproofs in private, followed by one in public, before proceeding to severer remedies. If these were ineffectual, then ensued excommunication, or for those too young or otherwise disqualified for spiritual censures, corporal punishment (*Reg. Ben.* c. 33). The incorrigible were to be flogged and prayed for; and, as a last resource, expelled (c. 26): if re-admitted, they were to be placed in the lowest grade (c. 39); cf. *Greg. M. Lib. X. l. iv. Ep. 39; Lib. I. l. ix. Ep. 19*. A breach or waste was lightly regarded, unless unconfessed (c. 46); and the confession of secret faults was to be made, not in public, but to the deacon (*Ducange, § v.*) (seniori *con.* c. 46). Only the contumacious, after four admonitions, were to be subject to the "disciplina regularis," flogging, with, probably, solitary confinement on bread and water (cc. 43, 45).

Where not adopted as a whole, the Benedictine rule was frequently incorporated with other rules. Thus the rule of Isidore of Seville, in the first part of the 7th century, though more minute in its distinctions, resembles the Benedictine code of punishments (*Ibid. Reg.* c. 17; cf. *Mab. Ann. III. 37, xii. 42*). Duguesne of Beaumes, about the middle of this century, himself a pupil of Columbanus, blended the two rules in one: "disciplina" with him seems to mean flogging or solitary confinement (*Don. Reg. ad Virg.* c. 2); silence or fifty stripes is the penalty for idle words (c. 38). Later in the century, Fructuosus of Braga in Portugal, founder of the great monastery of Alcala (Complutum) near Madrid, borrowed largely from Benedict (*Fruct. Reg.* c. 17; cf. *Mab. Ann. III. 37*). The Council at Vern, near Paris, 755 A.D., speaks of a prison-cell or flogging-room—"locus custodiarum" or "palestrarium" (*Conc. Vern.* c. 6). The Harmony of Monastic Rules, compiled in the 9th century by the abbot of the founder of the Benedictines, contains a gradation of punishments, which is on the whole equitable, but too minute (*Bened. Ania. Concord. Regul.*). In the 12th century the influence of Petrus Damiani introduced a rigour hitherto unknown within the walls of Monte Cassino: each monk, after his confession every Friday, was to be whipped, by himself or by others, in cell, chapter, or oratory (*Alton. Acol. vi. 4*). In the famous monastery of St. Gall, in Switzerland, the whip for similar purposes was suspended from a pillar in the chapter-house (ib.).

Voluntary flagellations, or self-scourgings, as a recognised part of monastic discipline, began about the middle of the 11th century, at the suggestion of Petrus Damiani (Richard et Giraud, *Dilectio. Sacr.* a. v.); or according to Mabillon (*Acta SS. Ben. Prael.*, *Saec. vi.*, l. a. 6), rather earlier (cf. Bolles, *l'abbé Hist. Flupell.*, 1700 A.D.). [I. G. 3.]

(3.) *Canonical Discipline*.—Though the rule of the Council was earlier than that of the Monachi,

their code of punishments was severe. By Chrodegang's rule, any canon failing to make a full confession at stated times twice a year, was to be flogged or incarcerated (*Chrodegang. Reg.* c. 14). Any canon guilty of theft, murder, or any grave offence was liable to both these punishments; he was, besides, to do public penance by standing outside the chapel during the "hours," and by lying prostrate at the door as the others were going in and out, and to practise extraordinary abstinence, until absolved by the bishop (c. 15). Any canon speaking to one excommunicated incurred excommunication himself (c. 16). The refractory or contumacious were, after two reproofs, to do open penance by standing beside the cross; they were to be publicly excommunicated, or, if insensible to such a punishment, flogged (c. 17). Lesser offences, if confessed, were to be treated lightly; if detected, severely (c. 18). The measurement and apportionment of penalties was in the hands of the bishop (c. 19). But certain rules to guide the bishop's subordinates, "prelati inferiores" (perhaps = deans), in the exercise of this discretionary power were laid down by the Council at Aachen, 816 A.D. Boys were to be beaten. Older members of the community were, for more venial faults, on neglecting the "hours," being careless at work or in chapel, late at meals, out without leave or beyond the proper time, after three private admonitions, to be admonished publicly, to stand apart in the choir, and to be kept on bread and water. For a graver fault, "culpa criminalis," unless atoned for by spontaneous penance, they were to be publicly excommunicated, "damnetur," by the bishop, and to be imprisoned, lest they should "taint the rest of the flock" (*Conc. Aquisgr.* c. 134). It is to be noted that it seems customary then to have a prison within the precincts of the monastery or canonry ("at fit multas in monasteriis"), and that disobedience, rudeness, or quarrelling are not, as with monks, classed among things of a darker die (ib.). The same council, in a subsequent session, enacted a similar scale of punishment for nuns, "sanctioniales," with the same climax of solitary confinement for the incorrigible (*Conc. Aquisgr.* lib. II. c. 8). The rule was to be recited in chapter very frequently (cc. 69, 70).

For monastic and canonical discipline generally, see BENELECTIVE RULE, CANONICI, MONACHUS. [I. G. 3.]

(4.) From the constant use of the rod or scourge in monastic discipline (see above, § 2) the word *disciplina* came itself to mean flogging. In the *Liber Ordinis S. Victoris Paris.*, c. 33 (quoted by Ducange) is a full description of the manner in which a monk ought to take punishment (*disciplinam accipere*). Sometimes *disciplina* is used with a qualifying word, as "*discip. flagelli*" (*Reg. S. Aurel.* c. 41); "*discip. corporalis*" (*Reg. Chrodegang.* cc. 3, 4, 14; *Capitul.* A.D. 803, v. 1). [CONCORDIA PUNITIONUM.] [C.]

**DISCOFERAE.** In convents of nuns the sisters who bring the dishes to table are sometimes called *discoferae*. Caesarius of Arles (*Ad Ueritatem Abbatem*) gives the direction, "ne qualis cibaria potionesque communes exhibent discoferae vel pincernae" (*Ducange, a. v.*) [C.]

**DISCOMMUNICANTES.** The second

council of Arles (c. 10), referring to the eleventh canon of the first council of Nicaea, condemns those who have fallen away under persecution to five years among the catechumens, and two "inter-didmunicandis, ita ut communionem inter penitentem non praeassumant." The canon of Nicaea referred to has "ὅσοι ἐν χρόνῳ ὑποκαταλείποντες τὴν λατρίαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμετέρου." When all who offered communicated, this was equivalent to a sentence of exclusion for two years from the mysteries, though not from the preliminary prayers. [See COMMUNION, p. 415.] [C.]

## DISCUS. [PATR.]

## DISPENSATION. [INDULGENCE.]

DISPUTATIO. In some monastic Rules a discussion on Scripture, called *Disputatio*, is one of the exercises prescribed to the monks. For instance the *Rule of Pachomius* (c. 21) directs: "Disputatio autem Propositis domorum tertio fiet." [Compare COLLATION.] [C.]

## DISTRIBUTION OF THE ELEMENTS. [COMMUNION, HOLY.]

DISTRIBUTION OF CHURCH PROPERTY. [ALMS; CHURCHES, MAINTENANCE OF; CORN, ALLOWANCE OF; DIVINE MESSURAGE; PROPERTY OF THE CHURCH.]

DIUS. (1) Saint, in Calceos; commemorated July 12 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Alexandria, with Peter, bishop of Alexandria, Faustus the presbyter, and Ammonius, under Maximian; commemorated Nov. 26 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

DIVINATION. It was all but inevitable in the nature of things that the ineradicable desire to penetrate the secrets of the future should show itself sooner or later in some form of superstition within the Christian Church. Jews and heathens had alike been accustomed to practices of which that desire had been the origin. The decay and disrepute of the older oracles, of which the legend that they ceased at the time of the Nativity of Christ was the representation, forced men back upon the more mysterious and recondite arts by which the secrets of the future were to be unveiled. The mind of the Church was, of course, from the first opposed to such attempts, and taught men to leave the future in the hands of God. But still Jews and canons which meet us alike in East and West testify to the strength of the superstition against which the warfare was thus waged. It can hardly be said, looking at Christendom as a whole, to have succeeded in repressing it.

The revival within the Church of the arts of the old Chaldean soothsayers has been noticed under *ASTROLOGUES* and *CALCULATORS*. But the elaborate system of divination which was officially recognized in the auguries of the Roman republic and empire, and which had a thousand ramifications in private and local superstitions, was even more difficult to cope with. As early as the Council of Elvira (c. 62) we find the augur named among those who were not to be admitted to Christian communion unless they renounced their calling.<sup>a</sup> The Fourth Council of Carthage (c. 50) excommunicated any who addicted themselves to practices that were so essentially

heathen. That of Ancyra (c. 34) condemned the *sortes vereduperae* to five years' penance. See also the 'Penitential' printed in Michard's *Sacram. Græg.* p. 467. The legislation of the emperors was even more stern in its severity; but the sharpness of the law was in this case due, like the old edicts of banishment against the Chaldei under Tiberius, to the influence of suspicious fear. Diviners, who were consulted as to the length of the emperor's life might help to work out the fulfilment of their own predictions. So we find Constantius inflicting the penalty of death on all who were known to consult soothsayers or observe omens. Even the credulous peasants, to whom the cry of a vassal or a rat was a presage of evil, were hunted down and condemned (*Cod. Theod.* ix. tit. 16, leg. 4; *Ammian. Marcell.* xvi. p. 72). Valens, in like manner, half believing in what he sought to repress, having heard that it had been declared as the result of such divining arts (in this case *sortes parvulae* is named), that the name of his successor should begin with ΘΕΟΔ, not only enforced the law in its fullest severity against the diviner, but sought out and put to death all whom he could find whose names brought them within the range of his suspicion (*Socratus, H. E.* iv. 10). It is probable enough that the widespread belief thus engendered really helped to prepare the way for Theodosius.

It was comparatively easy to condemn arts that were manifestly heathen in their nature. It was more difficult when the practice came with Christian associations and appealed to men's reverence for the Sacred Books. The principle of casting lots was recognized in Scripture as an appeal from the ignorance of man to the Providence of God (*Acts* i. 26; *Prov.* xvi. 33; *xviii. 10 et al.*). What form of *sortes* could be more certain to direct men in the right path than an appeal to the Written Word? Here, too, both Jewish and heathen influences may have helped to foster the new form of superstition. The Jew had been in the habit of so dealing with the Law, opening it at random, taking the verse on which he lighted as an oracle from God. It was his substitute for the Urim and Thummim, and the utterance of a prophet's voice (*Gemara. Hieron. Sobab. f. 8*). The Roman, anticipating the mediæval belief as to the poet's character, had looked to the *Aeneid* of Virgil as filling up the gap left by the dumbness of the oracles. The *sortes Virgilianæ* were in repute as having predicted the power and character of Hadrian (*Spartian. Vit. Had.* p. 5), and Alexander Severus (*Lamprid. Vit. Alex.* p. 341). So in like manner the Bible, as a whole, or certain portions of it, came to be treated in the 4th century, if not earlier. It appears to have prevailed in the West rather than the East, but was never during the period with which we are concerned in any degree sanctioned by the Church or its leaders. Augustine, who had been consulted by Januarius as to its legitimacy, thought it a less evil than seeking knowledge from demons, but condemned it, as bringing down the Divine Word to base and trivial uses (*Epist. ad Januarium, clix. (adit. iv.) c. 37*). The provincial Councils of Gaul in the 5th century condemned the "*sortes divinationis*," "*sortes canonum*," and threatened clergy or monks who practised them with severe penalties (*C. Venetis*.

<sup>a</sup> There is, however, the various reading of "origis."

e. 16; *Agathena*. 42; *Aurel*. l. e. 80). The practice grew, however, in spite of the prohibition, with the increasing power of the Franks, and Gregory of Tours (*Hist.* iv. 16) describes a scene in which, with great solemnity, in the presence of bishops and priests in the celebration of Mass at Dijon, the volumes of the Epistles and Gospels were thus opened in order to ascertain the fortunes of the son of Clothaire. [E. H. P.]

**DIVINE SERVICE.** [COMMUNION, HOLY MASS: HOUSES OF PRAYER: OFFICE, THE DIVINE.]

**DIVISIO APOSTOLOREUM.** [APOSTLES' FESTIVAL, p. 87.]

**DIVISIO MENSURNA.** The division of the revenues of a church among the clergy seems commonly to have been monthly; this monthly payment is called by Cyprian "*divisio mensurna*," and a suspension from this was equivalent to what in later times was called suspension "*a beneficio*," which did not necessarily imply suspension from ministerial functions (Cyp. Ep. 84). [C.]

**DIVORCE.** [MARRIAGE.]

**DOCTOR.** Besides the general sense of "teacher," this word early acquired certain special significations:—

1. *Doctor Audientium*, the officer of the church to whom was committed the instruction of CATECHUMENS (p. 319). When we read in the *Passio SS. Perpetuae et Felice*. (c. 13; Ruinart, p. 99) that Aspasius, "presbyter doctor," stood before the door, we ought probably to understand that he was a presbyter who bore the office of *Doctor audientium*. Cyprian, too, speaks (*Epist.* 29) of "presbyteri doctores," as well as of a reader who held the office of teacher of the catechumens.

2. Persons whose teaching was of special weight in the church were called *Doctores*. The *Decreta* (c. 1) of Celestine (A.D. 422-432) condemn those who set themselves up against the Doctors, meaning apparently in this case more particularly St. Augustine (c. 2) and the bishops of Rome (c. 3). The same prohibition is repeated in the *Capitularium Car. M.* vii. c. 44.

3. The term *legis doctor* seems to have acquired a technical force at a comparatively early date. Adrevaldus (*De Mirac.* 8. *Bened.* l. 25) speaks of a certain "*legis doctor*"—clearly a judge—who deferred judgment in consequence of having received a bribe; and a charter of Pipin, mayor of the palace (quoted by Ducange, s. v. *Doctor Legis*), speaks of things decided by "*proceres nostri, seu Comitatus palatii nostri vel reliqui legis doctores*," where the doctors are clearly persons who have an official right to expound the law. [C.]

**DOCTORS, CHRIST IN CONFERENCE**

**WITH.** This subject is represented in a fresco of the first cubiculum of the Callistine Catacomb. See in Bottari, tavv. xv. and liv., also tav. lxiv. Both are conventionally arranged, our Lord being on a lofty seat in the midst, with hand upraised in the act of speaking; the doctors on His right and left, with some expression of wonder on their countenances. The only sarcophagus besides that of Junius Bassus (Bottari, xv.), which indisputably contains this subject, is stated by Martigny to be that in S. Ambrogio

at Milan. (Allegrezza, *Sacra Monum. Ant. di Milano*, tav. iv.) See, however, Bottari, v. i. tav. 33. All the surrounding figures are seated in this example, but our Lord is placed above them in a kind of stall or *edicula*, with two palm-trees at its sides. He holds a book or roll in His hand, which is partly unrolled, while the doctors have closed theirs. So also in Allegrezza, tav. i., a mosaic from St. Aquilinus of Milan. The Lord's elevated seat is placed on a rock, with the Divine Lamb below, probably in reference to Rev. v. as "able to open the Book." On the right and left, at His feet, are Joseph and Mary in the attitude of adoration.

Perret (i. pl. l.) gives a copy of a very skilful painting from the catacombs, which places two doctors on the Lord's right hand, who are expressing attention and wonder, and Joseph and Mary on the other, with looks of patient waiting on Him. The figure on the left is so evidently feminine, as to repel the idea that the four evangelists are intended.

The fine diptych of the 5th century at the Cathedral of Milan and that of Murano (Bugati, *Mem. di S. Celso and Gori*, *Theat. Dipt.* viii. tab. 8, see woodcut) also represent our Lord sitting,




with the doctors standing before Him. These represent Him of more mature appearance and stature than the account in the Gospels quite warrants. The figure below our Lord's feet is supposed to represent Uranus or the Firmament of Heaven (Pa. xviii. 9). [R. St. J. T.]

**DOLIUM.** This seems to be the most convenient generic term for the various representations of casks and large vessels which occur frequently in early Christian art, and have symbolic meaning very generally attributed to them. (Boldetti, pp. 164-368; Perret, iii. 3; Bottari, tav. 155.) As they are generally found on tombs they are taken as empty, representing the body when the soul has fled from it. If the marriage of Cana [see s. v. CANA] can be supposed to be so frequently used on sarcophagi as a symbol of the Resurrection, the cask may be supposed to represent a water-vessel, and be a short-hand symbol of the Miracle. This seems altogether unlikely, and, moreover, in almost all cases the vessels represented are strictly "waterpots of stone" or hydriae. The close juncture of the staves of a cask has been taken to indicate Christ's unity



Martigny conjectures (quoting St. Cyprian, *Ep. xvi. Ad Confess. Rom.* "Vini vice sanguinem funditis") that the form of a cask has been given to certain small vessels for preserving the blood of martyrs (e.g. Boldetti, pp. 163-4), with allusion to the power of their self-sacrifice in holding the Church together. He concludes, however, on the whole, that the picture of the Dolium was very possibly only a play on words, from its resemblance in sound to *deleo*, and its inflections. This seems to be proved by his example from Mamachi (see woodcut)—two dolia, with the inscription *IVLIO FILIO PATER DOLIENS*.

[R. St. J. T.]



**DOLPHIN** [see a. v. *FISH*]. As in the case of other Christian symbols, the dolphin is used

from a very early date in two or more senses, representing either the Lord Himself, the individual Christian, or abstract qualities such as those of swiftness, brilliancy, conjugal affection, &c. In a painting given by De Rossi (vol. i. tav. viii.), two dolphins bear (apparently) vessels with the Sacramental loaves. It has been suggested, and is not improbable, that the Dolphin embracing the Anchor, so often found on gems, rings, &c. (Mamachi, *Antiq. Christ.* iii. 23; Lupi, *Epitaph. Sever. M.* 64, note 1), is an emblem of the Crucified Saviour, or, indeed, of the faithful follower. For its use as an emblem of swiftness, see Boldetti, p. 382, where is figured the handle of a pen found in a Christian sepulchre, fashioned into the dolphin-shape, which may indicate, as Martigny supposes, that the occupant was in life a scribe or short-hand writer.—Ps. xiv. 2. The fish with extended fins, or back bent, as if in the act of plunging forward, seems to be used to express speed in pressing forward for the prize of the Christian race. See Lupi, *Epitaph. Sev.* pp. 53 and 185. In the latter he is accompanied by a dove, and both are approaching a vase, which may signify the Living Waters of Baptism or of Truth. See Martigny, a. v. *Daphnia*. The dolphins (see woodcut), placed two close together on each side of the inscription over Baleria or Valeria Laetitia, are thought to symbolize conjugal affection. [R. St. J. T.]



**DOLUS MALUS.** [FORSYTH.]

**DOME.** (Commonly derived from *DOMUS* *Domus*, domes being at one time so invariable a part of churches as to usurp their name. Perhaps from *δῶμα*.) A concave ceiling or cupola, either hemispherical or of any other curve, covering a circular or polygonal area; also a roof the exterior of which is of either of these forms (Parker's *Gloss.* a. v. *CUPOLA*).

The dome is not casual in churches of the basilica type, though it is sometimes found; in the church of Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme (for instance), we find a dome covering one of the chapels (the south-eastern) by which the apse is enclosed. [CHURCH, p. 370.]

In sepulchral or memorial churches, usually circular, sometimes polygonal in form, the dome, as might be expected, is of frequent occurrence. The church of Sta. Costanza is of this class, and there we find the dome supported on an interior peristyle. [CHURCH, p. 371.] The "Dome of the Rock" at Jerusalem, classed by some authorities among memorial churches, has a dome supported by four great piers. Other examples may be found in the church of St. George in Thessalonica, 5th cent., and the cathedral at Bozrah in the Hauran, of the date A.D. 512. [CHURCH, p. 372.]

The sepulchral chapel built by the empress Galla Placidia at Ravenna has a tower enclosing a small dome. [CHURCH, p. 372.] One of the most remarkable domes in the world is that of St. Sophia, both from its size and from the peculiar manner in which it is supported, not by piers or arches on every side but upon two semi-domes, east and west, by which means a vast unen-

cumbered space—300 ft. by 100 ft.—is obtained. [CHURCH, p. 373.] After the time of Justinian churches in the East were almost exclusively built after some modification of the plan of St. Sophia, in which the dome forms so important a feature. The germ of the nearly square ground-plan, with a dome covering the centre, is perhaps to be found in domed oratories or Kalybes of Syria. See woodcut, p. 347.

In the church of St. Vitalis at Ravenna, built between A.D. 526 and 547, there is a sort of clerestory, 20 ft. high, below the dome. And after the death of Justinian we find this construction, in which the dome itself is placed on a drum pierced with windows, frequent in the empire. The church of St. Clement, for instance, at Ancyra, belonging probably to the latter part of the 6th and beginning of the 7th century, had such a dome placed on a low drum. The church of St. Irene, at Constantinople (earlier part of the 8th century), has the dome on a drum of great height; and a similar dome is found in the church of St. Nicholas of Myra, which is perhaps of more modern date. [CHURCH, p. 378.] The Duomo Vecchio at Florence, by some assigned to the 7th century, by others to A.D. 774, is covered by a dome 65 ft. in internal diameter. [CHURCH, p. 380.] [C.]

**DOMESTICUS**, "belonging to the house or household," has several ecclesiastical senses:—

1. *Domesticus* are all who belong to the "household of faith;" "omnibus congruus honor exhibetur, maxime tamen domesticis fidei" (*Regula St. Bened.* c. 53).

2. In the East, the principal dignitary in a church choir after the Protospathar. There was

one on each side of the choir, to lead the singers in antiphonal chanting (Codinus, *De Offic.* c. vi. § 3; Goar's *Eucholog.* pp. 272, 278; Ducange, s. v.).

3. *Domesticus Ostiorum*, δ Δομέστικος τῶν θυρῶν, the chief door-keeper at Constantinople (Codinus, *De Off.* c. i. § 43). [C.]

DOMINICA. [LORD'S DAY.]

DOMINICA, δσριαμήνη, commemorated Jan. 8 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

DOMINE LABIA. [DEUS IN ADJUTORIUM.]

DOMINICALIS or -LE. A fair linen cloth used by females at the time of the reception of the Eucharist. So far all authorities are agreed, but it is a controverted point whether it was a white veil worn over the head, or a napkin in which females received the Eucharist, which they were forbidden to touch with the naked hand. [COMMUNION, HOLY, p. 416.]

The latter view is that which has the greatest currency, and can reckon among its supporters such weighty liturgical authorities as Cardinal Bona (*Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 17); Habert (*Archicrat.*, part. x. obs. viii.); Mabillon (*de Liturg. Gall.* lib. i. c. v. r. xxv.); Macer (*Hierolex.*, sub voc.); Voss. (*Thes. Theol. de Symbol. Coen. Dom.*), and others. It is chiefly based on two canons of the Council of Auxerre, A.D. 578, one (can. 36) forbidding women to receive the Eucharist with the bare hand; the other (can. 42) enacting that every woman when she communicates should have her *dominicalis* or else postpone her communion. These two canons are interpreted to refer to the same subject, and the *dominicalis* has been thus identified with the fair linen cloth with which the hand was to be covered at the time of communion. This custom is expressly mentioned in a sermon printed among Augustine's, but erroneously ascribed to him, in which we read, "omnes quando communicare desiderant lavent manus, et omnes mulieres nitida exhibeant linteamenta ut Corpus Christi accipiant." It will be observed that nowhere is this napkin expressly called *dominicale*.

The other view—that the *dominicale* was a head-covering, a veil (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 13) is strongly supported by Ducange (*sub voce*); Labbé (*ad Concil. Autissiod.*); and Baluzius (*Not. in Gratian. caus. xxxiii. quaest. iii. c. 19*), and is accepted by our own Bingham (bk. xv. ch. v. § 7). The passage from an ancient MS. Penitential given by Ducange, forbidding a woman to communicate if she has not her "dominicale" on her head, "si mulier communicans dominicale suum super caput suum non habuerit, &c.," is express for this view if it be correctly quoted. The canons cited by Baluzius (apud Bingham, l. c.) from the Council of Mâcon, "in which the *dominicale* is expressly styled the veil which the women wore upon their heads at the communion," do not appear in the acts of either the first or second Council of that name. This, however appears the more probable view. [E. V.]

DOMINICUM. 1. One of the names of a CHURCH (q. v.), Greek κυριακόν.

2. Equivalent to κυριακὸν δεῖπνον. Cyprian, *Epist.* 63; "Numquid ergo Dominicum post coenam celebrare debemus?" And the martyrs in Africa, somewhat later, were accused of celebrating "collectam et Dominicum," the ordinary

assembly and the Lord's Supper (*Acta Procons. Saturnini*, etc., c. 5; compare cc. 7 and 8). [C.]

DOMINUS or DOMNUS. 1. Equivalent to "Saint" as a title; as "Dominus Joannes" for St. John, in Cyprian's *Life* of Caesarius of Arles. Sometimes in the form *Domnus*; St. Martin, for instance, is called "Domnus Martinus" in the preface and in can. 13 of the first council of Tours. St. Peter is called "Domnus Petrus Apostolus" (*Conc. Turon. II. c. 23*); St. Paul, "Domnus Paulus Apostolus" (Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* ix. 41). The *Mar* of the Chaldaean Christians (as in "Mar Markos") is equivalent to *Dominus*.

2. Bishops are called *Domini*, without any further designation of their episcopal dignity. For instance, a bishop is described by Gregory the Great (*Epist.* iv. 27) as "Dominus Mizenatis ecclesiae." *Dominus* in this usage also is frequently shortened into *Domnus*, as, for instance, by Gregory of Tours and Gregory the Great (Ducange, s. v.). [C.]

3. *Domnus* was at first a title of the abbat (*Reg. Benedict.* 63), afterwards of his sub-officials, and, in the middle ages, of monks generally (Martene *ad loc. citat.*). The word was applied to saints (Sulpic. Sever., *Epp.* 2, 3; Mabill. *Ann. O. S. B.* xviii. 9), to bishops (*Conc. Aurel.* iii. Subscr.), and to the pope (Ducange, *Glossar. Lat. s. v.*). Hence the titles, "Dan," "Don," "Donna," &c. in the Romance, and, in modern French, "Dom," for monks (Ducange, *Gloss. Lat. u. s. Alard. Gaz. Praef. Cassiani Opp.*).

"Domna" was used similarly of nuns.

[I. G. S.]

DOMINUS VOBISCUM. 1. The versicle *Dominus Vobiscum*, with the response, *et cum spiritu tuo*, is found in the Gregorian *Sacramentary* immediately before the *Sursum Corda*, which introduces the CANON.

In the third of the ancient canons read and approved at the First Council of Braga, A.D. 563, (Bruns's *Canones*, ii. 35), it is provided that bishops and priests should not greet the people in different ways, but that both should use the form *Dominus sit vobiscum* (Ruth ii. 4), and the people respond *Et cum spiritu tuo*, the form handed down from the very Apostles, and retained by the whole Eastern Church. The latter assertion does not appear to be founded on fact, for the Eastern Church has constantly used the form "Peace be with you all." [PAX VOBISCUM.] The distinction which the canon notes and forbids between the priest's salutation and the bishop's, was probably that the former used the form *Dominus vobiscum*, the latter, as representing more completely the Lord Himself, the form *Pax vobiscum*. But see Krazer, *De Liturgiis*, p. 399 f.

2. At Prime, in the Daily Office, *Dominus vobiscum*, with the usual response, is said before the Collect.

3. When the *Breviarium Hipponense* (can. 1, al. 6) orders "ut lectores populum non salutent," the meaning probably is, that they were not permitted to use the form commonly appropriated to the higher orders, whether *Dominus* or *Pax vobiscum*. [C.]

DOMIO, bishop of Salona in Dalmatia, martyr, with eight soldiers; commemorated April 11 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**DOMITIANUS.** (1) Abbot of Lyons; deposition July 1 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Philadelphia in Arabia, with five others; commemorated Aug. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) Deacon, and martyr at Ancyra in Galatia, with Eutycus the presbyter; commemorated Dec. 28 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*).

(4) Bishop of Melitene, circa A.D. 570; commemorated Jan. 10 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**DOMITILLA**, virgin, martyr at Terracina in Campania, under Domitian and Trajan; commemorated May 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*); May 12 (*Mart. Hieron.*). [W. F. G.]

**DOMITIUS.** (1) Martyr in Syria; commemorated July 5 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) In Phrygia, *Secundus*, under Julian; commemorated Aug. 7 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**DOMNINA** or **DOMNA**, virgin, martyr with her virgin companions; commemorated April 14 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**DOMNINUS.** (1) Martyr at Thessalonica with Victor; commemorated March 30 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Julia, under Maximian; commemorated Oct. 9 (*ib.*). [W. F. G.]

**DOMUS DEL.** (1) Literally, the church as a material building (*Optatus, c. Donat. iii. 17*). Hence Ital. *Duomo*, and Germ. *Dom*.

(2) The Church, as the whole body of Christian people (Lucifer of Cagliari, *Pro Athanasio*, l. 22; *Ducange*, s. v.). [C.]

**DONA, DONARIA.** These words are not unfrequently used by Christian writers in the special sense of offerings placed in churches, particularly costly presents given as memorials of some great mercy received by the offerers (*Jerome, Epist. 27, ad Eustach.; Epist. 13, ad Paulin.; Sidonius Apoll. lib. iv. Ep. 18; Paulinus of Nola, Natal. S. Felicit., 6*). The corresponding Greek word is *δωρεῖα* (Luke xxi. 5; 2 Maccab. ix. 16), which *Suidas* defines as *τὰ τὰ ἀπορροήματα θεῶν*. See, for instance, the account of the offerings of Constantine to the Anastasis at Jerusalem (*Euseb. Vita Constant. iii. 25*). [*CONONA LUCIS; VOTIVE OFFERINGS.*] [C.]

**DONATA**, of Scillita, martyr at Carthage with eleven others; commemorated July 17 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**DONATI.** [*OBELATI.*]

**DONATIANUS.** (1) Martyr at Nante with Rogatianus, his brother; commemorated May 24 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Bishop and confessor in Africa, with Presidius, Mansuetus, Germanus, and Fuscolus, under Hunnericus; commemorated Sept. 6 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**DONATILLA**, virgin, martyr in Africa, with Maxima and Secunda, under Gallienus; commemorated July 30 (*Mart. Hieron., Rom. Vet., Usuardi, Cal. Carth.*). [W. F. G.]

**DONATUS.** (1) Martyr at Rome with Aquilinus and three others; commemorated Feb. 4 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Concordia with Secundianus, Romulus, and eighty-six others; commemorated Feb. 17 (*ib.*);

(3) Martyr at Carthage; commemorated Mar. 1 (*ib.*);

(4) Martyr in Africa, with Epiphanius the bishop, and others; commemorated April 7 (*Mart. Usuardi*), April 6 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

(5) Martyr at Caesarea in Cappadocia, with Polyeuctus and Victorinus; commemorated May 21 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(6) Bishop and martyr at Aretium in Tuscan under Julian; commemorated Aug. 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*).

(7) The presbyter and anchorite in a district on Mount Jura, in Belgic Gaul; commemorated Aug. 19 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(8) Martyr at Antioch, with Restitutus, Valerianus, Fructuosus, and twelve others; commemorated Aug. 23 (*ib.*).

(9) Martyr at Capua, with Quintus and Arcadius; commemorated Sept. 5 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(10) Martyr with Hermogenes and twenty-two others; commemorated Dec. 12 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**DOOR** (AS SYMBOL). See St. John x. 9. It seems most probable that in the various representations of sheep leaving or entering their fold or house, and so representing the Jewish or Gentile Church [*YERUSALEM; CHURCH*], the door may be intended to recall the words "I am the door," to the spectator's mind. In *Alleganza, Mon. di Milano*, &c., tav. ii., the door is seen five times repeated, evidently with this symbolic reference, and on the porch or tympanum of the old basilica of St. Aquilinus in the same city the following verses occur:—

"Janua sum vitæ; precor omnes intra vultu;  
Per me transibunt qui cordi gaudia querant;  
Virgine qui natus, nullo de patre creatus,  
Intrauit salvet, redeuntis ipse gubernat."

*Lupi, Diss. e Lett. i. p. 282* gives a bas-relief in gilded bronze, which contains a gate or door, with the Lamb under it bearing the Cross, and the words "Ego sum ostium, et ovis ovium." [R. St. J. T.]

**DOORS OF CHURCHES.** (*Januas, portæ, valvas; θύραι, πόρται.*)

1. The principal outer doors of a church seem to have been in ancient times at the west, if the church was so built that the altar was at the east end, or at any rate in the end facing the altar. In a basilican church of three aisles there were for the most part three western doors:

"Alma domus triplici patet ingreditibus arcu."  
*Paulinus of Nola, Ep. 32, ad Sev.*

In Constantine's great "Church of the Saviour" at Jerusalem, the three doors faced the east [*CHURCH*, p. 369]. At these doors stood during service the "weepers" (*υποψαλλιστρæ*). If there was a *NARTHEX*, the western doors gave entrance into this, and other doors again from the narthex into the nave. The nave was sometimes again itself divided into chorus and trapeza—the portion for the clerics and the people respectively—by a screen or partition having doors; but more frequently those who entered by the western doors saw before them at once the *ICONOSTASIS*, or screen enclosing the sanctuary, with its three doors.

2. The doors in the *iconostasis* were known generally as *καρυλλαιοὐλῆται, πόρται τοῦ θείου*

θύματος; the side door distinctively as πλάγαια or παραπόρτια. The central doors were called the "Holy Doors" (ἁγία θύρα) and sometimes the "Royal Doors" (βασιλικαὶ θύραι).

3. The great western doors of the nave were called the "Royal Gates" (βασιλικαὶ πύλαι); and this term was also adopted by Latin writers, so that "regiae" came to be used substantively for these doors. Anastasius, for instance, says (*Vitas Pontiff.* c. 119) that pope Honorius (A.D. 626-638) covered with silver plates the great royal—the so-called "Median"—doors at the entrance of a church (regias in ingressu ecclesiae majores, quae appellantur medianae). When the church had a narthex, the western doors of this were also sometimes called the "royal" gates.

4. The great church of St. Sophia at Constantinople had nine doors between the narthex and the nave. As these were covered with silver, not only were they called the "Silver Doors," but the same term came to designate the doors of other churches which occupied the same position.

5. Another term, the application of which cannot be absolutely determined, is the "Beautiful Gates" (ὡραῖαι πύλαι). These have been supposed to be the gates which separate chorus and trapeza (Goar); those which separate nave from narthex (Ducange); or the outer gate of the narthex (Neale). The latter application is supported by the fact that the term is taken from the "Beautiful Gate" of the temple, undoubtedly an outer gate.

6. The "Angelic Gate" (ἀγγελικὴ πύλη) was one which allowed a person to enter the trapeza, so as to draw near the choir. Nothing farther is known of it. It is not improbable that it was a local term.

7. The word θύρα is consistently used to designate a door within the building, and the word πύλη to designate the much larger "gates" which admitted the mass of the congregation from without into the narthex or the nave. Epithets like "royal" "and beautiful" are perhaps not used invariably with a special meaning, but the "Holy Doors" are always the central doors of the Bema, and no other.

8. The Holy Doors were opened at the commencement of the Great Vespers, at all "entrances," whether at Vespers or in the Liturgy; and at the end of the Liturgy, when the people are invited to approach for the purpose of communicating (Neale, *Eastern Church*, Introd. pp. 194-200).

9. The doors of churches were frequently of rich material and workmanship. The outer doors of St. Sophia at Constantinople were of bronze, with ornaments in relief [CHURCH, p. 374]; and those of the Iconostasis, as well as those between the narthex and the nave, of silver. And elsewhere, as not unfrequently in the *Liber Pontificalis*, we read of doors of metal gilt, or of wood richly inlaid or carved. [C.]

**DOORKEEPERS** (πυλωποὶ, θυρωροὶ, Ostiarii), an inferior order of clergy mentioned by the Pseudo-Ignatius (*Epist. Antioch.*), by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 43), and by Justinian (*Novell.* iii. 1). There is no mention of them in Tertullian or Cyprian, from which Thomassin (*Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* i. 2, c. 30, § 8) infers that in the early African church their duties were

discharged by the laity. The council of Laodicea (c. 24), speaks of them among the inferior orders of clergy. At the ordination of a doorkeeper, after previous instruction by the archdeacon he was presented to the bishop who delivered to him the keys of the church, with the injunction to act as one who must render to God an account of the things which are opened by those keys (iv. *Conc. Carth.* c. 9). The 4th council of Toledo (c. 4) provides that a doorkeeper should keep the door of the church at the opening of councils. In the 2nd canon of another council of Toledo, held A.D. 597, it is ordered that a doorkeeper should be appointed by the priest to provide for the cleansing and lighting of the church and sanctuary (Brun's *Canones*, i. 220). In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (ii. 25) they are spoken of as belonging to that portion of the clergy which represents the Levites, but in the lowest grade. Their share of the Agapae was the same as that of a Lector or Cantor (*Ibid.* ii. 28); there is no mention of their ordination, and they are named among the clergy who were not permitted to baptize (*Ibid.* iii. 11). They were to stand during the time of service at the door of the part of the church allotted to the men (*Ibid.* ii. 57). They were allowed to marry (*Ibid.* vi. 17). [P. O.]

**DORIA**, martyr with Chrysanthus, under Numerian; commemorated March 19 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**DORMITIO** (κοίμησις), the "falling asleep," used to describe the state of those who "depart hence in the Lord" (Cyprian, *Epist.* i. c. 2). More especially it is used to designate the day of the departure or "Assumption" of the Virgin Mary [MARY, FESTIVALS OF]; Xanthopoulos, for instance (quoted by Ducange, s. v. *Dormitio*), uses the expression, κοίμησιν ἁγνῆς, τὴν μετέστασιν λέγω. See Daniel's *Codex Liturg.*, iv. 239; and Ménard's *Sacram. Greg.*, pp. 411, 707. [C.]

**DORMITORIUM**. A garment for sleeping in; the "lebiton lineus" of Pachomius (*Vita*, c. 22). The gloss on the *Rule* of St. Benedict explains *Dormitoria* by the Greek word ἐγκοιμηθῆρα (Ducange, s. v.). [C.]

**DORMITORY** (*Dormitorium*). It was the primitive custom for monks to sleep all together in one large dormitory (Alteser. *Asceticon*, ix. 8). Not till the 14th century (Ducange, *Glossar. Lat.* s. v.) was the custom introduced of using separate sleeping cells. By the rule of Benedict all were to sleep in one room, if possible (Bened. *Reg.* c. 22) with the abbat in their midst (cf. Magist. *Reg.* c. 29; Bened. *Reg.* c. 22) or in larger monasteries ten or twenty together with a dean (Bened. *Reg.* ib.; cf. Caesar. Arelat. *Reg. ad Monach.* c. 3; *Reg. ad Virg.* c. 7; Aureol. *Reg.* c. 6; Ferreol. *Reg.* cc. 16, 33). Only the aged, the infirm, the excommunicated were excepted from this arrangement (Cujusd. *Reg.* c. 13). Each monk was to have a separate bed (Bened. *Reg.* v. s.; Caesar. Arelat. *Reg.* v. s.; Fructuos. *Reg.* c. 17). They were to sleep clothed and girded (Bened. *Reg.* v. s.; Mag. *Reg.* c. 11; Cujusd. *Reg.* v. s.), the founder probably intending that the monk should sleep in one of the two suits ordered by his rule (Bened. *Reg.* c. 55); but in course of time the words were loosely interpreted as meaning only the woollen tunic (Marten. *ad loc.*



estab.) It was particularly enjoined, puerile as the caution sounds, by Benedict and others, that the monks were not to wear their knives in bed (Bened. Reg. c. 22; Magist. Reg. c. 11). A light was to be kept burning in the dormitory all night (Bened. Reg. v. a.; Mag. Reg. c. 29; Cujusd. Reg. v. a.). All the monks were to rise at a given signal (Regg. Monast. passim). The dormitory was to be kept under lock and key till morning (Mart. ad Bened. Reg. c. 48). The sleeping-room for stranger monks was usually close to the great dormitory, and not far from the chapel (Mart. ad Bened. Reg. c. 53; cf. Capitul. Aquigr. 68).

In the first fervor of monastic zeal it was a common practice to sleep on the bare ground (*yxauvria*; cf. Altea. Ascet. ix. 8; Vit. St. Anton. c. 6; Theodoret, Philoth. i. 1, &c.). Others slept on mats (*ψαθία, mattae, stramenta*; Cassian. Collat. i. 23; xviii. 11; Rufin. Verb. Senior. ii. 29, 125); frequently these were made by themselves (Vit. Pachom. 43), and Augustine speaks of some strict Manicheans as "mattarii" (Conf. Frustrin. v. 5). The rule of Benedict allows mattress (*sagum*), coverlet (*laena* or *lana*), and pillow (*capitale*, v. a.); but in Egypt the mattress was considered a luxury in the 4th century, not permissible except for guests (Cass. Coll. xix. 6). Some of the monks of Tabenna slept in their tunics, half sitting, half lying (Vita Pachomii, c. 14, in Rosweyde's Vit. Patr.).

The time allowed for sleep was for Egyptian monks in the commencement of monachism very short indeed (Cass. Instit. v. 20; Coll. xii. 15, xiii. 8). Arsenius is said to have contented himself with one hour only. Rufinus speaks of others who allowed themselves four hours in the night for sleep, assigning four for prayer, four for work (Verb. Scit. c. 199). Even Benedict, though far more tolerant, forbade his disciples to retire to rest again after nocturns (Reg. c. 8; cf. Cass. Instit. ii. 12). But the rule was not adhered to strictly (Mart. ad Bened. Reg. i. c.).

The rules of the canonici in the 8th and 9th century were very similar to those of the monks. Chrodegang ordered all to sleep in one chamber, unless with the bishop's licence (Reg. c. 3). This was enforced on the canonici in their monasteries and on those dwelling under the bishop's roof, by the council of Tours, 813 A.D. (Conc. Turon. iii. cc. 23, 24). The council at Aachen, three years later, ordered bishops to see that the canonici slept in one dormitory (Conc. Aquagr. cc. 11, 123); and in its second session repeated the decree of the council at Châlons 813 A.D., that all nuns, except the sick and infirm, should sleep in one dormitory on separate beds (Conc. Cabill. c. 59, cf. Conc. Magunt. 813 A.D., c. 9, cf. Conc. Psom. ii. 587 A.D., c. 14). Grimlaic, in his rule for solitaries, orders that no fancy work is to be allowed on the coverlets. [I. G. S.]

**DORONA**, "Indus et Dorona," commemorated Dec. 19 (Cal. Armen.) [W. F. G.]

**DOROTHEA**, virgin, martyr with Theophilus at Caesarea in Cappadocia; commemorated Feb. 6 (Mart. Rom. 1 st., Adonis, Usuardi).

[W. F. G.]

**DOROTHEUS**. (1) Martyr at Tarsus in Cilicia, with Castor commemorated Mar. 28 (Mart. Usuardi).

(2) Bishop of Tyre, martyr under Julian commemorated June 5 (Cal. Byzant.).

(3) Martyr at Nicomedia, with Gorgonius, under Diocletian; commemorated Sept. 9 (Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**DORYMEDON**, martyr with Trophimus and Sabbatius, A.D. 278; commemorated Sept. 19 (Cal. Byzant.). [W. F. G.]

**DOSSAL** (*Dorsale, dorsile pallium*). A curtain hung on the walls of the choir of a church, or other place of dignity, behind the stalls of the clerks, "a dorsa clericorum" (Durandus, Rationale, i. iii. 23). "Cortina quae pendet ad dorsum" (The Monk of St. Gall, Vita Car. Mag. i. 4). Ekkehard the younger (*De Cassibus S. Galli*, c. 1), speaks of a place decked "tapeto et dorsali" (Ducange, s. v.). [C.]

**DOTALIA INSTRUMENTA**. [CONTRACT OF MARRIAGE, p. 458.]

**DOVE** (AS SYMBOL). Like the mystic fish and lamb, the dove has more than one meaning or train of meaning: it is used symbolically for the Divine Being and for the Christian worshipper; and is also represented simply in its own form on graves and the walls of catacombs. It is used very frequently (see woodcut) with Noah in the ark, in the literal sense; and in all representations of the Lord's baptism



Noah's Dove. From the Catacombs.



Doves on a Tomb. From Aringhi.



From the Catacomb of Domitilla, probably moved country.

and elsewhere, the dove indicates the presence of the Holy Spirit. In one instance, an Orante surrounded by several doves is opposed on one medallion of the front of a sarcophagus to the Good Shepherd with His sheep on another.

This use of the dove is very frequent in the monuments of Southern Gaul; where, as in the catacombs, the birds which stand on each side of the monograms or crosses are often clearly intended for doves. See Leblant, *Inscr. Chrétiennes de la Gaule antérieures au huitième siècle*, Paris, 1856.

As an emblem of the Third Person of the Trinity, the carved or painted figure of the dove appeared from a very early period in all baptisteries (see Luke iii. 24). One of the earliest examples of this is the baptistery in the cemetery of St. Pontianus (Aringhi, ii. 275). The painting, though considered by Martigny as of later date than the building, is referred by him to the 6th century, and represents the Lord's



Baptismal Dove. Catacomb of Pontianus: seventh century.

baptism in Jordan. The rude and grim figures in this painting remind us of those of the Laurentine and other very early MSS. The symmetrical arrangement is also like early Byzantine work, so called; and the river is a winding trench, with a curious typical resemblance to the actual course of Jordan, which induces us to think the painter had visited it. So also in both baptisteries at Ravenna. The mosaic of St. Mark's preserves this likeness, with the addition of three adoring angels, a star above the dove, fish in the river, and the double axe laid to the root of a tree. This imagery is strictly followed in the wild and powerful painting of Tintoret, in the Scuola di S. Rocco, now scarcely intelligible (Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, vol. ii.). The Turin miniature is remarkable for its topographical accuracy as to two of the sources of Jordan, labelled respectively **Fons YOR** and

**Fons DAD**. Martigny also mentions

figures of doves on a font or laver of very early date belonging to the church of Gondrecourt (*Revue Archéologique*, v. i. p. 129), where however only birds are said to be drinking from vases, and pecking at grapes. See also Paciaudi, *De Cultu S. Joannis Baptistae*, pp. 58, 69, where copies of a miniature from a MS. in the Royal Library at Turin, and of a mosaic in St. Mark's in Venice, are given, both containing the dove. A golden or silver dove was often suspended above the font in early times. [DOVE, THE EUCHARISTIC.] These sometimes contained the anointing oil used in baptism and extreme unction (Martigny, s. v.; and Aringhi, vol. ii. p. 326, c. 5). On lamps in form of doves, see Aringhi, ii. 325, 1.

As a symbol of the believer, the dove of course has chief reference to two texts of H. S., belonging to different yet harmonious trains of

thought. One is Matt. x. 16, "Be ye wise as serpents and harmless as doves:" the other, Pa. iv. 6, "O that I had wings like a dove, then would I flee away and be at rest." The passages in Cant. i. 15, ii. 14, v. 2, vi. 9, refer to the Church, and therefore may be taken as referring simply to all faithful souls. Martigny gives a drawing of a seal with a dove in the centre, surrounded by the words "Veni si amas," is obvious reference to Cant. ii. 10. The dove with the olive or palm-branch, which so often accompanies it, is held equivalent to the form "In Pace." As with other birds, the flying or caged dove has reference to the deliverance of the soul from the flesh in death, or to its imprisoned state in life. [See BIRD.] Aringhi quotes St. Ambrose's sermon on St. Eusebius, "Altiora facilius penetrantur simplicitate mentis, quam levitate pennarum;" and St. Augustine on St. Matt. x. to the same purpose. In Aringhi, ii. p. 145, the dove is associated with the peacock; also, p. 139, in a vault of the Catacomb of St. Priscilla. In Bottari, tav. 181, it hovers with the olive-branch above the three holy children in the flames.

Twelve doves, representing the Twelve Apostles, occur in Bottari, i. p. 118, on a mosaic crucifix. See also Paulinus of Nola (*Ep. ad Severum*, xxii. c. 10). He thus describes a mosaic (*musivum opus*) in his church. [CROSS.]

"Meno coruscat Trinitas mysterio:  
Stat Christus agno: vox Patris coelo tonat:  
Et per columbam Spiritus Sanctus fluit.  
Crucem corona lucido cingit globo:  
Cui coronae sunt corona apostoli,  
Quorum figura est in columbarum choro.  
Ira Trinitatis unitas Christo colit,  
Habente et ipsa Trinitate indigna;  
Dum revelat vox paterna, et Spiritus:  
Sanctam latentur crux et agnus victimam.  
Regnum et triumphum purpura et palma indicant  
Petram superstat ipsa petra ecclesiae,  
De qua sonori quatuor fontes meant,  
Evangelistae, viva Christi flumina." [R. St. J. T.]

DOVE, THE EUCHARISTIC. Pyxes or receptacles for the reserved host were not unfrequently made of gold or silver in the shape of a dove, and suspended over the altar. Doves of the precious metals, emblematic of the Holy Spirit, were also suspended above the font in early churches. In the life of St. Basil by the Pseudo-Amphilochius, it is narrated that that father, after a vision that appeared to him while celebrating the Eucharist, divided the wafer into three parts, one of which he partook of with great awe, the second he preserved to be buried with him, and placed the third in a golden dove hanging over the altar. He afterwards sent for a goldsmith, and had a new golden dove made to contain the sacred morsel (*Amphiloch. Vit. Basil.*, c. 6).

One of the charges brought against the Acephalian heretic Severus by the clergy of Antioch at the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 536, was that he removed and appropriated to his own use the gold and silver doves hanging over the sacred fonts and altars, χρυσᾶς καὶ ἀργυρᾶς περιτεοῦς κρεμαμένας ὑπὲρ τῶν θείων καὶ λυμβηθρῶν καὶ θυσιαστηρίων.... ἐσφετερίσας (*Labbe, Concil.* v. 159).

Such doves are mentioned by Anastasius in the *Liber Pontificalis*, c. g., St. Hilar. 70, "columbar

suream pensan. libras 21 ;" Cf. Ducange, *sub voc.*: Durantus, *De Ritibus*, lib. i. c. xvi. § 5; Paulin. Nolan. *Ep.* xxxii. Not. 154, p. 910. [E. V.]

### DOWRY. [ARRHAE: MARRIAGE.]

**DOXOLOGY** (Δοξολογία). The term doxology is usually confined (1) to the "Gloria in Excelsis," which is called the greater doxology, and also the Angelical Hymn, from its opening clause recorded by St. Luke as having been sung by the angels who announced the birth of Christ to the shepherds; and (2) to the "Gloria Patri," which is called the lesser doxology. The term is, however, sometimes given to the "Trisagion" (Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory), called also the Seraphic hymn, in reference to the vision of the Seraphim described by Isaiah (c. vi.); and also to the word ALLELUIA (q. v.), when repeated again and again as a hymn of praise.

The exact periods of the origin of these doxologies are unknown, owing to the extreme scantiness of early Christian literature. But it may be safely conjectured that, in their earliest forms, they came into use soon after that circulation of the Gospel narratives which must have quickly become general among Christians in proportion to the cultivation of each local church, and its means for communicating with the general body of believers. The extent and rapidity of this circulation being involved in extreme obscurity, so far as contemporary history informs us, the positiveness with which later writers have spoken of the almost Apostolic origin of these hymns must be set down amongst those numerous assumptions which have clouded our real knowledge of primitive Christian life and devotions. The "Trisagion" in all probability is the most ancient of all, as it would be the natural expression of the adoration of the Jewish Christians, who were already in possession of the Old Testament, and who would have been familiar with the book of Isaiah before their conversion to Christianity. The use of the "Gloria in Excelsis," which originally consisted only of its opening sentence, would be equally natural, wherever the narrative of St. Luke was known; and the "Gloria Patri," which originally consisted only of its first clause, would be the result of a familiarity with the last verses of St. Matthew's Gospel.

The "Gloria in Excelsis" is unquestionably of Eastern origin. Liturgical speculators, indeed, have ingeniously discovered a reference to its existence in very early writers. It has been frequently assumed that it was in fact "the hymn," which Christians sang on all solemn occasions, including such as are referred to in Acts xvi. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 26; and Col. iii. 16. When the author of the dialogue attributed to Lucian speaks of the Christians as watching all night for the purpose of singing hymns, it is supposed that their chief song was the "Gloria in Excelsis." It is also held to have been specially referred to in the famous passage in Pliny's letter to Trajan: "Affirmabant hanc fuisse summam vel culpae suae, vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere secum invicem." In reality, however, we first meet with this doxology, and in something very like its final form, in the book known as *The Apostolical*

*Constitutions* (vii. 47). It is there described as the "morning prayer," and stands as follows: "Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good will towards men (ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία). We praise Thee, we sing to Thee (ὕμνοῦμέν σε), we bless Thee, we glorify Thee, we worship Thee, through the great High Priest; Thee the true God, the only unbegotten, whom no one can approach for the great glory. O Lord, heavenly king, God the Father Almighty, Lord God, the Father of Christ, the Lamb without spot, who taketh away the sin of the world, receive our prayer, thou that sittest upon the Cherubim. For thou only art holy, thou only, Lord Jesus, the Christ of God, the God of every created being, and our king; by whom unto Thee be glory, honour, and adoration." Unfortunately, the writer of the *Constitutions* was not exempt from the spirit of falsification, which was by no means rare among early religious writers. As it is impossible to believe him when he attributes a liturgy of palpably Oriental character to St. Clement, we cannot be sure that in this record of the great doxology he has not made alterations or interpolations of his own. In the mention of the doxology in the treatise *De Virginitate* (in Athanasius's *Works*) only the beginning is quoted, and even here it is not identical with that given by the author of the *Constitutions*. Giving directions to the virgins for their morning devotions, Athanasius says, "Early in the morning say this Psalm, 'O God, my God, early will I wake to Thee.' When it is light, say, 'Bless ye the Lord, all ye works of the Lord,' and 'Glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth, goodwill towards men. We sing to Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee,' and the rest (of the hymn)" (c. 20; tom. 2, p. 120, ed. Benedict.).

St. Chrysostom, on the other hand, in describing the morning devotions of those who led an austere life, says that they sang, as the angels did "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men"; making no mention of the subsequent additions (*Hom.* 69 in *Matth.*). How soon the use of the complete hymn became general in the Western Church it is impossible to say. The 4th council of Toledo, A.D. 633, treats of it in its completeness, defends it, as such, against certain rigorists who objected to its repetition on the ground that only its first sentence was of divine origin. "For the same reason," said the fathers of the council (can. 13), "they might have rejected the lesser doxology, 'Glory and honour be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost,' which was composed by men; and also this greater doxology, part of which was sung by the angels at our Saviour's birth; 'Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace to men of goodwill'; but the rest that follows was composed and added to it by the doctors of the Church."

The period at which this doxology was generally introduced into the eucharistic office in the West is entirely a matter of conjecture. There is no foundation for the common idea that it formed a portion of the early liturgies. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. c. 65) in describing the eucharistic worship of his contemporaries, makes no mention of this hymn. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his 5th catechesis on St. Peter's 1st Epistle, while fixing certain details in the eucharistic service, such as the "Sursum corda," &c., gives

no hint of its use. Nor is it found in any of the earliest liturgies, whether Western or Eastern, which are in existence. In the East, it is still used in the non-eucharistic morning services of the Church, being sung on Sundays and the greater festivals, and recited on ordinary days. It was first appointed (according to the *Liber Pontif.*) to be said in the Roman Liturgy by Pope Symmachus, who was raised to the Pontificate in 498, but only on Sundays and the festivals of martyrs, and apparently its recital was held to be a special privilege; for the Gregorian *Sacramentary* (p. 1) gives the following directions concerning it: "Item dicitur *Gloria in Excelsis Deo*, si episcopus fuerit, tantummodo die Dominico, sive diebus festis. A presbyteris autem minime dicitur, nisi in solo paschâ. Quando vero letania agitur, neque *Gloria in Excelsis Deo*, neque *Alleluia* canitur." Pope Stephen the 3rd directed that on the highest festivals it should be sung only by bishops, at least in the Lateran Church. Pope Calixtus 2nd granted, as a privilege to the monks of Tournus\* that they should use it on the Feast of the Annunciation; "pro reverentiâ B. Mariæ semper Virginis, cujus nomine locus vester insignis est, in Annunciatione Domini Salvatoris nostri hymnum Angelicum inter missarum solemnias abbati et fratribus pronunciare concedimus" (Calixti *epist. ad Franconem Abbatem monasterii Trenorchiensis*). From the Mozarabic ritual it seems to have been about this time recited in Spain on Sundays and certain festivals, in the eucharistic office; but in the Gallican Church it appears even when introduced to have been for a long time only sung on public days of thanksgiving. Its ultimate gradual adoption throughout the Western Church was no doubt due to the increasing influence of the example of Rome. At the same time our modern desire for uniformity in religious worship was unknown in the early ages of Christianity, not merely because our ideas on disciplinary organization were as yet undeveloped, but because the facilities for communication, both personally and by letter, were comparatively slight, and local customs were preserved, as almost sacred in the eyes of those who had received them from their fathers. [GLORIA IN EXCELSIS.]

2. The origin and history of the "Gloria Patri," or lesser doxology, is even more obscure than that of the "Gloria in Excelsis," and in its present shape it is the result of the Arian controversies concerning the nature of Christ. It is quite impossible to trace its use to the three first centuries; if it was really known to the primitive Christians, it probably arose, as has been already suggested, from the juxtaposition of the three persons of the Trinity, in the command given by the Lord to his Apostles to teach and baptize all nations. For several centuries, the clause "As it was in the beginning, &c.," was certainly unknown in many parts of Christendom. The 4th council of Toledo, A.D. 633, makes no mention of this clause, and at the same time gives a version of the first portion which is not identical

\* Tournus was an abbey in Burgundy, on the Saône, between Mâcon and Châlons; and the privilege granted by Stephen is remarkable as one of the earliest instances in which the bishop of Rome claimed a right over the public forms of prayer in local churches.

with that which subsequently became universal, reading it thus: "Glory and honour be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, world without end, Amen." In the old Spanish liturgy, known as the Mozarabic, supposed to be of a little later date, it occurs in the same form as in the decree of Toledo. In the treatise of Walafridus Strabo *De rebus ecclesiasticis* (c. 25), the different usages of different countries are particularly specified. "Dicendum," he says, "de hymno, qui ob honorem sanctæ et unicæ Trinitatis officiis omnibus interseritur, eum à sanctis patribus aliter atque aliter ordinatum. Nam Hispani sicut superius commemoravimus, ita eum dici omnimodis voluerunt. Graeci autem, 'Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto, et nunc, et semper, et in saecula saeculorum. Amen.' Latini vero eodem ordine et eisdem verbis hunc hymnum decantant, addentes tantum in medio, 'Sicut erat in principio.'" The writer of the treatise *De Virginitate* which is often placed among the works of Athanasius, gives the "Gloria Patri," as "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, world without end, Amen."

The addition of the second clause is enjoined in the year 529, by the 2nd council of Vaison, which at the same time asserts that it was already universal among the Greeks. "Quia non solum," says the council, "in Sede Apostolicâ, sed etiam per totum Orientem et totam Africam vel Italiam, propter hæreticorum astutiam, quâ Dei Filium non semper cum Patre fuisse, sed a tempore fuisse blasphemant, in omnibus clausulis post *Gloria*, sicut erat in principio dicitur, etiam et nos in universis ecclesiis nostris hoc ita esse dicendum decrevimus." From which decree it appears certain that the use of the additional clause was at the least not general in Gaul at that time, though it is likely that it had gradually been introduced from Italy. It is remarkable, indeed, as the new addition was adopted with the direct object of repudiating the Arian doctrine, that it should not have spread more rapidly eastward, after the decisive action of the council of Nice in asserting the orthodox faith.

From the writers of the Arian period, again, it would seem that there were important variations in the traditional forms of the first clause, to which great significance was attached by the adherents of the opposing doctrines. One of these forms stood thus: "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, with the Holy Ghost;" and another, "Glory be to the Father, in or by the Son, and by the Holy Ghost." Sozomen asserts (*H. E.* iii. 20) that the form "Glory be to the Father through the Son" was adopted by the Arians as distinctly implying the subordination of the Son to the Father; and Valesius believes that the ἀκροτελεύτια which the Arians used in their chanting (*Ib.* viii. 8), composed to support their own views (πρὸς τὴν αὐτῶν δόξαν), were doxologies. On the other hand, Philostorgius, himself an Arian, alleges that the ancient form was really that which the Arians preferred, and that Flavian of Antioch was the first person who introduced the form now used, every one before him having said either "Glory be to the Father by the Son," or "Glory be to the Father in the Son." It is to be noted, also, that St. Basil was accused of having introduced a novelty.



when he said, "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son;" and that in his vindication of himself (*De Spiritu Sancto*, c. 29 [al. 70 ff.]) he declares that all the three forms were ancient and to be used in the Nicene sense. He says, too, that his own practice was that of Irenæus, Clement of Rome, Dionysius of Rome, Eusebius of Caesarea, Dionysius of Alexandria, Origen, Athenogenes, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Firmilian, and Meletius. Each form indeed, was probably used indifferently, during the long period when the faith of the Church was left undefined, that is, until the council of Nice in the early part of the 4th century. How soon, in its present complete form, it was generally used in connection with the recitation of the Psalms, it is impossible to say. It is directed to be thus recited by St. Benedict (*Regula*, c. 18) where he writes, "In primis dicantur versus; 'Deus in adiutorium,' &c., 'Domine ad adjuvandum,' &c., et 'Gloria.'" But whether he was introducing a novelty, or merely sanctioning a practice already introduced, is a matter of mere conjecture. [See PSALMODY.] [J. M. C.]

**DRACONARIUS.** Strictly speaking this word denotes the bearer of the military standard, on which a dragon was represented, "vexillifer, qui fert vexillum ubi est draco depictus" (Ducange, s. v.).

When Constantine after his conversion placed the Christian symbol on the military ensigns instead of the dragon, the name outlived the change, and the standard-bearer was still called *dracônarius*. Sometimes we find the ancient symbol joined to the new, the dragon being placed beneath the cross.

In the Christianized empire this name came to signify the official who carried a standard or banner in ecclesiastical processions; a transference which was facilitated by the fact that the official in question often carried, as the soldiers also did, the labarum with the cross, Constantine's chosen symbol.

Pellicia states (*Politia*, li. 113, ed. 1780) that in his time an object resembling almost exactly the ancient labarum, as depicted on coins, was still carried in supplications, and called "gonfalon" by the Italians.

The name *Dracônarius* seems also to have been sometimes given to the cross-bearer. [C.]

**DRAGON (as SYMBOL).** [See SERPENT.] Though the serpent from the earliest ages has been a symbol of both good and evil, the dragon, wherever he occurs in early Christian art, seems to represent the enemy of mankind, all his temptations, and the evil desires of mankind which combine with them. The images of the Apocalypse have much to do with this, of course, and the dragon appears in MSS. of that book, as in a Saxon one now in the Bodleian Library. The dragon-standards of cohorts, on the conversion of Constantine, had the Cross or monogram of Christ placed above the serpentine image; the name of the standard-bearer [DRACONARIUS] being applied in after times to bearers of banners in Church processions. The labarum is represented as planted on the body of a serpent, in a medal given by Aringhi after Baronius (vol. ii. p. 705).

The fish or whale of Jonah is often represented in the catacombs as a sort of draconic nondescript (see Bottari lvi. and *passim*, De

Rosa, &c.), perhaps with an idea of carrying out the symbolism of our Lord's passing under and out of the power of hell and of death. But the idea of a sea-monster seems always intended to be conveyed. The idea of the dragon as a winged crocodile or lizard may have been derived from remains of the Sauri: a skeleton of some animal of that family is mentioned by Mrs. Jameson as having been exhibited at Aix in a fossil state, as the frame of a dragon which had long devastated the neighbourhood. Prof. Kingsley calls attention to the fact that the pterodactyles of the lias were literally flying dragons to all intents and purposes. The GRIFFIN, as a minister of God's service, is quite distinct from the dragon (see s. v.).<sup>a</sup> For Daniel and the Apocryphal Dragon or Serpent see Bottari, v. 1, tav. xix. and woodcut.



The Gothic imagination, in later days, revelled in dragons; the seven-headed beast, with crowns and nimbuses on all his heads except that "wounded to death" (Rev. xii.), is a type of such art; see Didron's *Outline*, &c., vol. i. p. 162, "from a 12th century Psalterium cum figuris," in the *Bibliothèque Royale*. In Constantine's Mosaic, (Euseb. *de Vite Const.* li. iii. c. 3; see also Didron, *Iconogr. Chrétienne*, vol. i., art. Croix), the serpent or dragon is associated with the Cross as the conquered enemy of mankind. The serpent is placed at the foot of the Cross of Lothaire, and in the mosaic of Charles the Bald (Essay by Mons. G. St. Laurent, in Didron's *Annales Archéologiques*, vol. xiv. See SERPENT.) dragons are mentioned as occupying alternate panels of bas-relief with doves, drinking or pecking at grapes, on a font from the ancient church of Godreacourt, *Revue Archéologique*, vol. i. p. 129.

Gori's representation (*Theocorus Diptychorum* v. ii.) of the ivory binding of the Codex Laurentianus consists in part of our Lord trampling on

<sup>a</sup> Bottari refers to Bosio, *de Cruce*, vi. c. xi.; Clappetier, *Mem. t. i. c. xxi.* p. 191; Gresser, *de Cruce*, t. iii. lib. i. c. 32.

the lion and dragon, while the serpent is carved also near Him. [See *Serpent*.] For the devout and tempting serpent on the Barbarian gem see same article, and Gort, *Th. Dipych.* vol. iii. p. 100. [R. St. J. T.]

**DRAMAS, CHRISTIAN.** As works of literature, dramas such as the *Σπέρδης υδρόγειος* ascribed to Gregory of Nazianzus, do not come within the scope of this Dictionary. Nor have we any sufficient evidence that sacred dramas were ever acted till after the time of Charlemagne, which forms the chronological limit of its archaeology. All that can be said, therefore, is to note the fact that there is no proof of the practice of dramatic representations of sacred history prior to that period, but that probably those which soon afterwards became very popular were not entirely novelties, and, as the present writer has noticed elsewhere (*Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. *Mops*), that names and descriptions like those which Bede gives of Gaspar, Melchior, and Balthazar (*de Collectum.*), appear to imply a dramatic as well as pictorial representation of the facts of the Nativity. [R. H. P.]

**DREAMS.** It does not appear that the attempt to foretell the future by the interpretation of ordinary dreams was condemned by the early Church; rather it was acknowledged that dreams might be made the vehicle of divine revelation. But some of the old heathen practices by which men sought to acquire supernatural knowledge in dreams, such as sleeping in an idol's temple wrapped in the skin of a sacrifice (Virgil, *Aeneid* vii. 88), or under the boughs of a sacred tree, were distinctly condemned. Jerome (*in loco*) takes Isaiah lxx. 4 to refer to such practices. There was no impiety (he says) which Israel in those days did not perpetrate, "sitting or dwelling in sepulchres, and sleeping in the shrines of idols; where they used to pass the night (incubate) on skins of victims laid on the ground that they might learn the future by dreams, as the heathen do in certain temples even unto this day" (Weiser and Walte, *Archæologia*. xi. 172). [C.]

**DRESS.** This article relates to the ordinary dress of Christians, and the dress of the clergy in civil life. For the ministerial dress, see *VESTMENTS*.

1. *Dress of Christians generally.*—In the earliest days of the Church Christians probably took little thought for raiment; yet even in the first century "gay clothing" was found in Christian assemblies (St. James ii. 2) as well as in kings' palaces. For Christians wore the ordinary dress of their station and country; neither in speech nor in manners did they differ from other men; whether in cities of the Greeks or cities of the barbarians they followed the customs of the place in dress and manner of life (*Epist. ad Diognetum*, c. 5; Tertullian, *Apologet.* c. 42). Here and there a convert adopted or retained—as Justin did—the napleon cloak (*χιτών*) which was characteristic of the philosopher, and especially of the Cynic; but this did not distinguish him from the heathen, but from those who made no profession of philosophy or asceticism. There is no reason to doubt that those converts who had a professional dress—as civil and military officials—continued to wear it whenever duty required.

But if the Christian was not in early times

distinguished from the heathen by his garb, there was always in the Church—as there could not fail to be—a strong feeling against luxury, display, and immodesty in apparel. Clement of Alexandria, who represents a somewhat ascetic tendency, condemns (*Stromate*, ii. 10, p. 223 E.) all kinds of dyes for that which is but the covering of man's shame, all gold and jewelry, all over-nice plaiting of the hair or decoration of the face; he seems even to imply that there is no reason why men's dress should differ from that of women, as in both cases it serves but the same purpose of covering and protecting from the cold. He will none of cloth of gold or Indian silk, the product of a poor worm turned to purposes of pride; still less of those fine materials which display what they seem to cover. Let the stuffs which Christians wear be of their natural colour, not dyed with hues fit only for a Bacchic procession. It is permissible to wear stuffs soft and pleasant to wear, not gaudy so as to attract the gaze. The long train which sweeps the ground and impedes the step is an abomination to him, as also the short immodest tunic of the Lacedæmonian dædal. In a word, he urges simplicity and modesty in all points.

Clement's invective probably implies that luxury in dress was not unknown among the faithful in his time; this is certainly the case with that of Tertullian, whose denunciations are expressly addressed to Christians. In his treatise on women's dress, he charges on the "sons of God," who lasted after the daughters of men, the invention of the adventitious aids of feminine beauty—the gold and jewels, the brilliant dyes, the black powder with which the eyelids were tinged, the argente which gave colour to the cheek, the wash which changed the hair to the fashionable yellow, the towers of false tresses piled upon the head and neck (*De Cultu Fæminarum*, i. 2, 6, 8; ii. 5, 6, 7). Why, he asks, should Christian women clothe themselves in gold and jewels and gorgeous dyes, when they never displayed their charms in processions, as the heathen did, and needed not to pass through the streets except when they went to church or to visit a sick brother—not occasions for gorgeous apparel (*ib.* ii. 11)? Why should they imitate the Apocalyptic woman that was "arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls?" (*ib.* ii. 12). He does not object to seemly and becoming dress (*cultus*), and approves attention to the hair and skin, but he inveighs against such decoration (*ornatus*) as seems intended to attract notice (*ib.* i. 4; ii. 2). The wrist accustomed to a bracelet would hardly bear a chain, the leg adorned with an anklet would scarcely bear the fetter; some socks were so loaded with pearls and emeralds as hardly to afford room for the headman's sword (*ib.* ii. 13). Virgins ought always to cover their faces when they had occasion to go abroad (*De Virgine*, *Volund.* *passim*).

Nor does the vehement African spare the men; he speaks with contempt of their foolish efforts to please the other sex by artifice clipping of the beard, by dressing the hair, by dyeing white locks, by singeing the down from the skin, even by using the feminine aids of paint and powder on the face (*De Cultu Viri*, ii. 8). To the same effect Cyprian speaks (*De Habit. Virginit.*, a.

12 ff.), and so speaks the treatise *De Bono Pudicitiae* (c. 12) attributed to him.

From such passages it is evident that Christians in the latter part of the second and the beginning of the third century, both men and women, followed the fashion of the world, though not without strong remonstrance from those who took a more serious view of their Christian calling. The only exception probably was in the case of some decoration which implied, or was thought to imply, participation in idolatry (Tertullian, *De Idololatria*, c. 18). It was indeed a part of the torture applied to Christians to compel them to put on garments distinctly indicative of such participation (*Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas*, c. 18, in Ruinart, p. 100, ed. 2). A series of passages in denunciation of luxury in dress might be produced from the early fathers; see, for instance, Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. IV.* p. 94, ed. 1641; Basil, *Reg. fusius Tract. Interrog.* 22; ii. 366, ed. Bened.

Some canonical decrees on the subject relate to the assumption by one sex of the dress of the other; since for women to wear the dress of men was sometimes represented as meritorious asceticism. Eustathius, for instance (quoted by Bingham, xvi. xi. 16) taught his female disciples to cut off their hair and to assume the habit of men. But the council of Gangra (A.D. 370), in canons 13 and 17, condemns both these practices in the following terms:—"If any woman, under pretence of leading an ascetic life, change her apparel, and instead of the accustomed habit of women take that of men, let her be anathema." And, "If any woman, on account of an ascetic life, cut off her hair, which God has given her as a memorial of subjection, let her be anathema, as one that annuls the decree of subjection." These decrees are manifestly founded upon Deut. xxii. 5 and 1 Cor. xi. 6 respectively. Cyprian (*Ep. 2*, c. 1, *ad Eucratium*) and Tertullian (*de Spectac.* c. 23), with other writers (see Prynne's *Histriomastix*), apply the Mosaic prohibition to the interchange of clothing by men and women in stage plays, which they condemn for this reason among many others.

Under the Frankish emperors the Mosaic prohibition (Deut. xxii. 11) of wearing a garment of woollen and linen was re-enacted (*Capitularium*, vi. c. 46).

The civil code under the empire attempted to repress luxury by specific enactments (*Codex Justiniani*, lib. xi. tit. 8), which seem however to contemplate, at least in part, the preservation of an imperial monopoly and of the sanctity of the imperial insignia. [COMMERCE, p. 409.] It was utterly forbidden to manufacture cloth of gold or edgings (paragaudas) of silk and gold thread for male attire, except in the imperial factories (gynaeciariis); nor was any male to wear such decorations, except imperial officials. No woollen garments were to be dyed so as to imitate the imperial purple, the blood of the sacred murex. No one was to wear imperial insignia, nor to manufacture privately any silk tunics or pallia. There was probably a demand for silk and cloth of gold for male attire, when so strict laws were made against their use.

2. *Civil Dress of the Clergy.*—It is certain that during the first five Christian centuries the clergy in general were distinguished from the laity, in ordinary life, neither by the form nor

the colour of their garments, but only by their sober and unobtrusive style (Thomassin. i. ii. 43). The lacerna, byrrus, and dalmatic which Cyprian took off before his martyrdom (*Acta Procons.* c. 5) seem to be the ordinary dress of a citizen of that period. So far were the clergy commonly from adopting a peculiar dress that pope Celestinus (A.D. 428) sharply blamed certain Gallican bishops who had chosen to make themselves conspicuous by a dress different from that of the laity about them (*Epist. 2*, in Binius' *Concilia*, i. 901). These bishops, it appears, had been monks before they were promoted to the episcopate, and retained as bishops the pallium and girdle of the monk, instead of taking the tunic and toga of the superior layman. Yet Constantinus (*Vita Germani*, in Surius, iv. 360) says that bishop Amator, when he ordained Germanus (†448), afterwards bishop of Auxerre, put upon him "habitum religionis," an expression which in all probability designates the monastic dress; and other ecclesiastics of special austerity no doubt wore the rough dress of the monk, as St. Martin did (Sulpicius Severus, *Vita B. Martini*, c. 10; *Dialogus II.* c. 1), but the very fact that this costume was specially noticed shows that it was not the common attire of the clergy.

Nor do the clergy of the East, more than those of the West, seem to have adopted a distinctive dress in early times, unless they were members of monastic bodies, or remarkably austere in life. If Heraclas (Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 19) wore the gown of the philosopher, this distinguished him not from the laity but from the unphilosophical, whether lay or clerical. The dress of the bishops whom Constantine assembled round his table (Euseb. *Vita Constant.* i. 42) seems to have had no distinctive character except simplicity. Sisinnius, a Novatian bishop (Socrates, *H. E.* vi. 22), incurred the reproach of ostentation by wearing a white robe, which contrasted with the more usual sober colour of episcopal garments. But there are indications at a later date among the orthodox, that a somewhat splendid vesture was thought to become high station in the hierarchy. John Chrysostom, for instance, a short time before his death, adopted the more splendid attire suited to his position; and Gregory Nazianzen declares that his own simple life and mean dress was one of the reasons for his expulsion from Constantinople—implying that something more distinguished was looked for.

St. Augustine too (*Sermo 50, De Diversis*), apparently still a priest, says that a valuable byrrus might befit a bishop, which would by no means suit a poor man like Augustine. That the byrrus was the common, as opposed to the ascetic, dress of Christians, is shown by the 12th canon of the council of Gangra (A.D. 358), in which those who wore the ascetic gown (περιβόλαιον) are warned not to despise the wearers of the byrrus. Augustine objects only to wearing one more valuable than became his station.

The account also of Euthymius (*Life*, by Cyril, in Surius, Jan. 20) saluting Anastasius as Patriarch, shows that a dignitary of that eminence was generally distinguished by the splendour of his attire.

We conclude then generally that no especial style of dress was prescribed for the clergy within the first five centuries, but that during the latter part of that period it was usual for

monks who became bishops to retain their monastic garb, and for the higher dignitaries—especially the Patriarch of Constantinople, connected as he was with a splendid court—to wear such garments as befitted a person of rank.

The same inference may be drawn from the fact that the Pseudo-Dionysius (*Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 5), in describing the ordination of bishops, priests, and deacons, probably in the 5th century, says not a word of any change of dress, though he is careful to mention it in the case of monks.

In the 6th century the civil dress of the clergy came to differ from that of the laity, mainly because the latter departed from the ancient type to which the former adhered; for the clergy, in the empire of the West, retained the long tunic and toga (or pallium) of the Romans, while the laity adopted for the most part the short tunic, trousers, and cloak of the "gens bracata," the Teutonic invaders. It was probably in consequence of this change of dress that the compilation of canons sanctioned by the second council of Braga, A.D. 572 (c. 66; Bruns's *Canones*, ii. 56), especially desired the clergy to wear the long dignified tunic (talarem vestem). Gregory the Great constantly assumes the existence of a distinctive clerical habit. He speaks, for instance (*Epist.* iv. 22), of men assuming the ecclesiastical habit and living a worldly life. And John the Deacon (*Vita Gregorii*, ii. 13) directs especial attention to the fact, that the great Pontiff himself tolerated no one about him who wore the barbarian dress; every one in his household wore the garb of old Rome (trabeata Latinitas), then almost synonymous with the clerical habit.

And from the beginning of the 6th century we find canons forbidding clerics to wear the secular dress. They are not to wear long hair, nor clothes other than such as befit "religion" (*Conc. Agathen.* c. 20); nor a military cloak, nor arms (*C. Mutiscon.* c. 5); nor purple, which rather befits the great ones of the world (*C. Narbon.* c. 1). And again, in the 8th century, priests and deacons are desired not to wear the laic *sagum*, or short cloak, but the CASULA, as becomes servants of God (*C. German.* i. A.D. 742, c. 7),—where the expression "ritu servorum Dei" probably does not mean "like monks" (Marriott, *Vest. Christ.* 201, n. 416)—and generally not to wear ostentatious clothes (pompatico habitu) or arms (Boniface, *Epist.* 105). Yet about the same time pope Zachary, writing to Pipin, mayor of the palace (*Conc. Galliae*, i. 563), desires bishops to dress according to their dignity, and parish priests (presbyteri cardinales) to wear in preaching a better style of dress than that of the people committed to them; warning them at the same time that not the dress of the body but the state of the soul is the important thing.

Yet even in the latter part of the 7th century Bede tells us (*Vita Cuthberti*, c. 16) that St. Cuthbert wore ordinary clothes (vestimentis communibus),\* neither splendid nor dirty, and that after his example the monks of his monastery continued to wear garments of undyed wool.

The course of events in the East, in respect of clerical dress, was not very different from that in the West, except that as the settlements of the barbarians were less numerous, the distinc-

tion between layman and cleric was less obvious, both wearing the long tunic. A law of Justinian (Nov. 123, c. 44) protected monastic dress from profane uses, but says nothing of any other dress peculiar to clerics. The council in Trullo, however, A.D. 691, expressly enacted (c. 27) that no one on the roll of the clergy should wear an unprofessional (ἀνοίκειον) dress, whether in the city or on a journey, but should use the robes (στολαῖς) prescribed for those who were enrolled among the clergy, under pain of excommunication for a week. From this point the difference between clerical and lay dress may be considered established, though a series of enactments throughout the middle ages shows that the clergy were constantly in the habit of assimilating their dress to that of the laity.

Pope Zacharias decreed (A.D. 743) that bishops, priests, and deacons should not use secular dress, but only the sacerdotal tunic; and that when they walked out, whether in city or country—unless on a long journey—they should wear some kind of upper garment or wrapper (operimentum).<sup>b</sup>

The second council of Nice, in the year 787, condemns (c. 15) bishops and clerics who distinguish themselves by the richness and brilliant colours of their dress. So Tarasius, patriarch of Constantinople (†806), bade his clergy abstain from golden girdles, and from garments bright with silk and purple, prescribing girdles of goats' hair, and tunics decent but not gorgeous (*Life*, c. 14, in Surius, Feb. 25).

The council of Aix, in the year 816 (c. 124), inveighs against personal ornament and splendour of dress in the clergy, and exhorts them to be neither splendid nor slovenly. It seems to be presumed that the proper form of the clerical dress was well known, for nothing is said on this point. It further (c. 25) forbids secular or canonical clerks to wear hoods [CUCULLA], the peculiar distinction of monks. A somewhat later council (*C. Metens.* A.D. 888, c. 6) forbids the clergy to wear the short coats (cottos) and mantles (mantellos) of the laity, and the laity to wear the copes (cappas) of the clergy. Early in the 9th century also, presbyters were enjoined to wear their stoles *always*, as an indication of their priesthood (*Conc. Mogunt.* A.D. 813, c. 28; *Capitularium*, lib. v. c. 146).

We may conclude then, generally, that the clergy wore in civil life, during the first eight centuries of the church, the long tunic which was the dress of decent citizens at the time of the first preaching of Christianity. This was at first generally white [ALB], afterwards of sober colours, though not seldom—in spite of canons—of more brilliant hue. To this was added in early times the dignified toga; afterwards the cappa [COPE; CASULA, p. 294], or pluviale, not then appropriated as a vesture of ministration only. The long tunic, under whatever name, has continued to be the ordinary dress of the clergy to this day, wherever they have worn a peculiar dress.

*Literature.*—Bingham's *Antiquities*, VI. iv.

\* This may mean, however, that Cuthbert as abbot did not assume a dress different from that of his monks.

<sup>b</sup> The word rather suggests a covering for the head; but it is difficult to understand why a man taking a long journey should be excused from wearing a head-covering, while it is easy to imagine that he might not wish to wear a cumbrous cappa or casula in the climate of Italy.



13 ff.; Namachi, *Costumi dei Primitivi Cristiani* (Rome, 1758, 54), and *Origines*, lib. III. c. 7; Thomassin, *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* 1. II. 43 ff.; J. Boileau, *Discurs. Humine Sacri cultus communione more civili tractantibus*; Hainssius, *De Habit. Sacerdot.* (C.)

**DROCTOVEUS**, abbot, disciple of Germanus the bishop; deposition at Paris, March 10 (Mart. Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**DROMIC.** In the Oriental Church churches of the basilica form, i. e. parallelograms, with the length considerably exceeding the breadth, and terminating in a semicircular apse, were called "dromic" (*σπονδαί*), from the similarity of their plan to that of a *σπόδος* or "stadium." The notion of Leo Allatius (*de Tempis Græc. Ecclæ*, Ep. li. § 3), and Suicer (*not. cod. vatic.*, adopted by Bingham, *Origines*, bk. viii. ch. iii. § 1) that they were so styled from having "void spaces for deambulatio" within their roofs on the upper side of the flat ceiling, is quite unfounded. Theod. Zygomalas *apud* Suicer correctly derives the name "dromic" from the form, the length much greater than the breadth, like a "path" or wand: *σπονδαί* ὁρτοὶ ὑψηλοὶ καὶ σπονδαί ὁρτοὶ ὑψηλοὶ Ἀθῶνας. Of this plan was the original church of St. Sophia at Constantinople: τὸ πρῶτον ἱερὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Σοφίας ὁρτοὶ ὑψηλοὶ καὶ σπονδαί ὁρτοὶ (Codex. Orig. Constantinopol. 77) and that of St. Anastasis in the same city: ὁ δὲ ναὸς καὶ ὁρτοὶ ὑψηλοὶ Ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ (Constant. de Admin. Imp. 29). Existing examples of dromic churches in the East are those of St. Demetrius at Thessalonica (Tozer, *Archæol. Byzant.* 137), St. Philip, and the Virgin of the Grand Monastery at Athens (Conchand, pl. 2, 4), and St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, built by Justinian. [E. V.]

**DRUNKENNESS.** Of the prevalence of this vice in the Roman world in the early ages of Christianity it would be needless to speak. That it became peculiarly shameful about the very opening of the Christian era, we infer from Pliny's observation that under Tiberius man first began to drink fasting, *jejunum* (bk. xiv. c. xlviii.). The neighbouring races to the Roman empire were not more temperate than the Romans themselves. To the east, the same Pliny records that the Parthians were great drunkards. Of the Germans, Tacitus says that to drink through a whole day and night was considered no disgrace (*De Mor. Germ.* c. xlii.).

It is not necessary to go here into the denunciations of drunkenness contained both in the Old and New Testament. It will be enough to say that St. Paul expressly includes "drunkards" among those who shall not "inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. vi. 10). Early Church writers follow the same line, as Clement *ad Cor.* *Ep.* l. c. 30; *Apost. Const.* ii. c. 25; v. c. 10; vii. c. 6; and particularly viii. c. 44. The *Apostolical Constitutions* there were against giving relief to gluttons, drunkards, or idlers, as not being fit for the Church (bk. ii. c. 4). Drunken habits were to afford a presumption against a person accused before the Church Courts (ib. ~ 49). The oblations of drunkards were not to be received (bk. iv. c. 6). The true rule of Christian temperance is given in one of the later constitutions (bk. viii. c. 16): "Not that they should not drink, for this is to condemn men

which is made of God for cheerfulness, but that they should not drink to excess." The *Apostolic Canons* in like manner make drunkenness a ground of excommunication from communion for bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, readers or singers, and also for laymen (a. 35, otherwise numbered 41, 42, or 42, 43).

Still the vice flourished, as may be seen for instance from the injunctions of Jerome to Nepotianus "never to smell of wine," since "wine-bibbing priests are both condemned by the apostle and forbidden by the old law" (Ep. 3); or to Eustochium, that "the spouse of Christ should flee wine as poison." In some countries drunkenness was even made an accompaniment of the most solemn services of the Church. Augustine complains (ad Aur. Ep. 72, otherwise 64) that in Africa "revellings and drunkenness are deemed so allowable and lawful that they take place even in honor of the most blessed martyrs," even in the cemeteries [CELLA MEMORIAL], as appears from the sequel to the passage. And so rooted was he consider drunken habits to be in his flock that he advises them to be dealt with gently, rather by teaching than by command, rather by warning than by menace.

For a long time, however, clerical discipline in respect of this vice seems rather to have been enforced, or attempted to be enforced, through the well-known prohibition to clerics to enter taverns. [CAPOVON.] Except in the *Apomati Canon*, the first distinct Church canonism against drunkenness appears to be that of the 1st Council of Tours, 461. "If any one serving God in whatever clerical office shall not abstain from drunkenness according to the order of his estate, let a fitting punishment be awarded to him" (c. 2). In 1vo the same canon appears in an altered form as directed especially against clerical tavern-keepers, who sold wine in their churches, so that where nought should be heard but orisons and the word of God and his praise, these revellings and drunkenness are found. Such excesses are forbidden, and the offending presbyter is ordered to be deposed, offending laymen to be excommunicated and expelled (see also c. 2, of same). No doubt the vice was highly prevalent in France, for a few years later we find the Council of Vannes also enacting that "above all things should drunkenness be avoided by clerics . . . therefore we decree that he who shall be ascertained to have been drunk, as the order suffers, shall be either excluded for thirty days from communion or given over to corporal punishment" (c. 13). The same canon was re-enacted by the Council of Agde in 506 (c. 41). Somewhat later in the century, the *Constitutions* of king Childebert, after ordering the abolishing of certain remains of idolatry, lament the sacrileges committed, when for instance all night long men spend the time in drunkenness, scurrility, and slugging, even in the sacred days of Easter, Christmas, and the other feasts; and enacts for penalty 100 lashes for a sordid person, but for a freeman one strict imprisonment (diocletia incluso) and penance, that at least by bodily torments they may be reduced to sanity of mind. In the East even, at the Council of Constantinople in 536, we find mention of a letter of the clergy of Apamea against one bishop Peter (deposed for

heresy) who used to make drunk persons coming to baptism (see Labbé and Mansi's *Councils*, vol. vii. p. 1104).

The West, however, seems to have been the chief home of gluttony and drunkenness. A canon of the Council of Autun (A.D. 670 or thereabouts) enacted that no priest stuffed with food or crapulous with wine should touch the sacrifice, or presume to say mass, under pain of losing his dignity. In a work of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, *De Remediis Peccatorum* (end of 7th century), it is laid down that a bishop or other ordained person who has the vice of habitual drunkenness must either amend himself or be deposed. The Council of Berkhamstead, in the 5th year of Withraed king of Kent (A.D. 697), enacts that if a priest be so drunk that he cannot fulfil his office, his ministry shall cease at the will of the bishop (c. 7). Gildas (*De Penitentiâ*, c. 7), lays down that if any one through drunkenness cannot sing the psalms, he is to be excluded from communion. Some extracts from a certain "Book of David," supposed, like that of Gildas, to have been received by the Irish Church, make some curious distinctions. A priest drunk through ignorance is to be subject to 13 days' penance; if through negligence, to 40 days; if through contempt [of discipline?], to thrice forty. He who for civility's sake (humanitatis causâ) compels another to get drunk is to do penance as for drunkenness. But he who through the effect of hatred or luxuriousness, that he may shamefully confound or mock others, compels them to get drunk, if he has not sufficiently repented, is to do penance as a killer of souls (c. 1).

Gregory III. (731-41) in his *Excerpts* from the Fathers and the Canons, mentions the habitual drunkenness of a bishop, priest, or deacon as being a ground of deposition, if he do not amend himself (c. 8). An epistle of Boniface himself to Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, read at the Council of Cloveshoe, A.D. 747, bears further testimony to the prevalence of drunkenness in Britain: "It is said also that in your parishes drunkenness is a too common evil, so that not only do the bishops not forbid it, but themselves, drinking too much, become intoxicated, and compel others to become so, offering them larger beakers." And the Canons of the Council bear "that monks and clerics should not follow or desire the evil of drunkenness," but should avoid it; "nor should they compel others to drink immoderately." If they have no infirmity, they should not before the third hour of the day indulge in potations after the manner of drunkards (c. 21). So again the *Penitential* of archbishop Egbert repeats, with slight variation of language, the canon of the Council of Vannes as to the inflicting of 30 days' excommunication or corporal punishment on the cleric proved to have been drunk (bk. ii. c. 9); increasing the punishment to three months on bread and water to the cleric or monk who is given to drunkenness (c. 10). And the canons of the same on "the remedies for sin," reckon among capital crimes habitual drunkenness (c. 5), and impose three years' penance for it (c. 7),—such penance being apparently in addition to the three months' bread and water above referred to. A "faithful" layman making another drunk must do forty days' penance (c. 11). A definition is

given of drunkenness, which is also found elsewhere: "when the state of the mind is changed, and the tongue falters, and the eyes are troubled, and there is dizziness and distension of the belly followed by pains." Clerics guilty of such excess must do 40 days' penance; a rule followed unintelligibly by the enjoining for the same offence of 4 weeks' penance for a deacon or priest, 5 for a bishop, 3 for a "prelate;" the penance to be without wine or flesh-meat (c. 12).

Drunkenness must have been widely spread over the Continent also in the 8th and 9th centuries. The same Boniface in a letter to Pope Zacharias (A.D. 741-51), complains, among other scandals of the contemporary Romish Church, of its drunkard deacons; and the pope in reply only says that he does not allow such deacons to fulfil sacred offices or touch the sacred mysteries. The 3rd canon of the Council of Friuli (A.D. 791) is severe against drunkenness, referring to the passages on the subject in Titus i., Rom. xiii., Eph. v., Luke xxi. The *Capitularies* of Theodulf, archbishop of Orleans, to his clergy (797) enjoin on these both to abstain themselves from drunkenness and to preach to their flocks that they should likewise abstain (i. c. 13); but reckons among minor sins the intoxicating others for the sake of mirth (ii.). The 26th of Charlemagne's *Church Capitularies* (810) directs in like manner the elder clergy to forbear the vice themselves and offer to the younger an example of good sobriety: the first capitulary of 802 contains repeated injunctions against drunkenness among monks (c. 17), nuns (c. 18), and canons (c. 22); the Council of Mayence (812), speaking of drunkenness as "a great evil, whence all vices are bred," directs all to be excommunicated who do not avoid it, until they amend their ways (c. 46); the 2nd Council of Rheims (same year) declares that the bishops and ministers of God should not be too much given to feastings (vinolentiis; c. 18); the Edict of Charlemagne in 814 forbids clerics "nourishing" drunkenness and ordering others to become intoxicated (c. 14). See also the first capitulary of Aix-la-Chapelle of 802, c. 35; a capitulary of 803 (bk. vii. c. 218, and again at greater length, c. 270) repeating at the close the 15th canon of the Council of Vannes, but extending the period of suspension from communion to 40 days; the *Additio Quarta* to the capitularies, c. 46; the 3rd Council of Tours, A.D. 813, c. 48; and the 2nd Council of Chartres (same year), c. 10.

The above canons and rules relate chiefly, though not exclusively, to the clergy, or if to the faithful generally, only in respect to Church discipline. In the Carolingian era, however, civil penalties or disabilities began to be inflicted for drunkenness. In a capitulary of 803, added to the Salic law, it is enacted that no one while drunk may obtain his suit in the mall nor give witness; nor shall the count hold a plea unless before breaking his fast; nor may any one compel another to drink (cc. 15, 16; and see also General Collection, bk. iii. c. 38, and bk. vi. 232-3). The latter injunction is thus developed in a capitulary of 813: "That in the host none do pray his peer or any other man to drink. And whoever in the army shall have been found drunk, shall be so excommunicated that in drinking he use only water till he know himself to have acted evilly" (bk. iii. c. 72). Another

capitulary, relating however to the clergy, enacts that priests who against the canons enter taverns and are not ashamed to minister to smutings and drunkenness, are to be severely coerced (bk. v. c. 325; see also c. 162, which however only pronounces excommunication).

The data for the above statements are taken, except in the first few centuries, exclusively from the legal records of the Church, or those of a period when it was almost identified with the state. They might be abundantly illustrated from contemporary writers, century by century. But they suffice to shew that the vice in question was never absent from the Church nor from its clergy, and that it attained enormous proportions among the latter in our own islands, and in the 8th and 9th centuries on the Continent also. (See also CASPO.) [J. M. L.]

**DRUSUS**, martyr at Antioch, with Zosimus and Theodorus; commemorated Dec. 14 (*Mart. Rom. Vol., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**DUCKS**. It is quite uncertain why this bird is represented in early art, but it occurs repeatedly in the bas-reliefs of the Duomo at Ravenna, on the great piers at the east end, and in the church of St. Giovanni Evangelista in the same place. It is also drawn with great spirit and evident enjoyment by the monk Rabala, who twice indulges in an archivolt pattern of ducks and eggs (Amemant, *Catalog. Bibl. Med. Terr. xviii., xix.*); besides single representations of various species. The bird may have been domesticated in monasteries, &c., and have been a favourite subject of illumination from its pretty colours. It occurs in the Lombard bas-reliefs at Verona. [R. St. J. T.]

**DUEL** (*Duellum*). The notion of deciding a matter in dispute, after ordinary means had failed, by a single combat between the parties or their champions, came into the empire with the Teutonic tribes, who were accustomed to settle by arms their private as well as public disputes.

The earliest formal recognition of the judicial combat as an institution seems to be in the laws of the Burgundians (Canciani, *Leg. Rarior.* iv. 25; A.D. 502), which provide (tit. 43) that a man who declines to clear himself by oath is not to be denied his right of challenge to combat. Afterwards the duel is referred to in many barbarian codes, as *Leges Alemann.* tit. 44, § 1; *Bairar.* tit. 2, c. 2; *Longobard.* lib. i. tit. 9, § 39, &c.

It was only under the formal sanction of a court, and as a kind of appeal to a higher tribunal, that such combats were held to be legal.

The further development of the system, and the canonical precepts relating to it, belong to the Middle Ages (Selden, *The Duells or Single Combat*, 2 Works, vol. 3; Ducange, s. v. *Duellum*). [C.]

**DULA**, martyr at Nicomedia; commemorated March 25 (*Mart. Rom. Vol., Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**DUMB**. The 49th (otherwise 56th) of the Apostolical Canons enacts excommunication against any cleric who should make a mock of the deaf, dumb, or blind. By the 69th (otherwise 77th), the deaf, the dumb, and the blind were excluded from the episcopate, not as defiled, but that the proceedings of the Church should not be hindered.

The incapacity of the dumb to receive the sacraments or accept a penance was the subject of some controversy. A whole work of Fulgentius (*De Reptuente Lethargia*) is devoted to the question of the validity of the baptism of an Ethiopian catechumen after the loss of his voice, and he concluded that it was entitled to the same validity as that of an infant. This view prevailed in the Church. Amongst other canonical authorities, the 1st Council of Orange, A.D. 441, enacted that a person suddenly losing his voice might be baptized or accept a penance, if his previous will thereto could be proved by the witness of others, or his actual will by his nod (c. 12). The 30th canon of the 3rd Council of Arles (452) is to the same effect as regards baptism.

According to one of Ulpian's *Fragmenta* (t. xx.) the dumb could not be a witness, nor make a testament, the reason assigned in the latter case being that he could not pronounce the "words of nuncupation" technically required for the purpose. And by a constitution of Justinian, A.D. 531 (*Code*, bk. vi. tit. xxii. l. 10) deaf-mutes were declared incapable of making a will or codicil, constituting a donation *moris causa*, or conferring a freedom, unless the infirmity should not be congenital, and they should have learned to write before it occurred, in which case they could exercise all these rights by writing under their own hand. The dumb were in all cases allowed to do so by such writing. It was, however, held by the old law that the dumb, as well as the deaf and blind, could lawfully contract marriage, and become subject to dotal obligations (*Dig.* bk. xxiii. tit. iii. l. 73). Deaf-mutes were held excused from civil honours, but not from civic charges (*ibid.* bk. i. tit. ii. l. 7). But the dumb might lawfully decline a guardianship or curatorship (*Code*, bk. v. t. lxxvii.; *Const. of Philip*, A.D. 347). [J. M. L.]

**DUODECIMA**, the twelfth hour, or vespers (*HOURS OF PRAYER*). "Duodecima, quæ dicitur Vespers" (*Regula S. Bened.* c. 34; Martene, *De Rit. Monach.* t. i. c. 6). [C.]

**DÜREN, COUNCILS OF** (*Durinus*), at Düren, near Aix-la-Chapelle; (I.) A.D. 748, under Pipin, a "placitum," which commanded a synod to be held, for restoration of churches, and for the causes of the poor, the widow, and the orphan (*Labb.* vi. 1880); (II.) A.D. 761, a national council under Pipin, in the tenth year of his reign, called by Regino a "synod" (A. 1700); (III.) A.D. 775, under Charlemagne (A. 1621); nothing more is known of these two assemblies; (iv.) A.D. 779, under Charlemagne, of bishops, nobles, and abbots, passed 24 Capitula upon discipline, one of which enforces payment of tithes (A. 1824-1826). [A. W. H.]

**DURIENSE CONCILIUM**. [DÜREN, COUNCILS OF.]

## E

**EAGLE**. It is probably an instance of careful exclusion of all Pagan emblems or forms which had been actual objects of idolatrous worship, while merely Gentile or human tokens and myths were freely admitted, that the form of the eagle appears so rarely in Christian art.

mentation, at least before the time of its adoption as the symbol of an evangelist. [EVANGELISTS.] Aringhi (vol. ii. p. 228, c. 2) speaks of the eagle as representing the Lord Himself; and this is paralleled by a quotation of Martigny's from a sermon of St. Ambrose, where he refers to Ps. ciii. ("Thy youth is renewed like the eagle's") as foreshadowing the resurrection. Leblant (*Inscr. Chrétiennes de la Gaule*, i. 147, 45), in illustration gives a palm between two eagles, and Bottari a plate of a domed ceiling in the sepulchre of St. Priscilla, where two eagles standing on globes form part of the ornamentation. It refers evidently to some buried general or legionary officer (vol. iii. tav. 160). Triumphant chariots fill two of the side spaces, but they and the eagles can hardly be considered Christian emblems, though used by Christians.

[R. St. J. T.]

**EBRULFUS**, abbot and confessor; commemorated Dec. 29 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EARS, TOUCHING OF.** 1. *In Baptism.* As by the influence of the Holy Spirit men's hearts are opened to receive the wondrous things of God's law, so there was a symbolic opening of the ears in the baptismal ceremony (Ambrose, *De Mysteriis*, c. 1; Pseudo-Ambrosius, *De Sacramentis*, i. 1; Petrus Chrysologus, *Sermo* 52; see also the ancient *Expositio Evangeliorum in aurium apertione* in Martene, *De Rit. Ant.*, I. i. 12). Thus in Magnus's directions for the preliminaries of baptism (Martene, u.s. art. 17), drawn up by command of Charles the Great, we read, after the instruction in the Creed: "tanguntur aures et nares de sputo, et dicitur *Effata* [Ephphatha], id est, aperire," in order that the ears may listen to the wholesome teaching of the Christian faith and reject the sophistic pleadings of the devil. Similarly in the ancient baptismal *Ordines* of Gemblours and of Rheims (*ib.* art. 18).

2. *In Holy Communion*, it seems to have been the custom to touch the organs of sense (*αἰσθητήρια*) with the moisture left on the lips after receiving the cup (Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. Myst.* v. 22; see **COMMUNION, HOLY**, p. 413).

[C.]

**EARTHQUAKE.** The great earthquake which befel Constantinople in the year 758 is commemorated Oct. 26 (*Cal. Byzant.*) [C.]

**EAST, PRAYER TOWARDS.** Praying towards the East, as the quarter of the rising sun, the source of light, a natural symbolism common to nearly all religions, was adopted by the Christian church from its commencement, in accordance with the very wise rule which accepted all that was good and pure in the religious systems it came to supplant, breathing into the old ceremonies a new and higher life. One of the earliest testimonies to the prevalence of this custom among Christians is that of Tertullian, c. 205 (*Apolo.* c. xvi.; *cont. Valentin.* c. iii.), who refers to the suspicions entertained by the heathen that Christians were sun worshippers "because they were well known to turn to the East in prayer," being "lovers of the radiant East, that figure of Christ." The *Apostolical Constitutions* also direct that the whole congregation "rise up with one consent, and looking to the east, pray to God

eastward" (lib. ii. § vii. c. 57). The same rule is mentioned by Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromata*, vii. 7), who says that "prayers are made looking towards the sunrise in the east." Basil, c. 374, testifies to the universality of the custom (*De Sp. Sanct.* c. 27), and Augustine speaks of it as a general usage (*De Serm. in Monte*, lib. ii. c. 5). To take one later instance out of many, Joannes Moschus, c. 600, records an anecdote of a certain abbot Zacchaeus of Jerusalem, who, when praying, "turned to the east and remained about two hours, without speaking, his arms stretched out to heaven" (*Prat. Spirit.* § 102). The chapter of Joannes Damascenus (*De Orthodox. Fid.* iv. 13) "concerning worshipping to the east," proves the prevalence of the custom.

The true reason for this custom is doubtless that already alluded to, that, to adopt the language of Clemens Alex., "the east is the image of the day of birth. For as the light which there first shone out of darkness waxes brighter, so, like the sun, the day of the knowledge of truth has dawned on those immersed in darkness" (Clem. Alex. u.s.) In close connection with this is the reference to Christ as the "Day-spring from on high," the *ἀνατολή*, the "Light of the World," which the early writers delight to recognise (Chrys. *Homil. in Zach.* vi. 12). Other reasons for, or more properly speaking, deductions from the practice, are given by other writers, one of the most frequent and beautiful of which is that in praying to the east the soul is seeking and sighing for its old home in Paradise, to which it hopes to be restored in Christ, the second Adam (Basil *De Sp. Sanct.* u.s., *Const. Apost.*, u.s.; Greg. Nyss. *Homil. V. de Orat. Domin.*; Chrys. *ad Daniel.* vi. 10; Gregentius *Disputat. cum Herb. Jud.* p. 217). Another cause assigned is that Christ when on the cross looked towards the west, so that in praying to the east we are looking towards Him (Joan. Damasc. u.s., Cassiod. *ad Ps.* lxxvii.), and that as He appeared in the east, and thence ascended into heaven, so He will there appear again at the last day, the coming of the Son of Man being like "the lightning that cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west" (Matt. xxiv. 27), so that in prayer Christians are looking for their Lord's return (Hilar. in *Ps.* lxxvii.). We learn from St. Cyril of Jerusalem and others that the Catechumen at Baptism turned from the west, the place of darkness, to the east, the home of light, and to the site of Paradise which by that sacrament was reopened to him (Cyril *Catech.* xix. 9; Hieron. in *Amos.* vi. 14; Ambros. *De Initiat.* c. 2; Lactant. lib. ii. c. 10; Pseudo Justin. *Quest. ad Orthodox.* 118). (Bona *De Divin. Psalm.* c. vi. § 2; Bingham *Orig.* xi. 7. 4; xiii. 8. 15.) [E. V.]

**EASTER-EVE.** [**EASTER, CEREMONIES OF.**]

**EASTER.** The Teutonic name of the church feast of our Lord's resurrection (A.-S. *eastre*, Germ. *ostern*). Bede (*De Temp. Rat.* c. xv. *De mensibus Anglorum*), gives as the name of the fourth month, answering nearly to April, *Eostur-monath*, and adds: "*Eostur-monath*, qui nunc *Paschalis mensis* interpretatur, quondam a *Dea* illorum quae *Eostre* vocabatur, et cui in illo festa celebrabant, nomen habuit: a cuius nomine nunc *Paschale* tempus cognominant, consuetudo



antiquae observationis vocabulo gaudia novae solennitatis vocantes."

The name of the festival in the Romance languages (Ital. *Pasqua*, Fr. *Pâques*), like the Latin *Pascha*, takes us back at once to the historic origin of the festival in the passover. In N. T. τὸ πάσχα, though in A. V. once (Acts xii. 4) translated "Easter," refers either to the Jews' passover, or (1 Cor. v. 7) to our Lord as its anti-type. The word πάσχα represents the Hebrew פֶּסַח. See Ex. xii. Thus the history of Easter of necessity starts from the passover.

The passover was kept on the 14th day of the month originally called Abib (Ex. xiii. 4), afterwards Nisan (Neh. ii. 1; Esth. iii. 7), which month was to be the first month of the year. On the 16th Nisan, a sheaf (or rather handful) of the new barley was presented before the Lord, as the firstfruits of the harvest (Lev. xxiii. 10; Joseph. *Ant.* iii. x. v.).

The above observance led, as a most important consequence, to the fixity of the seasons (considered in the average) in the Jewish year. It may be taken as established that the Jewish year was luni-solar, of twelve lunar months, which we may say, in general terms, consisted by turns of twenty-nine days and of thirty, with an occasional 13th intercalary month, by which a correspondence was kept up with the length of the solar year: and for the proper time of intercalating this month, it was only necessary to consider, at the time of the commencement of the month Nisan, whether the barley would be sufficiently ripe in sixteen days for the observance of the rite of the firstfruits, and if not, to intercalate a month, and thus postpone the ceremony. In this way, the seasons would continually be brought back to the same point.

Having regard to the astronomical element in later controversies, we now offer some further account of the astronomical data affecting the passover.

1. The relation of the passover to the moon. The night following the 14th Nisan was no doubt intended to be and usually was that of the full moon. We hear indeed in the institution of the passover, not of the full moon, but of the 14th day of the moon, and in the early church controversies as well as in the modern rule settled by Clavius, everything still depends technically upon the "14th day of the moon." But Philo tells us (*Vit. Mosis*, iii. 686) that the passover is celebrated, μέλλοντος τοῦ σεληνιακοῦ κύκλου γίνεσθαι πλησιφαοῦς, and again (*de Sept. et Fest.* 1191), that it was so fixed that there might be no darkness on that day; and again, "That not only by day but also by night, the world may be full of all-beauteous light, inasmuch as sun and moon on that day succeed each other with no interval of darkness between." This last statement is extremely significant, and together with the lunar date, the 14th, very clearly marks the point of time. The first day of the moon means, in pre-astronomical times, not the day of the conjunction of the sun and moon, but the day on the evening of which the new moon first becomes visible as a thin streak of light to the left of the sun, just after sunset. This is possible in a fine climate, some eighteen hours after conjunction: if less time had elapsed, the first visible phase would be on the next day. Now an average synodic period of the moon, or

lunation, is 29 d. 12 h. 44 m., and therefore the average interval between conjunction and full moon is 14 d. 18 h. 22 m. Taking the average length of phase and of interval, we should be brought for full moon to sunrise on the 15th day of the moon (inclusive), which would make the night succeeding the 14th day (inclusive) the night of full moon. Since the half-lunation may be prolonged or shortened in rare cases about twenty hours, and the length of phase is also variable, some exceptions must be allowed for, but the general correctness of the rule is apparent, and also that the night of the 14th will more frequently precede the full moon than follow it; in other words, the moon would rise a little before sunset, instead of rising, as it might do in the contrary case (a day later), nearly an hour after sunset. Thus Philo's statement that there was no interval of darkness, a fact of a nature to catch the attention, and about which there could be no mistake, leads us to believe that by calculating the time of full moon from the astronomical tables, we may assign the 15th Nisan with certainty in many cases, and with a high degree of probability in others. In some cases where it appears difficult to decide between two successive days, an examination of the time of the preceding new moon will help, though it will not always suffice, to remove the doubt.

2. We have next to notice the relation of the passover to the sun. This relation is apparent from the regulations as to the firstfruits on 16th Nisan. The season of the year depends on the equinox, and the general statement is that barley ears can be procured in a fitting state at or soon after the vernal equinox. But this relation is not a mere matter of inference. Josephus writes (*Ant.* iii. x. 5): "In the month of Xanthicus, which is by us called Nisan, and is the beginning of our year, on the 14th day of the lunar month, when the sun is in Aries . . . the law ordained that we should in every year slay that sacrifice . . . called the passover." And Philo (*Vita Mos.* iii.): "Τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἐαρινῆς ἰσημερίας πρῶτον ἀναγράφει μῆνα Μωϋσῆς ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἐνιαυτῶν περιόδοις."

The first month of the Jewish year was then (as the best authorities hold), that month which contained the vernal equinox, although the beginning of the month might precede it. The Jews apparently had no rule about not keeping the passover before the equinox; at least if we may believe Epiphanius (*Haeres.* lxx. 11), and a definite instance given by St. Ambrose, A.D. 387, of the Jewish passover on Mar. 20 (*Ad Aemil. Episc.* 83). Moreover it is stated that the anterior limit of the Latins for the 14th of the moon, viz. Mar. 18, was derived from the Jews.

In after times, probably from the time of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, 247-264, it became one of the sharpest points of controversy: ὅτι μὴ ἄλλοτε ἢ μετὰ τὴν ἐαρινὴν ἰσημερίαν προσήκει Πάσχα εὐρτην ἐπιτελεῖν (*Eus. H. E.* vii. 15).

Although, however, the time of the equinox became a point of critical discussion in after times, there was so little general knowledge of its true position, that very strange mistakes were made respecting it. The correct knowledge of the equinox was in fact nearly confined to the Alexandrian astronomers, and there are several misapprehensions which still prevail, as, for

instance, that it was originally on the 25th March, which was true indeed of the *mean* vernal equinox, but never of the true vernal equinox. This misconception is probably due to the fact that the 25th of March was marked as the vernal equinox in the calendar of Julius Caesar, according to the testimony of Varro, Pliny, and Columella. We have thought it worth while to calculate, for the purpose of this article, and now to state, the principal positions of the vernal equinox (true) since the Julian era.

*Dates of (true) Vernal Equinox for the Meridian of Alexandria.*

B.C. 45. Mar. 23 (civil) 4<sup>h</sup> 34<sup>m</sup> A.M.

Range from Leap-year to Leap-year.

*Earlier Limit.* B.C. 45. Mar. 23 (civil) 4<sup>h</sup> 34<sup>m</sup> A.M.

*Later Limit.* B.C. 42. Mar. 23, 10<sup>h</sup> 1<sup>m</sup> P.M.

A.D. 29. Mar. 22. 9<sup>h</sup> 18<sup>m</sup> P.M.

Range from Leap-year to Leap-year.

*Earlier Limit.* A.D. 28. Mar. 22. 3<sup>h</sup> 29<sup>m</sup> P.M.

*Later Limit.* A.D. 31. Mar. 23 (civil) 8<sup>h</sup> 55<sup>m</sup> A.M.

A.D. 325. Mar. 20. 2<sup>h</sup> 17<sup>m</sup> P.M.

Range from Leap-year to Leap-year.

*Earlier Limit.* A.D. 324. Mar. 20 (civil) 8<sup>h</sup> 28<sup>m</sup> A.M.

*Later Limit.* A.D. 327. Mar. 21 (civil) 1<sup>h</sup> 54<sup>m</sup> A.M.

Clavius, misled by the tables which he used (*Tabulae Nicolai Copernici, sive Prutenicae*) placed the Vernal Equinox at the Nicene Council, A.D. 325, or March 21st, 6<sup>h</sup> P.M. nearly 28 hours too late (*Op. tom. v. p. 72*). The 20th and 21st are the very days to which the equinox was brought back at the Gregorian correction of 1582, when it stood at Mar. 11th (civil) 2<sup>h</sup> 10<sup>m</sup> A.M., the earlier limit being Mar. 10th, 2<sup>h</sup> 32<sup>m</sup> P.M., and the later Mar. 11th (civil) 8<sup>h</sup> A.M.

The connection of the passover with Easter is through that particular passover at which our Lord suffered, but so few are the chronological details in the gospels, that it is impossible to fix with absolute certainty either the year or the day of the year, or perhaps even of the month on which our Lord suffered. The full investigation of the subject would be beyond the scope of this article.

The points which are beyond doubt are these:

I. Our Lord's death took place under the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate: that is to say, between the limits A.D. 28 and A.D. 33 inclusive.

II. It took place at the passover.

III. All the gospels agree that it took place on the *παρασκευή*, that is, on a Friday. In St. John (xix. 14), the *παρασκευή τοῦ πάσχα* probably means (like *πρωτομυστία* in the *Chronicon Paschale* i. 15) the day before the 15th Nisan, which was in a double sense that year a Sabbath (John xix. 31), but the word was in common use to designate the eve before the Sabbath, and came afterwards to mean simply "Friday."

Astronomy, while furnishing valuable suggestions on this important subject, is not competent to decide absolutely, either for the particular year, or between the advocates of the 14th and of the 15th Nisan.

The history of the paschal observance in the apostolic and early post-apostolic times is extremely obscure, and has been very variously represented. There is no evidence in the New Testament that it existed at first as an institution. The ecclesiastical historian Socrates is no

doubt right when he says (v. 22): "The Saviour and His apostles have enjoined us by no law to keep this feast . . . . The apostles had no thought of appointing festival days, but of promoting a life of blamelessness and piety. And it seems to me that the feast of Easter has been introduced into the Church from some old usage, just as many other customs have been established." It appears (from Acts xviii. 21; xx. 6, 16) that the Jewish Christians and even St. Paul still observed the Jewish feasts, and there can be no doubt that the memory of the Lord's death would be with them the main thought of the passover-night, and would gradually supersede for them all other associations. On the other hand, the passover meal had no place amongst the habits of the Christians of Gentile descent, and their anniversary naturally attached itself to the first day of the week, which was observed both by Jewish and Gentile Christians as the weekly festival of the Lord's resurrection. When the time of the passover came round, the first day of the week seemed to be the actual day of the resurrection, and this day, taken together with the preceding Friday, as the day of the crucifixion, seemed the proper representations of the great act of our redemption. Amongst the Gentile Christians these institutions, with their accompanying rules of fasting, &c., were apparently very gradually developed, and the conflict between the two usages was slow in coming. When it came, we find the cardinal point to be the *τῆρεῖν* (with the Asiatic Christians), or the *μὴ τῆρεῖν* (with the Westerns), the 14th of the moon (Nisan), and afterwards along with this, and connected with it, the correct determination of the 14th of the moon. The point insisted on most emphatically by the Alexandrians (whom the Westerns followed), was, that it must not precede the equinox.

When the Western view ultimately prevailed in the church, those who obstinately persevered in the Asiatic custom, and were condemned as heretics, were called Quartodecimans, and it is usual and convenient to give the same name by anticipation to those who observed the 14th day of the moon in the earlier controversy.

The chief information we have is derived from Eusebius, from several passages of Epiphanius, treating in his work on all heresies of certain Quartodeciman sects, and from several fragments preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale*, a work of about 630 A.D.

The following conclusions of Bucherius from a passage in Epiphanius (*Haer. lxx.*), will express the probable course of events. "From this I gather three things: First, that so long at least as the first fifteen bishops of Jerusalem (those of Jewish descent) continued, the pascha was celebrated everywhere by all Christians, or by a great majority of them, according to the lunar computation and method of the Jews. But they continued until the year 136 A.D., or to the end of the reign of the emperor Hadrian, when Mark was first taken from the Gentiles to be bishop. (Euseb. v. xii.) Secondly, that then began a time of dissension, as Epiphanius a little before more plainly testifies (see below). Thirdly, that a more general method then came in, whether the eighty-four years cycle, or the octaëteris (amended), otherwise that reproach was unmeaning which the Audiani launched against the

orthodox—that they had departed from the ancient custom,” &c. We subjoin the earlier part of the chapter which is here alluded to.

“For even from the earliest times various controversies and dissensions were in the church concerning this solemnity, which used yearly to bring laughter and mockery. For some, in a certain ardour of contention, began it before the week, some after the week, some at the beginning, some in the middle, some at the end. To say in a word, there was a wonderful and laborious confusion. Nor is it unknown to learned men, how often, at the various times of this feast, there have arisen from the observance of a different ecclesiastical discipline, tumults and contentions, especially in the time of Polycarp and Victor, when the Easterns and Westerns would receive no mutual letters of peace. Which also happened in other times, as in that of Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, and Crescentius, how they wrote against each other and bitterly fought. Which disputes began to be agitated from the very times of the bishops who had been converted to Christ from the circumcision and from the sect of the Jews, even to our own times, on which account those who had gathered from all sides to the Nicene council, the matter having been accurately known, with common agreement from all, and with fitting computation and calculation of times, order it to be kept.”

Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 24) gives in a letter of Irenaeus the following account, relating to the events about A.D. 160:

“When the blessed Polycarp was at Rome in the time of Anicetus, and they had also some little difference of opinion with regard to other points, they immediately came to a peaceable understanding respecting this one, for they had no love for mutual disputes. For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe (*μὴ τηρεῖν*, i.e. the 14th Nisan) inasmuch as he had always observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and the other apostles with whom he had associated; nor could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe (*τηρεῖν*) for he said that he ought to follow the custom of the presbyters before him.”

Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna in Asia Minor, and there can be no doubt that he expressed in these words the custom of the Asiatic churches, which was *τηρεῖν*, whilst that of the Western was *μὴ τηρεῖν*. That we ought to supply after *τηρεῖν*, the 14th Nisan, we learn from c. 23 (referring to about A.D. 190).

“There was a considerable discussion raised about this time, in consequence of a difference of opinion respecting the observance of the paschal season. The churches of all Asia, guided by ancient tradition, thought that they were bound to keep the 14th day of the moon, on the occasion of the feast of the Saviour’s passover, that day on which the Jews had been commanded to kill the paschal lamb, it being necessary for them by all means to regulate the close of the fast by that day, on whatever day of the week it might happen to fall; while it was the custom of all the churches of all the rest of the world, which observed in this respect an apostolic tradition that has prevailed down to our own time, not to celebrate it in this manner, it being proper to close the fast on no other day than that of the resurrection of our Lord.”

“The bishops, however, of Asia” (he continues

in the 24th chap.) “persevering in observing the custom handed down to them from their fathers, were headed by Polycrates. He, indeed, had also set forth the tradition handed down to them, in a letter which he addressed to Victor and the church of Rome. ‘We,’ said he, ‘therefore observe the genuine day: neither adding thereto, nor taking therefrom. For in Asia great lights have fallen asleep, which shall rise again in the day of the Lord’s appearing . . . . All these observed the 14th day of the passover according to the gospel, deviating in no respect, but following the rule of faith; so also do I, Polycrates, who am the least of all of you, according to the tradition of my relatives, some of whom I have followed. For there were seven of my relatives bishops, and I am the eighth; and my relatives always observed the day when the people (i.e. the Jews) threw away the leaven.’”

“Upon this, Victor, the bishop of the church of Rome, forthwith endeavoured to cut off the churches of all Asia, together with the neighbouring churches, as heterodox, from the common unity. And he publishes abroad by letters, and proclaims that all the brethren there are wholly excommunicated.”

Many bishops, however, remonstrated, amongst others Irenaeus, who wrote an epistle, in which he maintains the duty of celebrating the mystery of the resurrection of our Lord, only on the day of the Lord; but admonishes Victor not to cut off whole churches of God, who observed the tradition of an ancient custom.

In chap. xxv. Eusebius explains that the bishops of Palestine agreed with the decree, and stated that they observed the same day with the church of Alexandria, an important point, for Alexandria is to be looked on, along with the churches of Rome and Asia Minor, as the third, and ultimately the most important, influence in regulating Easter.

Considering how much has been written respecting the Asia Minor controversies in modern times, it is material to observe that the statements of Eusebius and the whole course of the controversy, leave no doubt of the observance of the 14th day of the moon. No other day comes into consideration. Thus the facts are settled; to judge of the motives from which the day was kept is, however, more difficult. Various reasons might easily be alleged for the observance of this day: those who thought that our Lord died on the 14th Nisan, might keep it (as we believe) as the anniversary of our Lord’s death, or even if they desired to keep the anniversary of the last supper, knowing that that supper, which was by intention a passover, was only anticipated in point of time by necessity, might revert to its legal time of celebration, whilst those who thought that our Lord died on the 15th Nisan, might yet keep the 14th (as Baur and Hilgenfeld allege) in memory of the supper.

That St. John found at Ephesus a festival on the 14th and joined in it, and gave it the weight of his authority, in no way militates, then, against his authorship of the gospel, that fixes the 14th Nisan for the crucifixion, even though it were true that the other chronology had originally prevailed there.

The argument of Baur, and all the members of the Tübingen school, is as follows:—The Asiatics celebrated the 14th Nisan by an ad-

ministration of the Lord's supper, in commemoration of the passover which Jesus had on that same day, immediately before his death, eaten with his disciples. The Asiatic church, therefore, believed that Jesus ate on the evening of the 14th, and that he died on the 15th, and it believed this, according to unimpeachable testimony, on the authority of the apostle John. But now, what says the 4th gospel? According to it, the celebration of the last supper by our Lord took place, not upon the 14th Nisan, but upon the evening of the day previous, the 13th, while Jesus dies upon the cross upon the 14th, and therefore before the passover of the law could have been partaken of. The conclusion is obvious. The apostle who is the great authority for the Asiatic, cannot possibly be the author of the gospel, which speaks unmistakeably for the western practice.

There is a simplicity and coherence in the Tübingen theory, as expanded at length in Hilgenfeld's *Paschastreit der alten Kirche*, which gives it a very strong hold upon the mind. But it rests upon more than one untenable assumption. Thus it assumes that the Asiatic Christians kept the 14th evening as the anniversary of the last supper. There is not, however, any hint of this in the most important narratives of the controversy, and the plain natural view is that the 14th Nisan was observed in Asia by fasting in memory of the death of Jesus; while a communion feast in the evening commemorated a completed redemption. The fact of the fasting, to which both Irenaeus and Eusebius bear witness, is of itself a testimony that it was the solemn memory of the death of our Lord that was observed. Fasting in anticipation of the eucharist, belongs altogether to a later period, as is truly observed in Steitz's article in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*. [COMMUNION, HOLY, p. 417.]

Between these controversies, that of Anicetus and Polycarp (about 160 A.D.), and that of Victor and Polycrates (190 A.D.), there occurred another in Laodicea (between 170 A.D. and 177 A.D.), which has become of late the very turning-point of the whole discussion, but about which Eusebius affords us no further information than what follows (*H. E.* iv. 26). "Of Melito, there are the two works on the passover . . . . In the works on the passover he shews the time in which he wrote it, beginning with these words:—'When Servilius Paulus was proconsul of Asia, at which time Sagaris suffered martyrdom, there was much discussion in Laodicea respecting the passover, which occurred at that time in its proper season, and in which also these works were written.' This work is also mentioned by Clement of Alexandria, in his own work on the passover, which, he says, he wrote on occasion of Melito's work (*ἐξ αἰτίας τῆς τοῦ Μελιτωνος γράφης*)."

But with this dispute are connected, probably rightly, the two following fragments of Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, given in the *Chronicon Paschale*:

1. "There are some who now, through ignorance, love to raise controversy about these things, being guilty in this of a pardonable offence, for ignorance does not so much deserve blame as need instruction. And they say that on the 14th the Lord ate the lamb with his disciples, but that He himself suffered on the

great day of unleavened bread; and they interpret Matthew as favouring their view, from which it appears that their sentiments are not in harmony with the law, and that the gospels seem, according to them, to be at variance."

Again, "The 14th is the true passover of the Lord, the great sacrifice, instead of the lamb the Son of God, . . . . who was lifted up upon the horns of the unicorn, and was pierced in his sacred side, who shed out of his side the two cleansing elements, water and blood, word and spirit, and who was buried on the day of the passover, the stone having been placed upon his tomb."

We know very little of Apollinaris. Eusebius tells us that he was the author of an *Apology for the Christians*, addressed to the emperor, and that he was an eloquent writer against the Phrygian, Cataphrygian, and other Montanists, and wrote two works against the Jews: but we are left to conjecture who those opponents were against whom he was arguing in the work from which these fragments are taken.

With these fragments are associated quotations from Hippolytus and Clement of Alexandria:—

"Hippolytus, the witness of religion, who was bishop of the so-called Portus, near Rome, has written literally thus in his *Treatise against all the Heresies*: 'I therefore see that there is a contentiousness in this affair. For he (*i.e.* the adversary, the Quarto-deciman) says thus: Christ celebrated the passover on that very day, and suffered: I therefore must also do as the Lord did.' But he is wrong from not knowing that, when Christ suffered, he did not eat the passover according to the law. For He was the passover that had been foretold, and which was accomplished on the day appointed."

And again the same (Hippolytus) says in the *Treatise on the Passover*: "He did not eat the passover, but he suffered (*i.e.* as the passover) οὐκ ἔφαγεν, ἀλλ' ἔπαθεν."

Another passage from Clement of Alexandria, in his work concerning the passover: "In the preceding years then the Lord keeping the passover ate that which was slain by the Jews: but when he proclaimed himself to be the passover, the Lamb of God, led as a sheep to the slaughter, immediately he taught his disciples the mystery of the type on the 13th, on which also they ask of him, Where wilt thou that we make ready to eat the passover, . . . . but the Saviour suffered on the next day, being himself the passover . . . ." See also *Philosophumena*, 274—5.

These fragments are given because they offer almost the entire evidence on which we have to fix the place of the Laodicean interlude. Hilgenfeld views Apollinaris as a representative of the West, through whom Western influence has gained a footing in the heart of Asia. His opponent is directly Melito, but Melito as the representative of the whole body of Asiatic Christians.

Now that Apollinaris is in the greatest harmony with the Roman and Alexandrian writers whose fragments are associated with him in the *Chronicon Paschale*, is manifest: there is great probability also in the conjecture that he, like Clement, wrote on the occasion of Melito's work, and the absence of his name from the list of Polycrates suggests some discordance between his views and those of Polycrates. But he writes against certain persons who are creating a disturbance, not against the quietly existing



ancient custom, nearly universal around him: he seems to observe the 14th himself, and when we notice the characteristics of his writings as directed against the Phrygians, Cataphrygians, and other Montanists, and against the Jews (Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 27), we may see ground for suspecting that his real antagonist was such a man as Blastus (perhaps the very man) who, about 180, carried Montanism from Asia Minor to Rome and there provoked the opposition of the church, which is extremely likely to have stirred up Victor's crusade against the customs of Asia Minor. We know that Hippolytus, as well as Irenaeus, wrote against Blastus, and although Melito's work may have occasioned that of Apollinaris, Eusebius would hardly have noticed them together, as he does, as fellow-helpers in the church, if they occupied so marked an antagonistic position as has been supposed.

We have already seen from Epiphanius that a diversity of usages continued to prevail until the Nicene council. At that council the Western usage may be said to have established its victory, and those who still persisted in the Asiatic practice fell into the position of heretics. We find in the letter of the emperor Constantine to the churches after that council (Socr. *H. E.* i. 9): "There also the question having been considered relative to the most holy day of Easter, it was determined by common consent that it would be proper that all should celebrate it on one and the same day everywhere." Also that "it seemed very unsuitable in the celebration of this sacred feast, that we should follow the custom of the Jews," . . . who, labouring under a judicial blindness, "even in this particular do not perceive the truth, so that they, constantly erring in the utmost degree, celebrate the feast of passover a second time in the same year." This of course refers to the error of celebrating before the equinox. "Consider how grievous and indecorous it is, that on the same days some should be observant of fasts, while others are celebrating feasts; and especially that this should be the case on the days immediately after Easter. On this account, therefore, Divine Providence directed that an appropriate correction should be effected, and uniformity of practice established, as I suppose you are all aware." (This refers to the determination of the equinox, which was settled to be on the 21st March, although, as we have shown above, the 20th was the proper day, as it only happened once in four years on the 21st, and then at 2 A.M.) "And since the order is a becoming one, which is observed by all the churches of the western, southern, and northern parts, and by some also in the eastern: from these considerations all have on the present occasion thought it to be expedient, and I pledged myself that it would be satisfactory to your prudent penetration, that what is observed with such general unanimity of sentiment in the city of Rome, throughout Italy, Africa, all Egypt, Spain, France, Britain, Libya, the whole of Greece, and the dioceses of Asia, Pontus and Cilicia, your intelligence would also concur in." The epistle of the synod to the church of Alexandria speaks in the like terms (see Socr. i. 9): "We have also gratifying intelligence to communicate to you relative to unity of judgment on the subject of the most holy feast of Easter: for this point also has been

happily settled through your prayers; so that all the brethren in the East who have heretofore kept this festival when the Jews did, will henceforth conform to the Romans and to us, and to all who from the earliest time have observed our period of celebrating Easter." (See also Euseb. *Life of Constantine.*)

It is to be noted that no rule is here given for determining Easter; the churches are referred to the ancient rule of the West.

It has been often stated that the council established a particular cycle, that of nineteen years, but this is a mistake.

Epiphanius mentions three different sets of so-called heretics, who persisted in the Quarto-deciman usage, viz. the Audiani (*Hæres.* lxx.), the Alogi (li.), and the Quarto-decimans (l.), the last being orthodox in all respects except this.

It is unnecessary to follow out further the history of the decline of the Quarto-decimans.

We must now give some brief account of what is known respecting the various astronomical cycles employed for the determination of Easter.

The use of cycles was very familiar to the ancient astronomers. It arose out of the necessity, when lunar months were in use (as at Athens) of linking together in some manner the changes of the moon and the sun. They all rested upon the mean motions of the moon, which was not only all that could be exactly calculated in the state of their astronomical knowledge, but which is in fact all that can be used with advantage for the arrangement of ceremonies and festival-days. The object was to find a period which should contain an exact number of lunations and also of tropical years—the former consisting of 29 d. 5305887 or 29 d. 12 h. 44 m. 2s. 865.

1. The most ancient cycle was the Octaëteris, or cycle of 8 years. It depends on the fact, that 8 tropical years are nearly equal to 99 lunations. The 99 months contained 2922 days, three of the 8 years having embolisms or intercalary months, as follows. The first year of the period seems to have been variously taken: I. being the arrangement given by Geminus; II. by Epiphanius; whilst III. is that adopted in Scaliger's account of this cycle, the letter E denoting the embolism.

I.								II.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		E		E			E			E		E		E	

III.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
E		E				E	

The months were full (30 days) and hollow (29) by turns, except the intercalary, which were always full. This is exactly 8 years of 365½ days. But neither the lunation nor the year is here taken at its true value, and the 8 years really fall short of 99 lunations by 1 d. 14 h. 10 m.—an error which would soon accumulate and make the cycle useless.

Cleostratus, Eratosthenes, and others made various changes for the correction of this cycle, which still however remained imperfect.

2. A great improvement upon this was the

cycle of 19 years ascribed by Geminus to Euctemon, but generally to Meton, about 432 B.C. This rests on the extremely close relation between the length of 19 years and 235 lunations, since

$$\begin{aligned} 19 \text{ years} &= 6939 \cdot 60256 \text{ days,} \\ 235 \text{ lunat.} &= 6939 \cdot 688348 \text{ days,} \end{aligned}$$

a difference of about 2 h. 3 m. The actual arrangement was that out of 235 months 110 were nollow, making 6940 days, being in excess of 235 lunations by  $7\frac{1}{2}$  hours. In the course of 4 Metonic periods the accumulation of errors would be 30 hours, and accordingly Calippus proposed then to leave out 1 more day. There was then an excess of 6 h. only in 76 years or of 1 day in 310 years. This period of 76 years is called the Calippic period.

The first Paschal cycle in use seems to have been the Octaëteris. Epiphanius refers to it (*Haer.* lxx.), and appeals to it in his argument with the Audiani in such a manner as to imply that they were right in holding this to be the ancient church cycle: on which account he would rather rest his argument upon it than upon the superior cycle of 19 years, which must have been familiar to him. Eusebius also mentions (vii. 20) that Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, in one of his Paschal letters gives a canon for 8 years, seeming to imply the use of the Octaëteris (about 250 A.D.).

The Paschal cycle of 112 years of St. Hippolytus attained some celebrity and was inscribed on the chair of his statue, discovered at Rome in 1551, and now in the Vatican. It was based on a double Octaëteris of 16 years, repeated 7 times: St. Hippolytus having observed that by using 16 years, instead of 8, the week-days recurred in succession, though in their natural order reversed. It extends from A.D. 222 to A.D. 333, and was evidently constructed about 222 A.D. and was based upon the period of years 215 to 222 A.D. for which period it is correct. Beyond this its defective nature soon appears, and after another period it would be found to be worthless. It may be seen in Fabricius's *Hippolytus*. See also Ideler, ii. 222, and *Ordo Saeculorum*, p. 477.

The Paschal canon of St. Cyprian, called the *Computus Paschalis*, which is extant, but without the table, was a repeat of St. Hippolytus, with a new start from A.D. 242, based on the 16 years from 228 to 243.

3. When the Western church discovered the defective nature of the Octaëteris, they took up or perhaps returned to a cycle of 84 years, which was employed by, according to Epiphanius and Cyril's Prologue in Bucherius, the Jews (perhaps after the fall of Jerusalem), then probably by some Quarto-decimans, and also by some Latins, for Cyril in his Prologue implies that the 84 years cycle was forsaken for that of Hippolytus, saying, "pejus aliquid addiderunt."

The 84 years cycle may be regarded as consisting of a Calippic period of 76 years (with the correction of 1 day) and a single Octaëteris: and as their errors are in opposite directions, it has a less error in 84 years than the Octaëteris had in 8. Both Epiphanius and Cyril ascribe it to the Jews, and the fact that, 84 being a multiple of 7, the Calendar moons would recur on the same days of the week in each period, would doubtless give it a value in their eyes. However

this may be, it became undoubtedly the great cycle of the Latin church, for more than two centuries, till it was superseded by the cycle of Victorius of 532 years, published in the year 457. An 84-year Easter-table of the Latin church may be seen in Ideler, ii. 249, constructed from a "Fasti Consulares," discovered by Cardinal Noris, and beginning with the year 298. Muratori published another in his *Anecdota ex Ambrosianae Bibliothecae Codicibus*. In both these it appears that the Epacts and week-days of the 1st January were employed for the determination of Easter. Bucherius also gives 'The Latin or Prosper's cycle of 84 Years,' beginning at 382. Since 84 Julian years contain 30681 days, and 1039 lunations 30682 d. 6 h. 48 m., the 84-year cycle gives at its conclusion the new moon 30 hours too early.

It may be right here to mention the fact that Epiphanius, believing that the Jews had this 84 years cycle at the time of our Saviour's crucifixion (for which there is no evidence in Jewish writers), argues at length (*Haer.* li.) that, this cycle being shorter than the moon's true cycle (he means probably the Alexandrian) the Jews anticipated the proper time of the passover by two days in the year of the Passion, and Bucherius believes that he is in the main right, and reasons quite correctly from his premisses that, if the Alexandrian cycle and 84-year cycle started together B.C. 161, the latter was 3 days in advance of the moon and the former 1 day. And Bucherius holds, in agreement with Petavius, that there was a division amongst the Jews as to these two calculations, the Pharisees and priests keeping the passover one day later than our Lord and his disciples and a great part of the nation.

There is, however, a great fallacy in these calculations. The cycles give, of necessity, not the true moon of the heavens, but the mean moon, and it does not at all follow that, because on the whole they give a good representation of the mean moon, that therefore they give the true mean moon in any particular year. On the contrary, they all go by fits and starts, according as the embolism has just taken place or not; and it requires not a general calculation, but an exact knowledge of the state of the cycle, starting from some absolutely certain date, before we can argue with any certainty from such cycles. We have above expressed the belief that the Jews, having been for many centuries accustomed to the feasts of the New Moon, did not allow any cycle to carry them away from a close adherence to the actual phase of the moon. And we may add that having examined the three best attested dates—that of the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey, B.C. 64, on the day of the Fast (10 Tisri) according to Josephus, and according to Dion Cassius, on a Sabbath; the setting of the Temple on fire, the 9th Ab or Lous A.D. 70, a Sabbath; and the taking of Jerusalem by Titus on the 8th Gorpiaeus, or Elul, according to Josephus—again a Sabbath, according to Dion Cassius, we find that the phase of the moon gives in each case, without any ambiguity and without any doubt, these very days, viz. B.C. 64, Oct. 4, Saturday; Aug. 4, A.D. 70, Saturday, and September 1, A.D. 70, Saturday. The investigation of a few such cases creates a vivid impression that we are on firm ground. A number of other cases, of a more conjectural

character, may be seen in Browne's *Ordo Saeclo-*  
*rum*, p. 538.

The following results are taken from the 84-  
year cycle in Ideler, ii. 249, already referred to.

1 A.D.	2 Easter Day.	3 Tabular Age of Moon.	4 A.D.	5 Real Age of Moon (by Phase) on Friday.
448	4 Apr.	XVI	28	XIX
449	27 Mar.	XIX	29	XXI
450	16 Apr.	XX	30	XXII
451	1 Apr.	XVI	31	XVIII
452	23 Mar.	XVIII	32	XX
453	12 Apr.	XIX	32	XXII

Thus whilst the 3rd column is correct for the  
years A.D. 448-453, it is erroneous by 4 or 5  
days for A.D. 28-33. It is remarkable that it  
gives Mar. 25 for Good Friday A.D. 29, like  
Hippolytus's cycle.

We have now to trace the history of the 19-  
years or Metonic cycle in the church, and its  
final triumph.

The Metonic cycle and the Calippic period had  
long been known to the Alexandrians, and had  
been in use in Syria and adjacent countries, so  
that it is remarkable that we hear of the Octa-  
ëteris rather than this cycle as having been first  
in use, even at Alexandria.

Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea about 284, by  
birth an Alexandrian, enjoys the credit, on the  
authority of Eusebius (vii. 32) of having been the  
first to arrange the 19-years cycle for ecclesi-  
astical purposes. But the passage has greatly  
perplexed the commentators, and has called forth  
elaborate attempts at explanation or emendation  
from Petavius and others. For Anatolius declares  
that the sun "is not entering the first segment  
(of the zodiac) on the 22nd March, where he  
places the New Moon of the 1st year of the  
cycle, but is already on the fourth day passing  
through it. But this segment they generally call  
the first dodecatemorium, and the equinox, and  
the beginning of the months, &c." Unless we  
are to reject all that is said about Anatolius's  
knowledge and ability, we must take him to  
mean that the equinox fell on the 22nd, but that  
the sun was not then at the beginning of the  
zodiacal sign, but four days advanced in it. This  
is quite in consonance with the statements of  
Pliny (xviii. c. 25) and Columella (ix. 13), who  
after Eudoxus place the equinoxes and solstices  
at the 8th part of the signs. But the account  
respecting Anatolius is further complicated by  
the existence of a Canon Paschalis attributed  
to him, which exercised great influence in the  
British church, but which, if it is identical with  
that given in Bucherius, was certainly forged. It  
is strange, too, that so little is heard of the cycle  
for some time afterwards. But the 19-year cycle  
probably gradually made its way at Alexandria,  
only it was found that something more than a  
cycle was wanted to insure uniformity. An actual  
catalogue of results was necessary. So Theo-  
philus, bishop of Alexandria (385-412) framed  
at the command of Theodosius a cycle (or actual  
calendar) of 418 years (19 × 22), which St. Cyril,  
who succeeded him in that see in 412, shortened  
into a cycle of 95 years (19 × 5) for convenience'  
sake. Part only of St. Cyril's *Computus Paschalis*  
remains, but his *Prologus* survives in a Latin  
translation (in Bucherius). Theophilus had laid

CHRIST. ANT.

down distinctly the rule that when the xiv of  
the moon falls on Sunday, Easter-day is the Sun-  
day after; and Cyril states distinctly that Easter  
may fall on any of the 35 days from March 22 to  
April 25, our modern mode. In fact, the two  
chief sources of discrepancy after the Nicene  
council were these: the Latins often celebrated  
on the Sunday on which the xiv fell, while the  
Alexandrians waited a week; and the Latins  
made the 18th March the first day on which the  
xiv could fall, whilst the Alexandrians made  
their limit the 21st March. They both agreed  
that as the passover was to be kept in the first  
month, Easter was to follow the same rule; but  
the Latins made (as Bucherius, &c. think the  
Jews did) the 5th March the earliest possible  
day of the 1st month, whilst the Alexandrians,  
holding firmly the doctrine that the xiv must not  
fall before the equinox, that is, according to their  
rules, the 21st March, made the 8th March the  
1st possible day of the month. The Alexandrian  
rules, as we shall see, ultimately prevailed.

It seems to be now the time to explain the  
actual method employed by the Alexandrians.

The years of the cycle of 19 years being num-  
bered in order, the number of any given year  
was called the Golden Number. So also the  
letters A B C D E F G being written against all  
the days of the year in succession, the letter A  
being placed against the first of January, the  
same letter will stand against any given week-  
day throughout the year, except in Leap-year,  
when a change will take place after the inter-  
calary day. The letter which stands against all  
the Sundays is called the Sunday Letter.

Again, the day on which the 14th of the equi-  
nox moon falls is called the Easter Term. As the  
Easter Terms recur every 19 years, the knowledge  
of the Golden Number gives the Easter Term,  
and if we know the Sunday Letter we can pass  
on from the Easter Term, its letter being known,  
to the next Sunday, which will be Easter Day.

Rule 1. To find the Golden Number. Add 1  
to the numeral of the year, and divide by 19.  
The remainder is the Golden Number; when there  
is no remainder, 19 is the Golden Number.

Rule 2. To find the Sunday Letter. To the  
numeral of the year, add its quotient on dividing  
by 4, and also the number 4; divide the sum by  
7, and subtract the remainder from 7. This will  
designate the place of the Sunday Letter in the  
alphabet. Ex.: 325 + 81 + 4 = 410; 410 ÷ 7  
leaves remainder 4; the 3rd letter C is the Sun-  
day Letter. In Leap-year the earlier two months  
of the year have the letter next succeeding.

The following Table will now suffice to find  
the Alexandrian Easter (old style).

Golden Nos.	Easter Terms	Golden Nos.	Easter Terms.
1	5 Apr. D	11	15 Apr. G
2	25 Mar. G	12	4 Apr. C
3	13 Apr. E	13	24 Mar. F
4	2 Apr. A	14	12 Apr. D
5	22 Mar. D	15	1 Apr. G
6	10 Apr. B	16	21 Mar. C
7	30 Mar. E	17	9 Apr. A
8	18 Apr. C	18	29 Mar. D
9	7 Apr. F	19	17 Apr. B
10	27 Mar. B	20	5 Apr. D

Ex.—A.D. 29. Golden number=11. Sunday Letter G  
Easter Term, 15th April. Easter Day=17th April.

It must not be supposed, however, that the subject was always regarded from this simple point of view. It was approached with old traditional notions, so that the 19 years was spoken of as made up of 8 and 11—and the years were thought of as lunar years with embolisms—and as it happened that the Latins began their cycles 3 years later than the Alexandrians, and so inserted embolisms in different years, this again was a cause of discrepancy.

Alexandrian cycle :

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19  
E E E E E E E E

Western cycle :

17 18 19 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16  
E E E E E E E E

We give at the same time the order of the cycle of Victorius :

11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  
E E E E E E E E

During the popedom of Leo the Great doubts occurred, in the year 444 A.D., and 455 A.D., as to the proper day of celebrating Easter. Leo wrote to St. Cyril to enquire respecting 444, who answered that the day was April 23, *propter rationem embolismi anni* (not 26 March, as the Latins made it). It was 8 of the lunar cycle of the Alexandrians, 18 of Victorius' cycle. Leo acquiesced.

In 455 the contention was greater. Here it was not a question of a month, but of a week. The Latins by the 84-year cycle made it April 17; the Alexandrians April 24.

Leo then wrote to Martian, emperor of the East, and to Eudocia Augusta, in which he asks them to interfere that the Alexandrians may not name April 24, alleging that the viii. kal. Maii is beyond the ancient limits. The emperor made enquiry of certain eastern bishops and of the Alexandrians, and Leo finally yielded for the sake of peace. In the matter of these limits the Alexandrians were always firm, allowing the 14th of the moon to range from March 21 to April 18, Easter-day from March 22 to April 25; while the Westerns had shown much vacillation. Their old 14th day limits were March 18 and April 21, then the council of Caesarea (A.D. 195) laid down as the limits of Easter-day March 22 and April 21, alleging that the crucifixion was on March 22. This authority, together with that of the Nicene council, ordering that Easter should not be kept before the equinox, led the Latins to yield the first limit; then Leo extended the 2nd limit two days, by understanding April 21 of the crucifixion, thus getting March 22 to April 23, 33 days. Finally the Latins had to yield 2 days more. But the Latins would only keep Easter from the 16th to the 22nd of the moon, so that the passion might be on the 14th, whereas the Alexandrians often kept Easter on the 15th. In the year 463 Victorius (or Victorinus) of Aquitaine, an abbot at Rome, was employed by pope Hilary to correct the calendar, and he was the real author of the cycle of 532 years, found by multiplying together 19, the cycle of the moon, and 28, the cycle of the sun. Thus, on the supposition of the perfect accuracy of the 19-years cycle, all full moons, days of the week, &c., would recur in the same order from cycle to cycle, for ever. The cycle is given in Bucherius: it begins at A.D. 239 and ends 770. Some days

are marked, as differently taken by the Alexandrians and Latins, for Victorius commenced the cycle at the 11th year of the Alexandrian cycle, and also still adhered to the above-mentioned Latin rules.

There were many errors in his tables, and the revision of it by Dionysius Exiguus obtained for it the name of the Dionysian cycle, transferring to Dionysius most of the merit which belonged to Victorius.

But what Dionysius really did was to continue the 95-year cycle of St. Cyril, and he also induced the Italians to accept fully the Alexandrian rules. He also abandoned the era of Diocletian, and was the first to introduce the modern Christian era, reckoning from the supposed date of the birth of Christ. Victorius had made his cycle begin from the baptism, A.D. 28.

But the Easter table of Victorius long held its ground in Gaul. In the council of Orleans (541) it was ordered that all should observe Easter according to the *laterculus Victorii*, and Gregory of Tours says of A.D. 577: "In that year there was a doubt about Easter. In Gaul we, with many other cities, celebrated Easter on the 14th Calends of May: others with the Spaniards on the 12th Calends of April. The former was Victorius's date: the Alexandrians kept Easter a week later, the Spaniards four weeks earlier." It is only at the end of the 8th century that traces of such differences disappear in Gaul. (Ideler, iii. 294.)

The 84-years cycle lasted longer in Britain than elsewhere: and the bitter controversies which were carried on for a long time between the new English church, founded by the mission of Augustine, and the ancient British church were entirely due to the persistence of the British clergy in clinging to the old cycle of 84 years (see the letter of Althelmus Anglus Episcopus, about 700 A.D. in Bucherius) and old traditional maxims respecting the paschal limits.

They kept the festival from the 14th of the moon to the 20th: they placed the equinox on the 25th March, and would keep no festival before it, and they used as the later limit of the festival the old limit of the Latins, the 21st April.

For these rules they appealed to tradition and the example of St. John, and also repeatedly to the authority of Anatolius. The discussion almost always turns in Bede's narrative, and in the letters preserved, on this point:—Is the festival to be kept from the 14th to the 20th of the moon (with the British church), or from the 15th to the 21st (with the Roman)? And as the battle turned so largely on the 14th of the moon, the partisans of the Roman use tried to fix on the British clergy the name of Quartodecimans, and so the stigma of heresy. But they were in no real sense Quartodecimans. They observed the Easter festival on a Sunday and kept the Friday before it, not keeping, as did the Christians of Asia Minor, the 14th of the moon, fall when it might: nor is there any ground for connecting them, on the supposition of their being Quartodecimans, with Asia Minor. As we have mentioned before, the spurious canon of Anatolius, given in Bucherius, was perhaps designed to support the cause of the British Christians. And there is some ground for supposing that the *laterculus* of 100 years, given in Bucherius, may have be-



longed to the British church, as it falls in with their principles.

Frequently as the differences respecting Easter are mentioned in Bede (*Ecol. Hist.*), there are unfortunately no dates given which can throw further light on these discrepancies; but the statement respecting Queen Eanfleda and her followers as still fasting and keeping Palm Sunday, when King Oswy had done fasting and was keeping his Easter, must refer to some year not far from 651; and the six of the moon full on Sunday in 645, 647, 648, and 651.

The Roman use finally prevailed in England. Archbishop Theodore, A.D. 669, is believed to have arranged everything according to Roman customs, and from that time general uniformity existed. Nothing further of importance occurred respecting Easter until the Gregorian reformation of the calendar, by which time the accumulated errors arising from the 1½ hrs. excess of the 19-years cycle made the calendar moon about four days later than the real moon. [L. H.]

**EASTER, CEREMONIES OF.** The season of Easter, as the epoch of the great redemptive acts by which the salvation of mankind was consummated, was from a very early period observed with special solemnity by the Christian church. The Paschal season originally extended over fifteen days, of which Easter Day was the central point, commencing with Palm Sunday and terminating with Low Sunday. The first week was known as *domina quadragesima*, the second week as *domina alveariorum* (Sulcor, sub var.). Leaving to other articles the solemnities of the former period [PALM SUNDAY: GOOD FRIDAY] we propose to speak of those of the period of Easter, properly so called.

*Easter Eve.*—This day was known by a variety of titles in the early church—*νύκτα ἐκτίλλουσα*, *νύκτα ἐκτίλλουσα*, *νύκτα ἐκτίλλουσα* (Pallad.). *Sabbatum Maynorum*. *Domus Iguarium Paschas*. (Hieron.). *ἡμέρα νύκτα ἐκτίλλουσα καὶ ἀναστήσεως* (Euseb. vi. 34). It had a double character, penitential and jubilant; as the conclusion of the great Lenten Fast, and as the prelude of the Festival of the Resurrection. This was the only Sabbath in the whole year on which fasting was permitted (*Apostol. Constit.* vii. 25). The fast of Easter Eve was of the strictest character, and was prolonged at least till midnight, Good Friday and Easter Eve being a continuous fast, in supposed obedience to our Lord's words (Matt. ix. 15). The *Apostolical Constitutions* enjoin fasting till cockcrow (*Ap. Constit.* v. 18). The synod of Auxerre, A.D. 578 (*Can. xi.*) forbids the breaking of the fast till the second hour of the night. The 89th Trullan canon (*Concil. Quinisext. Labba*, vi. 1180) limits the fasting at midnight. Jerome assigns as a reason for the congregation not being dismissed on Easter Eve till after midnight, that even as the Paschal deliverance of Israel took place at midnight (*Exod. xii. 29*) it was the expectation of the church, according to apostolical tradition, that Christ would return to

accomplish the redemption of His church and triumph over her enemies at the same hour. That hour being passed, the awe with which the Lord's coming was anticipated being relieved, the Easter Feast was celebrated with universal joy (Hieron. *In Matt.* xiv. 8). The same belief is mentioned by Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* vii. 19), when he speaks of the night being passed in watchfulness on account of the coming of our King and God. We have evidence that in Tertullian's time it was spent in public worship, when he speaks of the difficulty which would be caused by the absence of a Christian wife from her heathen husband during the whole night at the time of the paschal solemnities (*Tert. ad Uxor.* ii. 4). As the night advanced and Easter drew nearer all signs of mourning were laid aside for the highest festal jubilee. One special solemnity indicating the festival character of this night was the lighting of lamps and candles, a custom which is repeatedly referred to by writers from the 4th century downwards. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Introductory Catechetical lectures (§ 15), speaks of "that night, that darkness that shows like day," and Eusebius records (*De Vit. Const.* iv. 22) that Constantine observed Easter Eve with each pomp that "he turned the sacred or mystical vigil into the light of day" by means of lamps suspended in every part, and setting up huge waxen tapers as big as columns (*αὐγὰς αἰεὶς ἀφ' ὧν ἀνέστη*), through the whole city. We find a reference to the same custom in Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* xlii. *De Pasch.*), who speaks of persons of all ranks, even magistrates and men and ladies of rank, carrying lamps, and setting up tapers, both at home and in the churches, thus turning night into day; and again (*Orat.* xliii.) describes this *hpa vñ*, as a "torch-bearing" (*ἀφ' ὧν ἀνέστη*), being as it were a *πῶς* or forerunner of the rising of the great light, Christ. Gregory Nyssen also describes the brilliancy of the illumination as a cloud of fire mingling with the dawning rays of the sun, and making the eve and the festival one continuous day without any interval of darkness (*In Christ. Resurr. Orat.* v.). From the poem of Prudentius (*Hymn. v. ad Iacuum ante Pascham*, 141-148) we learn that the church was illuminated with lamps depending from the roof, reminding the spectator of the starry firmament. In later times one special wax taper of large size was solemnly blessed, as a type of Christ's rising from the dead to give light to the world. The institution of this custom was attributed to pope Zozimus A.D. 417 [PASCHAL TAPER].

The latter hours of the evening and the night were spent by the assembled congregations in united prayer and supplication, the singing of psalms and hymns, reading the Scriptures, and in hearkening to the exhortations of the bishop and presbyters (*Apost. Constit.* v. 19; Greg. Nys. *Orat.* iv. *in Christ. Resurrect.*).

Easter Eve was the chief time for the baptism of catechumens. The first seventeen catechetical lectures of St. Cyril were delivered during the weeks before Easter to those who were preparing for baptism at the ensuing Easter Eve, on which day the eighteenth was pronounced (*Catech.* xvi. 20, xviii. 32, 33). The nineteenth, on Easter Monday, explains "the deep meaning of what was done on the evening of their baptism" (xix. 1). On the Easter Eve which succeeded Chrysostom's deposition, no fewer than three thousand catechumens

\* The earliest instance of the use of this designation for Easter Eve is in the letter of the church of Smyrna denouncing the martyrdom of Polycarp (*Epist.* ix. 18, 19). The day on which Polycarp was apprehended is described as "the Great Sabbath"—*domina quadragesima pasche*. The term is evidently borrowed from John xii. 31. *ἡ νύκτα ἐκτίλλουσα* being also *ἐκτίλλουσα*.

awaited baptism at Constantinople, who were dispersed by a body of soldiers bursting into the baptistery, many of the female catechumens being driven out only half dressed, having laid aside their outer garments in preparation for the sacred rite. The sacrament, thus brutally interrupted, was resumed in the Baths of Constantine, where the scattered congregation reassembled (Chrysost. *Ep. ad Innoc.* i.; Pallad. *Vit. Chrys.* c. 9). The rite of baptism was preceded by the solemn benediction of the water (*Apost. Constit.* vii. 43; Tertull. *De Bapt.* c. 4; Cyprian, *Epist.* 70 (69)). [BAPTISM.]

We find in Rabanus Maurus, c. 847 (*De Clericor. Instit.* ii. 28) a detailed account of the mode of observing Easter Eve which would not differ much from that of the preceding centuries. All the congregation remained in perfect silence and tranquillity awaiting the hour of the Resurrection, uniting from time to time in prayer and psalmody. Towards nightfall the ceremonies of the *Nox Dominica* began with the benediction by the archdeacon of the paschal taper. This ceremony was followed by lections from the Old Testament and prayers, succeeded by the litanies of the saints. Then followed the administration of baptism. The white-robed neophytes ascended from the font—"ascendit grex dealbatorum de lavacro"—and the celebration of the eucharist commenced, of which all were bound to partake but the excommunicate.

Complaints of disorders consequent on these nocturnal assemblies are found as early as the 6th century. These scandals led first to the limitation of the hours of the vigil, and ultimately to the transference of the observance to the daytime.

*Easter-Day.*—Although nothing could exceed the honour paid to the Feast of the Resurrection by the early church, by which it was justly regarded as the chief festival of the whole year, there is very little to say respecting the mode in which was observed. The high-sounding titles with which the early fathers delighted to decorate it—"the queen of days," "the feast of feasts, and assembly of assemblies" (Greg. Nyss. *Orat.* xix.; *Ibid.* xliii.), "the desirable festival of our salvation" (Chrysost. *Homil.* lxxxv. *de Pasch.*), "the crown and head of all festivals," and the like—are mere rhetorical flourishes which never obtained general currency, and need not therefore be further dwelt upon. It was commonly known as ἡ μεγάλη κυριακή. "Dominica gaudii" seems also to have been a familiar appellation (Bingham, *Orig.* xx. 5. 5). As a religious observance Easter Day was not distinguished from other Sundays except by the vastness of its congregations, and the general splendour and dignity of its services. Indeed it was ordained by pope Vigilius in the 6th century (537-555) that the mass on Easter Day should be the same as that on other days, "ordine consueto," with the exception of the addition of "singula capitula diebus apta" (*Epist. ad Euther.* § 5; Labbe, v. 313). By one of the so-called Trullan canons, A.D. 692 (*Can.* 90; Labbe, vi. 1180) it was forbidden to kneel in prayer from the entrance of the priests to the altar on the evening of Easter Eve till the evening of Easter Day, the two days being combined in one continuous celebration of the Resurrection, ὡς ἐν ὁλοκλήρῳ ἐντεῦθεν νυχθήμερον πανηγυρίζειν ἡμᾶς τὴν ἀνάστασιν. Gregory Nyssen

draws a vivid picture of the joyous crowds who, by their dress and their devout attendance at church, sought to do honour to the festival. All labour ceased, all trades were suspended, the husbandman threw down his spade and plough and put on his holiday attire, the very tavern-keepers left their gains. The roads were empty of travellers, the sea of sailors. The mother came to church with the whole band of her children and domestics, her husband and the whole family rejoicing with her. All Christians assembled everywhere as members of one family. The poor man dressed like the rich, and the rich wore his gayest attire; those who had none of their own borrowed of their neighbours; the very children were made to share in the joy of the feast by putting on new clothes (Greg. Nyssen, *Orat.* iii. in *Christ. Resurrect.*). Evangelical lections were read to the assembled congregations, so arranged that the whole history of the Resurrection was gone through on successive days (Aug. *Serm. de Temp.* 137, 140), and sermons preached instructing the people how to keep the feast duly, δεόντως ἐορτάζειν (Athanas. *Epist. ad Dracont.* ad fin.). When the empire became Christian, the emperors, beginning with Valentinian, A.D. 367, testified to the universal joy by throwing open the prisons, and granting a general pardon (*Cod. Theod.* lib. ix. tit. 38, leg. 3, 6, 7, 8; *Cod. Justin.* lib. i. tit. 4, leg. 3; Cassiod. xi. *Epist.* ult.; Ambrose *Ep.* 33 (14)), debtors were forgiven, slaves manumitted, all actions at law were suspended except in some special cases (*Cod. Justin.* lib. iii. tit. 12, leg. 8; *Cod. Theod.* lib. ii. tit. 8, leg. 2; lib. ix. tit. 35, leg. 7), and liberal alms given to the poor. In the words of Gregory Nyssen (u.s.) "every kind of sorrow is put to rest to-day, nor is there any one so overwhelmed with grief as not to find relief from the magnificence of this feast. Now the prisoner is loosed, the debtor is forgiven, the slave is set free, and he who continues a slave derives benefit." All games or public spectacles were prohibited as being inconsistent with the sanctity of the season (*Can. Trull.* 86; Labbe, vi. 1171; *Cod. Theod.* lib. xv. tit. 5, leg. 5). What has been said of Easter Day may be extended to the week following, which, together with that which went before, was considered to partake in the sacredness of the festival. The *Apostolical Constitutions* ordain that slaves should be allowed to rest from their work "all the great week" (Holy Week), "and that which follows it" (*Ap. Const.* viii. 33). The purpose of this rest was religious edification. St. Chrysostom states (*Homil.* 34 *De Resurrect. Christ.*) that for seven days sacred assemblies were held and sermons preached. The council of Macon A.D. 585 (*Can.* ii.; Labbe, v. 981) also forbids all servile work for six days, during which all are to assemble three times a day for worship, singing paschal hymns, and offering their daily sacrifices. The Trullan canons (*Can.* 86; Labbe, vi. 1171) also lay down that the faithful ought to spend their time through the whole week in church, devoting themselves to psalmody, reading the Scriptures, and the celebration of the holy mysteries.

The Easter season—*Octo dies neophytorum* (August. *Epist.* xix. ad *Januar.* c. 17)—closed with the following Sunday (*Low Sunday* with us), known by the titles of ἀντίδοχα, ἡ καὶ

*εὐαγγελισμός*, *εὐαγγελισμός*, *Dominica de Octavis Pasche*, *Pasche Clavum*; also with reference to the white dresses of the newly baptized, & *εὐαγγελισμός* *de νεοφύτοις*, *Die Neophytorum, Dominica in Albis*. The appellation *Quasi modo geniti*, derived from the introit (1 Pet. ii. 2), is of later origin. In the Greek church it has been known as the *εὐαγγελισμός* *Θωμᾶ*, and *ἡμέρα ἀναστάσεως*, with reference to the gospel for the day (John xi. 19-23), and the appearance of Christ to Thomas on this day (ib. 26-29). The special solemnity of this Sunday was the laying aside by the newly baptized of their white baptismal robes, to be deposited in the treasury of the church. St. Augustine refers to the appearance of the neophytes in church in their white robes (*Serm. de Temp.* 163; *Dominica in Octav. Pasche*): "Hodie vitali lavacro reurgens Dei populus ad laetam Resurrectionis ecclesiam nostram splendore sive candore illuminatur." The white bands that were wrapped round the heads of the newly baptized infants were also removed on this day, which from this custom sometimes bore the name of *octavas infanthum*: "infantes vocantur et habent octavas hodie . . . . recludenda calum sunt capita eorum" (*Aug. Serm.* 100). We learn from Rabanus Maurus (*De Cleric. Inst.* ii. 38) that in his time the seven days after Easter Day were known as *Dies Albæ*, because those who had been baptized on the holy night wore their albs and assisted at the holy mysteries in that dress, till the following Sunday, when the bishop's hand was laid upon them in confirmation. Gregory of Tours mentions processions—*egrotationes*—being made every year at Easter tide (*Greg. Turon. V. Patr. c. vi. p. 1175*). [E. V.]

**ECCICI** (*ἑκκίαι* or *ἐκκλησιαστικοί*), certain officers appointed, in consequence of the legal disabilities of clergy and monks, to represent the church in civil affairs; see **ADVOCATE OF THE CHURCH**, **DEKANO**. The place where they met officially was called *ἐκκισίον*. [C.]

**ECONOMUS**. [**ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΟΣ**.]

**ECPHONESIS** (*ἑκφωνήσις*) denotes that portion of an office which is said audibly, in contrast with that said *secretly* (*μυστικῶς*); especially the doxology, with which the secret prayers generally conclude. [C.]

**ECTENE** or **ECTENIA** (*ἑκτενή* or *ἐκτενία*). Omitting from consideration certain preparatory prayers, the liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom begin with a litany, known as *Εκτενή*, *Synapte*, *Deconicus*, or *Eirenikos*. The name *Εκτενή* may refer to the length or (more probably) to the earnestness of the supplication. Litanies of a similar form are also found in the Hour-offices. See further under **LITANY**. [C.]

**ECTHESIS** (*ἑκθεσις*), a doctrinal formula, or "setting forth" of a **CREED**. Thus Theodoret (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 17) speaks of the statement of doctrine put forth by the "conciliabulum" of Rimini as an *ἐκθεσις*. The same word is again used by the same historian in speaking of the creed of Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 23). [C.]

**ECTYPOMATA**. [**ΔΩΝΑ**: **VOTIVE OFFERTORIA**.]

**ECUMENICAL COUNCILS**. [**COUNCILS**.]

**ECCLESIA** (*ἐκκλησία*). The principal senses of the word *Ecclesia* with which we are concerned are the following:—

1. The congregation or gathering together of the faithful. "*Ecclesia est convocatus populus per ministros ecclesiae ab eo qui facit unanimes habitare in domo. Ipse domus vocatur Ecclesia, quia Ecclesiam continet*" (Amalarinus, *De Eccl. Off.* iii. 2).

11. As indicated in the extract above from Amalarinus, the word came to designate the building used for the Christian assembly (**CONGREGATION**); as in 1 Cor. xi. 18: "*Appellamus Ecclesiam basilicam quæ continet populum*" (Augustine, *Epist.* 157). The principal designations of churches of different kinds are the following:—

1. *ἡ ἐκκλησία* is used absolutely to designate the principal church or "cathedral" of a city; as by Procopius (*De Bello Persico*, ii. 9), to designate the cathedral of Antioch.

2. *Ecclesia Baptismalis*, a parish church—to use the modern term—in which baptisms are celebrated. Walafrid Strabo (*De Reb. Eccl.* c. 30) speaks of "*presbyteri plebium qui baptismales ecclesias tenent et minoribus presbyteris prestant*." [Compare **PARISH**.]

3. *Ecclesia Cardinalis*. This was also a designation of parish churches. [CARDINAL.]

4. *Ecclesia Cathedralis*, a church in which a bishop set up his throne. [CATHEDRA: CATHEDRAL.]

5. *Ecclesia Catholica*. [CATHOLIC.]

6. *E. Diocessana* (*Logos Winiotā*, lib. iv. tit. 3, c. 6) is equivalent to *parochialis*. [DIOCESE: PARISH.]

7. *E. Mater, Matricialis, Matris, Matricula*, may designate either a cathedral, as distinguished from its subordinate churches; or a parish church, as distinguished from mere oratories.

8. *Ecclesia Plebialis* or *Plebiana*, the church of a *Plebs*, or community; that is, a parish church. See the quotation above (ii. 2), and Ducange's *Glossary*, s. v. *Plebs*.

9. *Ecclesia Principalis*, a cathedral (*Log. Winiotā*, lib. iv. 3, c. 6).

10. *Ecclesiae Patriarchales*, in the Roman church, are those subject to the immediate authority of the pope.

11. *Ecclesia per se*, a church having its own priest, and not dependent (as an oratory would have been) upon another church (Hincmar, *Epist.* ad Labbe, quoted by Ducange). [C.]

**ECCLESIAE MATRICULA**. [MATRICULA.]

**ECCLESIAECH** (*ἐκκλησιάρχης*), in the Eastern church, was the sacrist, who had general charge of the church and its contents, and summoned the people to service by the bells or other means of giving notice. The minor officials of the church were under his authority. The *Typicum* of Sabas (c. 1) represents the Ecclesiarch as giving a rubrical direction in the same way that the deacon commonly does: *εἰς τὴν ἑκκλησίαν ὁ ἐκκλησιάρχης, ἁγία, προσκυνήσωμεν* (Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v.; Daniel's *Codes* lib. iv. 700). [C.]

**ECCLESIASTICAE LITERAE**. [**COMMENDATORY LETTERS**: **DIMISSORY LETTERS**.]

**ECCLESIASTICAE RES**. 1. The term *ecclesiasticæ* is used, in a wide sense, to denote all matters belonging to the church, as opposed to *res secularæ*, *terrenæ*, matters belonging to the world. Things ecclesiastical are again divided into *res spirituales*, functions or objects which belong solely to the

priesthood, as the sacraments and the altars; and *res temporales*, which contribute to the welfare rather of the body than the soul (Ambrase, *Epist.* 53, ad Marcellinum).

Again, of *res spirituales* some are immaterial (incorporales), some material (corporales). To the former belong the invisible gifts and graces bestowed on the soul by God; to the latter, the outward acts or objects connected with such gifts or graces, that is, the sacraments; certain "*res sanctas, sacras, sacramentalis*," as churches, the vessels used in the eucharistic or other rites of the church, and the vestments of its ministers; and certain "*res religiosas*," such as foundations or institutions for purposes of piety and beneficence over which the church claims jurisdiction. The molestation or injury of ecclesiastical things is *SACRILEGE*.

2. In a narrower sense, the term *res ecclesiasticas* designates the PROPERTY OF THE CHURCH. (Lancelotti *Instit. Juris Canon.* ii. 1; Jacobson in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* s. v. *Kirchenachen*.) [C.]

**ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.** [BISHOP: DISCIPLINE: JURISDICTION.]

**ECCLESIASTICAL LANGUAGE.** [LITURGICAL LANGUAGE.]

**ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.** [CANON LAW.]

**ECCLESIASTICS.** 1. A member of the Catholic church, as opposed to a heretic or schismatic (Jerome, *Epist.* 62, c. 1; in *Ruffinus*, ii. 4).

2. Any person in orders, whether major or minor. Thus the first council of Vasa (c. 3) desires presbyters not to send for the chrism by the hands of any servant of the church (per quemcumque ecclesiasticum), but by the hands of a subdeacon at least. The word is similarly used in the Theodosian code.

3. Isidore of Seville (*De Eccl. Off.* ii. 3) speaks of a clerk occupying his due position in the hierarchy as "*clericus ecclesiasticus*," in contradistinction from *acephali*, or irregular clerks.

4. Those who were in any way the "men" of a church, so as to be unable to leave its territories or its service, were called in a special sense "*homines*" or "*virii ecclesiastici*" (Car. Mag. *Capitul.* iv. 3). "*Homines ecclesiastici seu fiscalii*" are mentioned, and their duties to their lord prescribed, in Car. Mag. *Capitul.* v. 303. They are distinguished from *servi* (Conc. *Swession.* ii. c. 12). [C.]

**EDESSA.** The translation of the Holy Icon (or picture) of Christ from Edessa is commemorated Aug. 16 (*Cal. Byzant.*). A great festival (Daniel's *Codex*, iv. 244). [C.]

**EDILTRUDIS.** [ETHILDREDA.]

**EDUCATION.** [SCHOOLS.]

**EGARA, COUNCIL OF** (*Egaras concilium*), held A.D. 615 at Egara, now Terana, in Catalonia: to confirm what had been enacted at Ooca or Huesca seventeen years before. Twelve bishops, whose sees are not given, and a presbyter and deacon representing two more, subscribed to it (Mansel, x. 531). [E. S. F.]

**EGDUNUS**, presbyter, martyr at Nicomedia with seven others; commemorated March 12 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EGESIPPUS.** [HESCHIPPUS.]

**EGYPT.** The entrance of Christ into Egypt is commemorated Ginbet 24 = May 19 (*Cal. Ethiop.*); the flight of Christ from Melas to Roakuma in Egypt, Hadar 6 = Nov. 2 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [C.]

**EGYPT, FLIGHT INTO.** It is difficult, if not impossible, to name any earlier representation of this event than the bronze casting on the doors of St. Zenone at Verona, which is at all events one of the earliest known of Christian works in metal, and may date from the original fabric of the 9th century. [R. St. J. T.]

**EGG.** There seems some diversity of opinion as to the use of the egg as a Christian symbol. Boldetti (p. 519) speaks of marble eggs found in the tombs of St. Theodora, St. Balbina, and others; these were of the size of hen's eggs. Eggshells are occasionally found in the loculi of martyrs, and Raoul Rochette refers them to the agapae so frequently celebrated there. [See EUCHARIST.] But Martigny, with the Abbé Cavedori (*Itagliaglio crit. dei Monum. dell'Arti Crist.*) is inclined to think that the egg signified the immature hope of the resurrection, "*Restat spes, quae quantum mihi videtur, ovo comparatur; spes enim novum pervenit ad rem*" (Augustine, *Serm.* cv. 3, *Opp.* t. v. 379). The use of eggs at Easter has no doubt reference to this idea; but whether the idea was really attached to the object or not, in a generally symbolic sense, seems still a dubious matter. For Eggs and Ducks see the *Medici MSS.* in Ammann. *Catalog. Bibl. Med.* [R. St. J. T.]

**EILETON** (*Εἰλετόν*). After the epiphany of the prayer of the catechumens, and immediately before the deacon warns the catechumens to depart (*Lit. Chrysos.*, Daniel iv. 349) the priest unfolds the eileton, or CORPORAL, on which the chalice and paten are afterwards placed. What this signifies is explained by Germans of Constantinople (*Theoria Myst.* p. 153, ed. Paris, 1560) thus: "The eileton represents the linen cloth in which the body of Christ was wrapped when it was taken down from the cross and laid in the tomb" (Salzer's *Theologia*, s. v.). [C.]

**EIRENICA** (*Εἰρηνικά*). (1) The earlier clauses of the great litany in the Greek liturgies are frequently called *eiprenica*, as being for the most part prayers for peace. Thus the great litany in the liturgy of St. Chrysostom (c. 14, p. 340, Daniel) begins with "Let us beseech the Lord in peace; for the peace which is from above; . . . for the peace of the whole world. . ." (2) See PACIFICAN. [C.]

**EISODOS.** [ENTRANCE.]

**ELASIPPUS**, martyr at Ferrara, with Spensippus and Melasippus, under Aurelian; commemorated Jan. 17 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**ELDERS** (*Seniores*). There are some traces of elders recognised in the church, yet distinct from the clergy. Augustine addresses his epistle to the church at Hippo (*Epist.* 137) to the clergy, the elders, (*senioribus*), and all the people. In another place (*Contra Crescon.* iii. c. 29), he mentions bishops, presbyters, deacons, and elders, (*seniores*). Optatus (l. c. 41) says, that when Mensarius, bishop of Carthage, was



threw to leave his diocese in the persecution under Diocletian, he committed the ornaments and utensils belonging to the church to the faithful elders (*idolibus senioribus*). These appear in some cases to have been merely the leading men of the congregation. Thus the council of Carthage, A.D. 419, committed the office of meeting the leaders of the Donatists to the magistrates and elders of the several districts (*Cod. Eccl. Afric.* c. 91). But there also appear to have been others who had a special position, and probably special duties, in the church. Thus, in the *Gesta Purpur. Concil. of Poiss.* (p. 263, in Optatus, ed. Paris, 1678) it is said, that in the business of enquiring into certain disputes there were associated with the bishop and clergy certain elders of the people, who were also officers of the church (*seniores plebis, ecclesiasticos viros*). Compare *ECCLASTASTICUS*. In the same tract mention is made in one place of the clergy and elders, and in another of bishops, priests, deacons, and elders. In the decrees of the council of Carthage, A.D. 419, mention is made of certain elders, who appear to have been sent as delegates to the council (*Cod. Eccl. Afric.* cc. 85, 100). Compare CHURCHWARDENS; ELECTORAL COLLEGE.

[P. O.]

**KLEAZAR**, teacher of the Nazarenes, commemorated Aug. 1 (*Cod. Byzant.*); July 29 (*Cod. Armen.*).

[W. F. G.]

**KLEAZARIUS**, martyr at Lyons, with his eight children and Minervius; commemorated Aug. 23 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

[W. F. G.]

**KLEEMOSYNARIUS**. 1. See ALMS, p. 52. 2. The word is occasionally used to designate the distributor for pious uses of the effects of a person deceased, i.e. the "executor" of his will. Thus Gregory of Tours (*De Vita Patrum*, c. 8) speaks of one from whose executors (*cleemosynarius*) so small sums were received in honour of a saint (*Ducange, s.v.*).

[C.]

**ELECTI**. Some writers (as Bona, *De Rel. Lit.* l. xvi. 4) consider the **CATECHUMENS** [p. 517] to be divided into the four classes of Audientes, Substrati or Genusflectentes, Compentes, and Electi; the latter being those whose names were actually inscribed in the church-list with a view to baptism. Bingham (*Antiq.* X. ii. 1) considers the Electi to be identical with the Compentes, though he also makes four classes by adding one of *ἡγουμένους*. But both these classifications are of doubtful authority. (See Martene, *De Rit. Ant.* l. i. 6.)

[C.]

**ELECTION OF CLERGY**. The first recorded election of clergy is in the Acts of the Apostles, where Matthias was chosen by casting lots. But this example does not appear to have been followed.

Clement Romanus (*Epist. Cor.* l. c. 42) says that in the early days of the church the apostles appointed their first-fruits, proving them by the Spirit, bishops and deacons of those who should join the faith; and that afterwards the ministers were appointed by other men of consideration (*ἀνδρῶν ἀλλοτρίων*) with the consent of the whole church (c. 44). Compare Pseudo-Clement (*Epist. ad Jacob.* l. c. 8). Clement Alexandrianus (*Strom.* H. E. iii. c. 23, § 6) says that St. John

ordained such clergy as were pointed out by the Spirit.

It appears to have been sometimes held that the bishop had the right of selecting the inferior clergy. Cyprian (*Ep.* 39, ed. Hartel) says that he had appointed Saturnus as a lector and Optatus as a subdeacon, insisting that he has not acted arbitrarily, but carried out the wishes of the church in general. Ambrose (*Epist.* 83 ad Verceil.) speaks of bishops as admitting other clergy to orders and benefices, and (*Offic.* i. c. 18) of a certain person who was refused admission into the clerical order (in clerum), by himself. Jerome (*Comm. in Tit.* i. 5) speaks of bishops as having power to appoint (*constituendi*) priests in every city, and again (*Epist. ad Nepot.*) of their selecting (*eligendi*) priests, and (*ibid.*) of their being entrusted with the power of placing in office whom they would. Philostorgius (*H. E.* iii. 17) speaks of Leontius bishop of Alexandria appointing Actius as a deacon. In the Life of John Damascene, it is said that the bishop of Jerusalem, acting by divine inspiration, sent for him and ordained him to the priesthood (*Vita Joann. Damasceni*, per Ioann. Episcop. Hierosolym. inter opp. Joann. Damasc.). Gregory the Great, while strenuously asserting the right of the clergy and people to the free election of bishops, was equally firm in reserving to the bishops the power of selecting parish priests and deacons, on the ground that in choosing a bishop, the clergy and people transferred to him all rights of election to the inferior offices (*Thomassin, 1<sup>re</sup> et Nov. Eccl. Discipl.* ii. 7, c. 34, § 10). The council of Laodicea (c. 13) forbids the election to the priesthood (*eis lepraevios*) to be entrusted to the multitude (*vois ὄχλου*). But this is sometimes referred to the election of bishops. The 4th council of Carthage (c. 27) provides that a bishop shall not ordain any without the advice of his clergy, and shall also seek not only the testimony, but the assent (*consentium*) of the people. A decree of the council of Merida (*Conc. Emerit.* c. 19) speaks of a parish priest as having been put in charge of his church, by the appointment (*per ordinationem*) of his bishop. Another decree of the same council (c. 18) ordains that all parish priests shall provide a supply of inferior clergy from the household (*familia*) of the church. The 8th canon of Theophilus of Alexandria associates the clergy with the bishop, providing that at every ordination all the clergy shall exercise the power not only of assent, but of choice (*consentiat et eligat*), and that the candidate selected by the clergy shall be ordained in presence of the people, and that the bishop shall enquire of them whether they also can bear testimony to his fitness.

In these instances it appears that the right of election rested with the bishop, or with the bishop and clergy, and that the people only consented. There is evidence, however, that in many cases the people not only bore witness to the fitness of the candidates, but had themselves a share in the election. Cyprian (*Ep.* 67, cc. 3 and 4) speaks of the people as having the greatest power of choosing worthy bishops, since by their presence the merits of the candidates will be known, and the election be just and legitimate as confirmed by the general suffrage and assent. He adds that this was the apo-

electic rule not only in the election of bishops and priests, but also in that of deacons. Jerome (*Epist. ad Rusticum*) appears to assert that either the bishop or the people had power to elect the candidates for ordination, "vel populus vel pontifex elegit." And, in another place (*Comm. in Esai. c. 33, v. 4*) speaks of either a bishop or a priest being a watchman, "speculator," of the church, because of his election by the people, "quia a populo electus est." Socrates (*Epist. l. ad Himerium Tarcon. c. 10*) speaks of elevation to the office of priest or bishop as depending on the choice (electio) of the clergy and people. Chrysostom (*Dei. iv. c. 2, § 378, 379*) speaks of the electors to the office of the priesthood (*ἐκλεκτοὶ*) as quite distinct from the bishop who ordains. Of these electors he speaks as being the elders (*οἱ πρεσβυτέρους*, *ibid. l. c. 3 § 20*) or the leading (*ἀρχαῖοι*) members of the congregation (*ibid. l. c. 14 § 39*). He also speaks of the election as being decided by a majority of votes (*ibid. l. c. 4 § 171*). Sometimes indeed the people appear to have brought a candidate to the bishop and insisted on his immediate ordination, as is said to have been the case with St. Augustine (*Pemid. Vita Augustini, c. 4*).

The 1st council of Orange (c. 10), provides that when a bishop is the founder of a church in another diocese, he may select the clergy to officiate in it. Justinian (*Novell. 123 c. 18*) allows the founders of private oratories to select their clergy, but if any unworthy were chosen, the bishop was to have the power of selecting those whom he thought fit. [P. O.]

**ELECTORAL COLLEGES.** The evils of a popular election of bishops and other clergy in a great city, such as Constantinople, were so manifest (*Chrysostom de Sacerdotio, l. 15*), that attempts were sometimes made to commit the choice of ministers to a select body or committee. We find perhaps a trace of this in the earliest times, when Clement of Rome (*ad Cor. l. c. 44*) speaks of the successors of the apostles being chosen by men of consideration (*οἱ ἀλλοτρίους ἀνδράς*) with the assent of the church. The council of Laodicea (c. 15) clearly desires that the clergy should be chosen by some definitely organized body, and not by a mere mass-meeting (*οἱ ἐκλεῖν*) [ELECTION OF CLERGY]. In spite of this ordinance, however, there are only too many instances in later times of the choice of clergy by meetings which can only be called mobs. (See Augustine, *Epist. 155*; Synesius, *Epist. 67*; Baronius, *an. 503, § 22 ff.*; Baluze, *Miscell. ii. 102 ff.*) Yet, generally, the influence of the principal men in a city could not be ignored, and when Justinian (*Novell. cxlii. c. 1*; see Binnor, p. 216) definitely enjoined that the clergy and chief men of a city (*ἐκλεῖν τῶν πόλεως*) should nominate three for a vacant see, he probably did but confirm an existing practice. From the three thus nominated, one was to be chosen by the consecrator (*οὗτος χειροτονήσας*), generally the metropolitan.

If the "chief men" had been defined, we should have had here an "Electoral College" of clergy and notables; as they were not, this system generally led to a struggle between the clergy and the civil government. [C.]

**ELEMENTS.** The two parts of the outward and visible sign in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

**I. Name.**—The Latin word *elementa* does not appear to have been used in this technical sense in the early ages of the church, though it is a very natural word to express the component parts of an thing. Possibly the use arose from the analogy of baptism, where the outward sign would naturally be spoken of as the "element" of water, as, for instance, in the following passage from St. Augustine, where, in speaking of baptism, he says, "Take away the word, and what is the water but water? The word is added to the element, and it becomes a sacrament, itself as it were a visible word" (*accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum*. Augustine in *Joan. Xf. 1-3, Tract. lxxx. 5*). Gregory of Tours (*De Vita Patrum, c. 15*) uses the word of both bread and water, "Nam cum illi panis tantum hordeneus erat et aqua, de utriusque elementis libras singulas per dies singulos sumens." Words denoting sacrifice or offering were constantly used of the Elements; *τὰ ἑὺν ἄμπα*, as in the Liturgy of St. James, *ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκδύσας τὰ ἑὺν ἄμπα*; or simply *τὰ ἑὺν*, as in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom and elsewhere; so the Latin *Sacra*, as in *Ordo Rom. II. c. 8* (see Mahillon, *Comment. Praef. p. xxxvi.*); or again, simply *τὰ ἄμπα*. *Ἐποσφά* was also generally used for the Elements placed on the altar. So the Latin *oblatus* and *oblato* as in the *Ordo Romanus II. (c. 9)*, "Archidiaconus suscipit oblatus duas de oblationario... et ponit [calicem] super altare iuxta oblationem pontificis." The word *Hostia*, "the Victim," expresses a somewhat different aspect of the sacrificial conception.<sup>a</sup>

The unconsecrated Elements on the altar are called in Eastern liturgies "the Mysterics;" the bread alone the "Seal" (*σφραγίς*), from its being divided by lines in the form of a cross (see below).

In certain Arabic rubrics (Renaudet, *Lit. Orient. ii. 82*) the Elements are called *Barmeha*, a corruption of the Greek *ἁρραχη*.

In Syriac they bear the name of *Kourbana*, corresponding nearly to the Greek *ἁρρα* and *ἁρραφά* and the Latin *oblatus*; the bread is simply "Bread of the Sacraments," or "of the Mysterics."

When the Elements have been placed on the altar, they acquire other names having more distinct reference to sacrifice, as "the Lamb," or "the First-born." The Syrians too call the portion impressed with a cross "the Seal." Other names are given to the various particles after division (*Ren. a. c. l. 169; ii. 62*) [FRACTION].

Again, the Elements were called *εὐχαῖα*, *εὐχάρις*, *formae aspectabiles*, as outward representations of inward and spiritual grace. The word species, often supposed to have the same force, probably in its origin meant no more than "fruits of the earth"—a sense which it is well known to bear in later latinity, especially with the jurists (Ducange, s. v.).

<sup>a</sup> By the *Hostia*, however, we ought probably here to understand the consecrated Host reserved from a previous celebration.

<sup>b</sup> See on these names the essay on sacrificial terms in *Memoriae of the Rev. Wharton & Mitchell* (London, 1873).

## II. What were the Elements?

Throughout the universal church bread and wine have always been the recognised elements in the eucharist, with but few and slight exceptions which may be described in a few words. There was an obscure sect called the Artotyritae who added cheese to the bread. St. Augustin (*de Haeres.* c. xlviii.) says "the Artotyrites are so called from their oblation, for they offer bread and cheese, saying that the first oblations which were offered by men, in the infancy of the world, were of the fruits of the earth and of sheep." There were also sects which used no wine but water alone, and some who did not use wine in their morning services, though they did in the evening (see below, § VI.)

## III. Composition of the Bread.

With regard to the element of bread, whatever may have been the practice of certain sects, there is entire agreement in the church that it should be made of wheat-flour. The mystical allusions to the superiority of wheat in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. 11, p. 787) and Origen (*Hom. in Gen.* xii. c. 5, p. 247, Wirceburg, 1780) strongly indicate, what indeed there is no reason to doubt, that wheaten bread and (ordinarily) no other, was used in the mysteries. Alcuin (*Epist.* 90) speaks specially of the "grana tritici," from the flour of which the bread is to be made. The great controversy in the matter has been: Should the bread be leavened or unleavened?

A. The principal evidences bearing on this question are the following:

1. It has generally been assumed in the West that the Last Supper was eaten at the feast of the Passover, and that therefore the bread used was the unleavened bread which the Jews were alone allowed to eat at that time. But it is contended by some writers of the Greek church that the Last Supper was held on the 13th Nisan, when leavened bread was still used; and there is no direct statement either in the New Testament or in the writings of the Early Fathers to indicate that *azyme*, or unleavened bread, was used; on the contrary, the fact that only "bread" was mentioned would lead to the inference that only common bread was meant. The *Acts of the Apostles* simply speaks of "breaking bread" as a solemn rite, or meeting together to "break bread." Justin Martyr simply speaks of bread, and as he is giving a particular description of the Christian rites, it seems most probable that he would have mentioned the fact had any particular kind of bread been used.

2. It is said that as the element of bread was taken in the early ages from the offerings of the people [OBLATION], which served also for the support of the ministers and dependents of the church, it must have been ordinary, that is, leavened bread. But this argument is by no means so conclusive as at first sight it appears; it is good for the age of Justin Martyr; but in later times there are evident traces of a double offering; one of ordinary food, for the use of the dependents of the church, and one of bread and wine for the altar. The council of Nantes (c. 9, quoted by Martene) clearly distinguished between the *oblationes* which were intended for consecration, and the *panes*, or loaves, offered for the use of the church [EULOGIAE]. So Hincmar (*Capitul.*

i. 16). And when such a separation was made between the offerings for the ministers and the offerings for the altar, the latter were probably specially prepared, whether leavened or not. The woman who smiled when Gregory the Great (Joannes Diac. *Vita Greg.* ii. 41) offered her in the eucharist that which she had herself prepared, need not be supposed of course to have taken the oblation from her household loaf.

3. Epiphanius (*Haeres.* 30, c. 16) says that the Ebionites, in imitation of the saints in the church, celebrate mysteries yearly in the church with unleavened cakes (*δι' ἀζύμων*), using water for the other element in the sacrament. Here the azymes seem to be mentioned, like the water, as a departure from Catholic practice; but Epiphanius does not in terms reckon the use of azymes among the heretical practices of the Ebionites, so that it is possible that their departure from orthodoxy may have consisted in their annual, instead of more frequent, celebration, and in their use of water for wine.

4. The words of the Pseudo-Ambrosius (*De Sacram.* iv. 4), "tu forte dicis, meus panis est usitatus; sed panis iste panis est ante verba sacramentorum; ubi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit caro Christi," are generally thought to imply that the bread used for consecration was leavened. But the opposition in the writer's mind is between "common bread" and "the Body of Christ," not between "common" and "leavened" bread, nor is such an expression as "panis usitatus" absolutely conclusive, though it is in the highest degree probable that it designates leavened bread, such as was everywhere most commonly used.

5. A custom of the Roman church, mentioned by the *Liber Pontificalis* (cc. 33, 55) in the lives of Melchiades and Siricius, is thus referred to by Innocent I. (*Epist. ad Decentium*, c. 5). Writing to the bishop of Gubbio, he says that his correspondent had no need to consult him about the "fermentum" which on Sundays he (Innocent) sent to the parish churches (*titulos*), because that was a custom confined to the city of Rome, intended to prevent the parish priests [see CARDINAL], who were detained in their own churches by their proper duties, from feeling themselves cut off from communion with the mother church [EULOGIAE]. Even in Rome it was only sent to the "tituli" proper, not to the presbyters of other churches. It has been supposed (e. g. by Bona) that the eucharistic bread which was sent by the pope was called "fermentum" as being made of leavened bread; but, unless the bread commonly consecrated in the churches was unleavened, this supposition does not furnish a reason why these particular oblates should be called "fermentum" by way of distinction, as they certainly appear to be; and the conjecture of Sirmond (adopted by Mabillon) seems by no means improbable, that this "fermentum" was so called as being intended to leaven the whole mass of the Roman church. Certainly the expressions used in the Lives of Melchiades and Siricius, "quod declaratur, quod nominatur, fermentum," seem to imply that the term is used in an improper, not a strict, sense.

6. The sixth canon of the 16th council of Toledo (A.D. 693) is to this effect. It having been brought to the notice of the council that in

some parts of Spain priests do not offer on the Table of the Lord clean loaves, specially prepared (*panes mundos et studio praeeparatos*), but take off a piece to form a round disc (*crustulam in rotunditatem*) from loaves prepared for their own use, and offer it upon the altar with the wine and water; a thing contrary to all precedent; . . . the council decides unanimously, that no other kind of bread be placed on the altar of the Lord, to be hallowed by priestly benediction, but such as is whole and clean and specially prepared (*panis integer et nitidus qui ex studio fuerit praeeparatus*); nor is anything of large size to be offered, but only cakes of moderate size, according to ecclesiastical custom (*neque grande aliquid, sed modica tantum oblata, secundum quod ecclesiastica consuetudo retentat*).

This canon has been claimed by the advocates both of the leaven and of the azymes; but in fact it is not conclusive for either. It is decisive as to the fact that in the Western church in the 7th century oblates were specially prepared, and were not portions of a loaf, but "integra;" but it is not proved that the words "nitidus" and "mundus" necessarily imply the absence of leaven.

7. The tenth canon of the council of Chelsea (*Conc. Calcut. A.D. 787*; Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 452) enjoins that the oblations be cakes or loaves, not pieces of bread (*panis, non crusta*). Probably the same distinction is intended as that laid down by the 16th council of Toledo, between a whole cake prepared for the purpose, and a piece taken from a loaf. The passage determines nothing as to the use of leaven, for "panis" may be used either of leavened or unleavened bread, as in "*panes azymi et crustula absque fermento*" (*Exod. xxix. 2*).

8. Another point of which much has been made in the discussion is this: that Photius of Constantinople (A.D. 867) never mentioned the use of unleavened bread in the eucharist as one of the Latin errors, while Michael Caerularius, also patriarch of Constantinople (A.D. 1054), gave it a prominent place; it has thence been inferred that the use of unleavened eucharistic bread was introduced between the years 867 and 1054. This is however by no means a certain inference; Photius may have omitted to mention azymes among the points of difference between the Greek and the Latin churches, because he was content to leave the question of leaven or no leaven undetermined, like the Greeks of a later age at the council of Florence. All that can be certainly inferred from the silence of Photius is, that either the use of unleavened bread was unknown to him, or he regarded it as a thing indifferent. It is extremely difficult to suppose that Leo IX. would have written so strongly as he did to Michael Caerularius (*Epist. ii. 24*; vi.) as to the immemorial use of azymes among the Latins, if that use had arisen since the time of Photius; i. e. not more than a century before his own birth.

There is in fact positive evidence—if the documents be genuine—as to the use of unleavened bread in the eucharist in the Western church before that date.

9. Cyprian (*Epist. 63, c. 13*) says, that, as the chalice is composed, not of wine alone, nor of water alone, but of the union of the two: so the Body cannot be meal alone, nor water alone, but

the union of the two into one loaf. This is repeated in almost the same words by Isidore of Seville (*De Div. Off. i. 18*). It is difficult to imagine that Cyprian, and Isidore after him, omitted all mention of so significant an ingredient as leaven, if it was used in the eucharistic loaf. Moreover, Alcuin (*Epist. 90 [al. 69] ad Fratres Lugdunenses*, p. 107) writing about A.D. 790, uses the very same expression as to the composition of the bread, "*ex aqua et farina panis fit qui consecratur in corpus Christi*," and adds, that it should be perfectly pure from leaven or "ferment" of whatever kind (*absque fermento ullius alterius infectionis debet esse mundissimum*). Somewhat later, A.D. 819, Rabanus Maurus (*De Cleric. Instit. i. 31, 4 p. 319*, Migne) lays it down that the eucharistic bread should be unleavened, after the manner of the Hebrew offerings (*Lev. viii. 2*), and holds that the bread which the Lord blessed in the Last Supper was undoubtedly unleavened.

10. John Maro (quoted by Martene), writing at any rate before the Trullan council, says that those who made the eucharistic offering in leavened bread reproached the Western churches, the Armenians, and the Maronites, with offering azymes, which were not bread at all; a clear proof that the Western churches generally, in the 7th century, were thought to agree with the Maronites and the Armenians in this respect.

11. Again, allusions to "common" or "leavened" bread would scarcely have been introduced into the CANON OF THE LITURGY [p. 272], as is done, for instance, in the liturgies of James Baradai and Mathew the Pastor, if the compilers had not known of some who used unleavened bread.

12. On the whole, then, there is distinct evidence that unleavened bread was used in the eucharist by the Latins, and by some Eastern sects, in the 7th and 8th centuries; and there is probable evidence that it was used in the 3rd. In the orthodox Eastern church, there can be no doubt that leavened bread has been used from a very early period indeed; if not from the very first, at any rate from the time when Judaizing sects insisted on using unleavened cakes, like those of the Passover, in the Lord's Supper.

B. *Mixture of Oil and Salt*.—The Syrian Christians, besides the leaven which is common to almost all oriental communions, mix with the bread a little oil and salt—a practice which they defend by many mystical reasons (Renaudot, *Litt. Orient. i. 191*). The mixture of oil—perhaps taken from *Lev. ii. 4*, etc.; compare Justin Martyr, *Dial. v. Trypho*, c. 41—was probably always a singularity of a small sect; that of salt was more general and more hotly defended. Thus Alcuin (*Epist. 90 [al. 69] ad Fratres Lugdunenses*) reprehends certain persons in Spain for insisting, against the custom of Rome and the church in general, that salt should be put into the eucharistic bread; and adds mystical reasons why three things only, flour, water, and wine should be offered in the Mass. The modern Greeks eagerly defend the mixture of salt, which (they say) represents the life, so that a sacrifice

\* The genuineness of this treatise is doubted by Baronius. See Cave, *Hist. Lit. s. v. Isidore*.

4 There seems no reason to doubt (with Bona, *De Act. Lit. i. xxiii. 7*) the genuineness of this passage.



without salt is but a dead sacrifice; and one of the reproaches commonly directed against the Armenians was, that they used oblates containing neither salt nor leaven (Martene, *A. R. I. iii. 7, § 1*).

#### IV. Preparation of the Bread.

The more minute directions for the preparation of the eucharistic bread belong to a later age than that with which we are concerned. Those which fall within our period are principally these.

The canon already quoted of the 16th council of Toledo makes it certain that special preparation of the eucharistic bread was enjoined in the 7th century. So long as people actually offered, they probably themselves prepared the oblates for the altar. Thus the emperor Valens is said to have prepared with his own hands the gifts which he offered for the altar (Gregory Nazianzen, *Funeral Oration on St. Basil*, c. 53, p. 809); and the Roman matron mentioned by Joannes Diaconus (u. s.)—probably a person of rank, or she would not have received the bread from the pope—had herself prepared that which she received. And it seems that not unfrequently noble ladies undertook the preparation of the oblates as a meritorious work; Candida, wife of Trajan, a prefect, prepared bread for oblation from flour which she had ground with her own hands (Martene, *A. R. I. iii. vii. 24*); so did St. Radegund († 587), distributing the oblates to different churches (*Life* by Fortunatus, in *Acta SS. Bened. I. 320*). And this task was not unfrequently undertaken by nuns. Theodulph of Orleans, however (c. A. D. 797), desired that duty to be discharged by the presbyters themselves or their "boys" in their presence, in the following terms: "panes quos Deo in sacrificio offertis aut vobis ipsis aut a vestris pueris coram vobis nitide et studiose fiant" (*Capitul. 5*). And since that time the oblates have generally been prepared by priests or "religious" persons. See BETHLEHEM. For further particulars of the preparation of the sacramental bread in various places, see Martene, *A. R. I. iii. 7, §§ 23–25*; Renaudot, *Litt. Orient. i. 189*; ii. 63 ff. ed. 1718.

#### V. Form of the Bread.

The loaf used by the Jews of Palestine seems commonly to have been round, somewhat less than an inch thick, and six or eight inches in diameter. In order that it might be more readily broken, it was scored with lines, frequently two lines at right angles to each other, so as to form a cross, dividing the loaf into four portions (Arimgh, *Roma Subterr. II. v. 9, p. 278*, quoted by Probat, *Sakramente*, p. 201). And such was probably the form of the eucharistic loaf in the early Christian church (see woodcut). The *Liber Pontificalis* (p. 98A, ed. Muratori) attributes to Zephyrinus (pope 197–217) the order, that presbyters should distribute round cakes (coronas) blessed by the bishop—a statement probably of no great authority. In the 4th century Epipha-

nus (*Anacrotus*, c. 57) and Cassarius, brother of Gregory Nazianzen (*Dial. iii. quæst. 169*), speak of the bread as round. Gregory the Great (*Dialogus*, iv. 55) speaks of a certain presbyter



On an ancient tomb. (From Martigny.)

bringing "duas oblationum coronas," then the usual form of oblation. These are explained by Joannes Diaconus (in Martene, *A. R. I. iii. vii. 26*) to be cakes made of a handful of fine flour, and in form like a crown (ex pugillo similis et ad speciem coronas); that is, round, whatever else may be intended by the comparison. And the evidence of pictorial representations agrees with this so far as it goes. Whenever in ancient representations the form of the bread is distinguishable, it is round. See CANISTEX, p. 264; EUCHARIST, p. 627.

A passage quoted by Martene (u. s.) from a treatise of Ildephonso, a Spanish bishop, describes the form and composition of the eucharistic bread in the beginning of the 9th century thus: "mensura trium digitorum anguli in rotundum panis azymi sic composita est;" i. e. the asymes for the eucharist were made in the form of a circle of three "fingers" radius. The same authority mentions that the oblate from which the priest was to communicate was larger than those intended for the people.

That it is an ancient custom to impress the oblates with a cross is probable from the words of Chrysostom (*Quod Christus sit Deus*, 571 A, ed. Ben.), where he says, "on the Table is the Cross . . . in the mystic Supper the Cross of Christ shines forth with the Body of Christ." The woodcuts represent the forms of the Greek and



Greek Oblate.

Coptic oblates, which may probably be of considerable antiquity. The former bears the inscription "IC XC [Ἰησοῦς Χριστός] νικῶν;" the latter, "Kyros, Kyros, Kyros, Kyros Zabadd." It is evident from what has been said above, that from a comparatively early age a strong

\* The word *kipas* commonly refers to the Elements; in this place, however, Nicetas takes the "gifts" for golden vessels which Valens had made (*de aurosculptis* &c.).

† Meaning, probably, those devoted to the service of the church—oblats.

‡ Somewhat less than three inches.

objection was felt to the practice of consecrating a *portion* of a loaf in the eucharist; a whole loaf or cake was always to be employed.



Coptic Oblate.

### VI. Composition of the Cup.

With regard to the element of Wine there has been less controversy, though it is an interesting and unsettled question whether the cup was mixed at the institution of the sacrament by our Blessed Lord himself. Pfaff (after R. Ob. de Bartenora and Maimonides, in *Mishnam de Benedict.* c. 7, § 5) asserts that the Jews as a rule mixed water with the wine in their Cup of Blessing. Light-foot (*Temple Service*, i. 691) says that he that drank pure wine performed his duty; so that, although it seems probable that our Lord used the mixed cup, yet it is not certain that he did so. Buxtorf (*De primae Coenae Ritibus et Forma*, § 20) says that it was indifferent whether the cup was mixed or not; and in his *Synagoga Judaica*, where he gives full details of the Passover, does not mention a cup of wine diluted with water. Again, the Babylonish Talmud calls water mixed with wine "the fruit of the vine;" but it would appear that the same term is used for pure wine in Isa. xxxii. 12; Hab. iii. 17; so that nothing positive can be ascertained from the use of that term. On the whole it seems probable that our Lord used a mixed cup, but there is no conclusive evidence on the point.

It is acknowledged on all hands that, with the exception of a few heretics, the church used for many centuries wine mixed with water. Justin Martyr, the first after the apostles who gives any account of the celebration of the eucharist, says, "There is then brought to the brother who presides a cup of water and mixed wine" (*κράματος*). And afterwards he tells us that "the deacons distribute to each one present that he may partake of that bread and wine and water which has been blessed by thanksgiving;" and this food, he says, is called Eucharistia (*Apol.* i. ch. 65). Irenaeus also (*adv. Haer.* lib. v. c. 2, p. 294) speaks of the mixed cup (*κεκραμένον ποτήριον*). And again (lib. v. c. 36) of the Lord's promise to his disciples, "that he would drink the mixture of the cup (mixturem calicis) new with them in the kingdom," which shows that he thought the fruit of the vine and the mixed cup the same thing. Cyprian (*Epist.* 63, *ad Caecilium*) has several passages bearing on this question. He says: (c. 2) that to mix wine with water is to follow the Lord's example; and again (c. 13): "Thus in sanctifying the cup of the Lord, water cannot be offered alone, as neither can wine be offered alone; for if the wine be offered by itself the blood of Christ begins to be without us, and

if the water be alone the people begins to be without Christ."

The third council of Carthage (c. 24) orders, "that in the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord, nothing else be offered but what the Lord himself commanded, that is bread, and wine mixed with water." The African code, both Greek and Latin, has this same canon, with further directions added (*Cod. Can. African.* c. 37). All the ancient liturgies either contain a direction for mixing water with the wine, or else in the canon the mixing is alluded to. Thus in the Clementine Liturgy (*Constt. Apost.* viii. 12, § 16), in reciting the words of Institution the priest says: "Likewise also mixing the cup of wine and water (*ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος*) and blessing it, He gave it to them." The Liturgies of St. James and St. Mark contain like words, while the Liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom order the deacon to put wine and water into the cup before the priest places it on the altar. In like manner, in some form or another, the mixing is mentioned in the Liturgies of Ethiopia, Nestorius, Severus, of the Roman and the Gallican churches. In most liturgies, when the water is mixed with the wine, some reference is made to the blood and water which flowed from the Lord's side; as (e.g.) in the Ambrosian rite: "De latere Christi exivit sanguis et aqua pariter." Similarly the Mozarabic and the Roman.

A peculiar rite of the Byzantine church is the mingling of *hot* water with the wine. In the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom (c. 34), after the fraction of the oblate, the deacon, taking up the vessel of boiling water (*τὸ ζέον*), says to the priest: "Sir, bless the boiling water;" the priest then says: "Blessed be the fervency (*ζέσις*)<sup>a</sup> of thy saints for ever, now and always, and for ages of ages;" then the deacon pours a small quantity of the boiling water into the chalice, saying, "The fervency of faith, full of the Holy Spirit. Amen."

Various mystical reasons have been given for the mixture of water with the wine. That of Cyprian has been already quoted. Gennadius (*De Eccl. Dogmat.* c. 75), besides the fact that our Lord used the mixed cup at the first institution, alleges as a further reason that blood and water flowed from His pierced side. The same reason is given by the Pseudo-Ambrosius (*De Sacram.* v. 1), and generally by the liturgies. In the comment on St. Mark, ascribed to Jerome, another is given; that by one we might be purged from sin, by the other redeemed from punishment (*On Mark XIV.*). Alcuin (*Epist.* 90) finds in the three things, water, flour, and wine, which may be placed on the altar, a mystical resemblance to the Three Heavenly Witnesses.

The principal deviations from the received practice of the church in this matter have been the opposite usages of the Aquarians, who used no wine at all in the eucharist, and of the Armenians, who mixed no water with the wine, claiming the authority of John Chrysostom. Both these are censured by the council in Trullo (c. 32). These Aquarians or Hydroporastatae probably abstained from wine as a bad thing in itself, like the Ebionites and the Tatianists or Encratites described by Epiphanius (*Haeres.* 30,

<sup>a</sup> See Acts xviii. 25; Rom. xii. 11

46, 2; 47, 1); but others in early times, though they partook of the mixed cup in the evening, used water only in the morning, lest the smell of wine should bring scandal upon them, and betray their celebration of the mysteries to heathen persecutors. This practice is noticed and reprehended by Cyprian (*Epist.* 63, c. 16).

Some in the 7th century offered milk for wine in the eucharist; others communicated the people not with wine pressed from grapes, but with the grapes themselves (*oblatis uvis*) (*Conc. Bracar.* iii. c. 1); errors severely censured by the ecclesiastical authorities, who constantly insisted on the offering of wine, water, and bread only.

A peculiar instance of an addition to the cup is the dropping of milk and honey into it, according to the Roman rite, on Easter-Eve (Martene, *A. R.* IV. xxiv. 32), the great day of baptism. [BAPTISM, p. 164.]

#### *The Colour of the Wine.*

The wine in use in the church has in general been red, apparently from a desire to symbolise as much as possible the blood of our Lord. According to the Talmud red wine was offered at the Passover. Irenaeus indeed (*Haeres.* bk. i. c. 13, § 2) says that Marcus (a heretic) claimed to perform the eucharistic ceremony over certain mixed chalices, and to make them appear red and purple, which would lead to the supposition that the wine had been originally white. But Cyprian (*Ep.* 63, c. 7) speaks as if the Eucharistic wine was blood-red; and Chrysostom (*Hom.* 82 in *Matt.* xxvi. 34, 35) speaks of the tongue being empurpled with the blood of Christ in the eucharist. Later in the history of the church many of the synods have ordered red wine to be used; and although there is no necessity in the matter, it certainly seems the most appropriate.

*Literature.*—Bona, *Rerum Liturgicarum Libri* ii.; Martene, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*; Krazer, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Occidentalis Liturgiis*; Bingham's *Antiquities*; Vossius, *Theses Theol.*; Brett on the *Liturgies*; Neale's *Eastern Church*; Vogan's *True Doctrine of the Eucharist*. On the special question of Azymes, see, against the antiquity of unleavened cakes in the eucharist, Sirmond's treatise *De Azymo* (1651); on the other side, Mabillon, in the preface to Saec. iii. of the *Acta SS. Bened.*, and in a special treatise *De Azymo et Fermentato*. [G.W.P. and C.]

**ELESBAAN**, king, monk in the time of the emperor Justin; commemorated Ginbot 20 = May 15 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [W. F. G.]

**ELEUTHERIUS**. (1) Bishop, and martyr at Messina, with his mother Anthia or Evanthia; commemorated April 18 (*Mart. Hieron., Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Bishop, at Autesiodorum (Auxerre); commemorated Aug. 26 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr at Nicomedia under Diocletian, "cum aliis innumeris;" commemorated Oct. 2 (*Mart. Hieron., Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(4) Deacon, martyr at Paris, with Dionysius the bishop and Rusticus the presbyter; commemorated Oct. 9 (*Mart. Hieron., Bedae, Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(5) Bishop of Illyricum, martyr A.D. 290; commemorated Dec. 15 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W.F.G.]

#### **ELEVATIO** (in a Liturgical sense).

(1) *Eastern Church.*—In all early Oriental liturgies an elevation of the bread by the celebrating priest is prescribed contemporaneously with the proclamation *ἅγια ἁγίοις*, and before the Fraction. Thus, in the liturgy of St. Chrysostom "the priest, elevating the holy bread, exclaims 'Holy things for holy persons;'" of St. James: "then he elevates the gifts, and saith 'Holy things,' &c.;" of St. Basil, "the priest, elevating the holy bread, exclaims 'Holy things,' &c.;" the Armenian, "the priest lifts up the sacrifice before his eyes, and saith 'the Holy of holies.'" The original intention of this rite was clearly not that the host might be adored by the people, for it took place within the Bema, the doors of which being closed and the curtains drawn, it could be only seen by the attendant ministers. This is acknowledged by Goar; "Non ita tamen ut a populo conspiciatur Dominicum corpus elevat Graecus sacerdos" (*Eucholog.* p. 145, note 158, cf. pp. 84, 151); he adds that there is no allusion to eucharistic adoration in the earlier ritualists: "De majoris hostiae, a populo, completa consecratione, per elevationem conspiciendae, nihil apud antiquos rituum expositores." The authority of St. Basil, τὰ τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ῥήματα ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναδείξεως τοῦ ἁγίου τῆς εὐχαριστίας τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν καταλέλοιπεν; (*De Sp. Sanct.* c. 27), is erroneously urged by Bellarmine (*De Eucharist.* ii. 15), Schelstrate (*De Concil. Antioch.* p. 219), and Bone (*Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 13, § 2), in support of the later practice of elevating the eucharist to show it to the people. For the word ἀνάδειξις has been abundantly proved by Albertinus, quoted by Bingham (*Orig. Eccl.* lib. xv. c. 5, § 4), and is acknowledged by Renaudot (i. 270), to be used here in its classical sense of "dedication," "consecration," not that of "displaying." The authorities alleged in support of the early introduction of the practice of displaying the eucharist to the people prove very weak on examination. The Pseudo-Dionysius, whose writings cannot be placed earlier than the 5th or 6th century, when speaking of the priest "showing the gifts," (τὰς δωρεὰς τῶν θεωρυγῶν ὑποδείξας), before proceeding to communion (*De Eccl. Hierarch.* c. iii. § 11) does not in any way assert that it was to the people that he showed them. The example of St. Euthymius, adduced by Martene (p. 423), is little more to the point. All that is said is, that after the *anaphora*, "stretching forth his hands to heaven, and as it were displaying to them the mystery administered for the sake of our salvation," (καὶ ὥσπερ αὐτοῖς ὑποδεικνὺς τὸ οἰκονομηθὲν τῆς σωτηρίας χάριν τῆς ἡμετέρας μυστήριον), "he cried with a loud voice, τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις" (Cyril Scythopol. *Vita S. Euthym.* apud Coteler. *Eccl. Graec. Monum.* vol. ii. p. 268, § 81), *aga*, passage quoted from Germanus, and approves Bingham as coming from the patriarch With this tinople of that name, A.D. 715, is the *Apostolic Theoria Rerum Divinarum*, cor by Cave to his namesake and lack of evidence turies later, A.D. 1222. The usage in early passage is that given by 11 Roman custom, but James bishop of Edessa against the multiply-rectly quoted, prescri uttering the ἅγια Quessell's sixth Dissertation sments and show. of Leo I.

a witness," "tum elevat et ostendit sacramenta universo populo tanquam in testimonium."

(2) *Western Church*.—Obscure and vague as is the date of the introduction of the elevation of the eucharist in the Oriental church, there is still greater uncertainty when it became the practice of the West. Goar humbly confesses his ignorance (*Eucholog.* p. 146, § 158), and Bona acknowledges the same (*Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 13, § 2), and professes his inability to discover any trace of the practice in the ancient sacramentaries or the codices of the *Ordo Romanus*, or in any of the ancient ritual writers, Alcuin, Amalarius, Walafrid, &c. Indeed there is little doubt, as is acknowledged by all learned and candid Romanists, that the elevation owes its introduction to the spread of the tenets of Berengarius, c. 1050, against which it was regarded as a public protest (Muratori, *Liturg. Rom. Vet.* i. 227). This practice was the natural consequence of the mediaeval doctrine of Transubstantiation, though it had little or no authoritative sanction before the 13th century. Although from its late date the Latin practice does not belong to the period embraced in this Dictionary, we may mention that the position of the elevation in the Roman canon differs essentially from that of the Greek church, not taking place until *after* the fraction and consecration instead of before it.

(Binterim, *Denkwürdig.* vol. iv. p. 3; pp. 432, sq.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. xv. c. 5, § 4; Neale, *Eastern Ch.* vol. i. p. 1, p. 516; Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 13, § 2; Goar, *Eucholog.* p. 145 sq.; Martene, *De Eccl. Rit.* vol. i. p. 423; Renaudot, *Liturg. Oriental. Collect.* i. 265–271, ii. 82, 572, 608; Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharist.* ch. vi. § 10, p. 546 sq.; ch. viii. § 7, p. 594 sq.) [E. V.]

#### ELIBERITANUM CONCILIUM. [ELVIRA, COUNCIL OF.]

ELIGIUS, bishop and confessor, "gloriosus in miraculis," at Noyon; commemorated Dec. 1 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

ELIJAH, the prophet; commemorated July 4 (*Cal. Armen.*), July 20 (*Cal. Byzant.*), Taksas 1 = Nov. 27 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [W. F. G.]

ELISHA, the prophet; commemorated Senne 20 = June 14 (*Cal. Ethiop.*, *Cal. Byzant.*), Oct. 12 (*Cal. Armen.*); also Tekemt 19 = Oct. 16 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [W. F. G.]

ELIZABETH. (1) Mother of John the Baptist; commemorated Jakatit 16 = Feb. 10 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(2) *Θαυματοπύρος*, commemorated April 24 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

ELODIA, virgin, and martyr with Nunilo at Osea; commemorated Oct. 22 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

AL-ELPIDIPHORUS, and companions, martyrs his diarsia, A.D. 320; commemorated Nov. 2 (*Cal. of the cl.*). [W. F. G.]

the kingdom (Hope), daughter of SOPHIA (Wisdom), commemorated with her sisters, Faith, Cyprian (*Epist.* 17 (*Cal. Byzant.*)). [C.]

passages bearing (c. 2) that to mix wine with the Lord's example; and held at Elvira in Granada sanctifying the cup of the Lord's example; and held at Elvira in Catalonia. be offered alone, as neither its own acts is Era alone; for if the wine be offered has been referred to blood of Christ begins to be by moderna. As

Hosius of Corduba is placed second of the nineteen bishops attending it, its date cannot well have been earlier than 313, nor later than 324. And, in either case, its canons about the lapsed would find their counterpart in those of Ancyra or Nicaea. Perhaps the later date, besides being that of its own acts, would accord best with the reference to it by Hosius himself in the 11th Sardican canon, which Baluze points out. Its own canons, all on discipline, seem to have amounted to fourscore and one; but Gratian and others cite several more not now found in its acts. Among the former, absence from church for three consecutive Sundays is punished by the 21st. Superstitious fasts—on which see Bingham xxi. i. 25—to be observed in all other months, are relaxed in July and August by the 23rd. Bishops, priests, and deacons cohabiting with their wives are threatened with deprivation in the 33rd, lights in cemeteries are forbidden during the day by the 34th, and pictures in churches by the 36th. A huge dissertation on this council, in three books, addressed to Clement VIII. by Mendoza, may be read in Mansi, ii. 58 and seq. [E. S. Ff.]

EMANCIPATIO, in a special sense, is the setting free of a monk, chosen to an ecclesiastical dignity, from the obedience which he owes to his superior. This was done by letters under the hand of the abbat, called *emancipatorie litterae*. A form of such letters is given by Petit in his edition of Theodore's *Penitential*, p. 143. (Ducange, s. v.). [C.]

EMBALMING. There are many testimonies to the observance of this custom among the Christians of the early centuries. That it was practised in the case of martyrs appears from the instance of Tharacus (*Acta Tharaci*, ap. Baron. an. 290, n. 21), to whom it was denied by his persecutor Maximus, and his body sentenced to burning, in contempt of the doctrine of the resurrection. But embalming was not confined to martyrs; it was a reproach cast upon Christians generally by the heathen interlocutor in Minucius Felix (*Octav.* c. 12, § 6), that "using no perfumes for their bodies in life, they required all costly ointments for their funerals." Tertullian also (*Apol.* c. 42) is a witness to the general observance of the custom: "Let the Sabaeans know that more of their costly wares is spent in the burial of Christians than in offering incense (fumigandis) to their gods."

The practice was doubtless derived from the Jews. In the Old Testament the only recorded examples are those of Jacob and Joseph (Gen. l. 2, 26) in conformity with Egyptian usage; but it would seem to have been observed more or less generally during their later history; and in St. John's description of our Lord's burial, we read that Joseph of Arimathaea and Nicodemus "took the body of Jesus and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury." Our Lord's interpretation of the pious offering of Mary to His person (Mark xiv. 8), "She hath anointed my body to the burial" (*ἐνταφιασμόν*) implies the use of unction as a recognized practice. Various spices were employed for the embalming, especially myrrh; see Prudentius (*Cathemerin.* hym. 4)—

"Aspersaque myrrha Sabaeo  
Corpus medicamine ornat."



Although the custom of embalming was common to Christians and heathens, there was an essential difference in the purpose for which it was practised. As a pagan ceremony it was intended to facilitate cremation; with the Christians, on the contrary, to whom "the old irreverence of burning" was always abhorrent, its object was to preserve the body from corruption. It was doubtless the expression of that reverential feeling for the body, as having been the temple of the Holy Ghost, and as destined for restoration to an imperishable existence, by which the Christian faith was exclusively characterised among all the religions of the world. [D. B.]

**EMBER DAYS** (*jejunia quatuor temporum*). From the Latin title has been derived the name of these seasons in most European languages, whether by translation [*e. g.* the French *les Quatre-Temps*, or the Swedish *de fyra fastetider*], or by a corruption of the original [*e. g.* the German *Quatember*, Dutch *Quatertemper*, or Danish *Kvatember*]. Hence too, if we consider the wide-spread use of the expression is a probable derivation of the English *Ember*; though two others have been proposed, one connecting it with embers in the sense of ashes, for which little can be said, and the other identifying it with the Anglo-Saxon *Ymbren*, a revolution or circuit, to which it has been objected that all church seasons are necessarily recurrent. [In favour of this last view, however, may be cited the phrases *ymbren dagas*, etc., and such notices as the canon of the English council of Aenham, given below.] On the supposition that the derivation from the Latin is the true one, it is interesting to note the Danish form *Tamperdag*, as marking an intermediate stage between that of the German and of the English. An exception to the above rule is the Welsh name, *Wythnos y Cydgoriau*, week of the united choirs or processions.

Whatever may have been the origin of the solemnity of the Ember Fast, we find them at an early period associated with the invoking of God's blessing on each of the four seasons as it came round in its turn, and the special striving by prayers and fasting to merit such blessings. Still, on the earliest occasion on which we meet with a mention of these fasts, this idea does not seem to have been present to the mind of the writer. The passage in question occurs in the treatise *de Haeresibus* of Philastrius, bishop of Brixia, in the middle of the 4th century. As the passage is of some importance, we think it well to quote it at length. After citing Zech. viii. 19, as referring to the subject, he proceeds ". . . ut mysteria Christianitatis ipsis quatuor jejuniis nuntiata cognoscemus. Nam per annum quatuor jejunia in ecclesia celebrantur; in Natali primum, deinde in Pascha, tertium in Epiphania, quartum in Pentecoste. Nam in Natali Salvatoris Domini jejunandum est, deinde in Paschae Quadragesima, atque in Ascensione itidem in caelum post Pascha die quadragesimo, inde usque ad Pentecosten diebus decem: id quod postea fecerunt beati Apostoli post Ascensionem jejuniis et orationibus insistentes." (*Haeres.* 119, in *Patrol.* xii. 1286.) It seems certain here, whatever the explanation may be, whether of a false reading in the text, or of an unusual meaning of the

word, that, as Fabricius (*not. in loc.*) suggests, the fast in *Epiphania* refers to the season of the Ascension, both from the position assigned to it between Easter and Pentecost, and from the subsequent reference to the Ascension.

We now pass on to the first definite mention of these fasts as associated with the beginnings of the four seasons. Among the works of Leo I., are found numerous sermons for each of the fasts, which are spoken of as the fast *decimi mensis* (*Serm.* 12-20), the fast in *Quadragesima* (*Serm.* 39-50), the fast in *Pentecoste* (*Serm.* 78-80), and the fast *septimi mensis* (*Serm.* 86-94) respectively: and in one passage (*Serm.* 19, c. 2; vol. i. p. 59, ed. Ballerini), he thus associates the fasts with the seasons they introduce, "jejunium vernum in Quadragesima, aestivum in Pentecoste, autumnale in mense septimo, hiemale autem in hoc qui est decimus celebramus." Further, he appears to speak of this practice as resting on apostolical authority (*Serm.* 80, c. 1; p. 316), meaning, probably, that resting on the authority of his church, they claimed the respect due to apostolic ordinances. The autumnal fast does not seem to be mentioned before the time of Leo I., for it will have been observed that the arrangement in Philastrius is different. Perhaps, however, Leo or some of his predecessors may have added to three existing ancient fasts this fourth one, and then associated the four seasons of the year with these four regularly recurring fasts.

The particular days on which it was incumbent to fast at the Ember seasons according to the Roman rule were Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday; thus Leo (*Serm.* 80, c. 4, p. 320) enjoins "Quarta et sexta feria jejunemus, Sabbato autem apud beatissimum Petrum Apostolum vigiliis celebremus." Augustine (*Epist.* 36, *ad Casulanum*, c. 8; vol. ii. 105, ed. Gaume) seems to speak simply of the particular days of the week on which the local Roman church fasted in its ordinary practice.

It has been said that Leo (*Serm.* 18, c. 2; p. 57), asserts that the fasts of the four seasons were celebrated "in universa ecclesia;" but an examination of the passage will show that he is referring to the institution of fasts generally. Indeed, there can be little doubt that the fasts of the four seasons were at first only observed in that part of the church in immediate dependence on Rome. The language of Augustine will not allow us to suppose that the same state of things prevailed in Africa; the church in north Italy differed, at any rate in not making Saturday a fast. (Ambrose apud August., *Epist.* 86 *ad Casulanum* c. 32; ed. cit. 120).<sup>a</sup>

In the eastern church there is no trace whatever of an observance of the Ember seasons. The passage of Athanasius, which some have quoted in support of a different conclusion (*Apol. de fuga*, c. 6; vol. i. p. 323, ed. Bened.), merely proves the existence of a fast at Pentecost. With this may be compared an allusion in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (lib. v. c. 20).

Not only is there thus a lack of evidence to establish the existence of the usage in early times as aught but a local Roman custom, but we find Jerome protesting against the multiply-

<sup>a</sup> See on this point Queasnell's sixth Dissertation appended to his edition of Leo I.

ing of obligatory fasts, and clearly recognizing no fast but Lent as of universal obligation (*Epist.* 41 *ad Marcellam* c. 2; vol. i. 189, ed. Vallarsi; cf. vi. 750).

Nor if we take illustrations from a somewhat later period shall we find the practice uniformly established. Thus the rule of St. Benedict (ob. circa 542 A.D.), carefully specifies the fasts which the order was to observe, but ignores the Ember seasons altogether, and indeed, his rule is hardly compatible with the existence of the latter (*Regula S. Bened.* c. 41; p. 88, ed. Venice, 1723).

Later still Isidore of Seville (ob. 636, A.D.), speaks of the four fasts which are to be observed in the church, "secundum Scripturas sacras," mentioning those in Lent, Pentecost, the seventh month, and [on the authority of Jeremiah xxxvi. 9], the Calends of November (*de off. Eccl.* i. cc. 36 sqq.). He afterwards mentions in addition to these four, that on the Calends of January and others.

As regards the Gallican church, the Ember seasons do not seem to have been established much before the time of Charlemagne. The second council of Tours (567 A.D.) in prescribing the fasts to be observed by monks, makes no mention whatever of the fasts of the four seasons—the various Gallican Liturgies published by Mabillon equally ignore them; and the language of the council of Mainz [813 A.D.], in ordering their observance, seems to imply a recently established institution, "Constituimus ut quatuor tempora anni ab omnibus cum jejuniis observentur, hoc est in mense Martio hebdomada prima, et feria quarta, et sexta, et Sabbato. . . . similiter in mense Junio hebdomada secunda, in mense Septembris hebdomada tertia, in mense Decembris hebdomada prima, quae fuerit plena ante vigiliam Nativitatis Domini sicut est in Romana Ecclesia traditum." (*Concil. Mogunt.* can. 34; Labbe vii. 1249). We also meet with capitularies of the Carolingian kings to the same effect (see e. g. lib. v. 151; vol. i. p. 854, ed. Baluzius. See also one of 769 A.D., *ib.* p. 192).

To return now to the Roman church properly so called, it will be seen that there is reason to doubt whether even there the spring fast was not at first really Lent itself, and not the three special days. It is pointed out by Muratori (see below) c. 3, that while Leo in his sermons on the summer, autumn, and winter fasts, alludes to the three days Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday; he yet in his sermons on the spring fast in no way refers to them, and indeed it is difficult in any case to see the meaning of a fast within the limits of another fast, except it were meant to be of a more rigorous kind, of which in the present case we have no evidence.

Some would attempt to solve this difficulty by supposing that the Ember seasons were originally instituted as times for ordination, but it certainly appears that this theory cannot be borne out by facts (see e. g. Amalarius Fortunatus, *de Eccl. Off.* ii. 2, and cf. Muratori c. 3). Everything points to the conclusion that the solemnity attaching to the seasons led to their being chosen as fitting times for the rite. The theory of Muratori seems very probable, that the spring fast is really Lent itself, and that the fixing of the three days is due to a later development.

Among other evidence referred to by him is the fact that in some ancient Roman sacramentaries, when notice is appointed to be given of the fasts of the fourth, seventh, and tenth months, no mention is made of the spring fast, Lent being assumed to be known from other sources. (For instances of this see Cardinal Bona, *Rerum Liturg.*, lib. ii. c. 16; vol. ii. p. 343, ed. Aug. Taur. 1753; and Thomasius, *Codices Sacramentorum*, lib. i. c. 82; p. 113.) We may further refer to the rule of the English council of Cloveshoe (747 A.D.), which orders that no one should neglect "jejuniorum tempora, id est, quarti, septimi et decimi mensis," and that due notice should always be given of each (*Concil. Cloves.* can. 18; Labbe vi. 1578). It is interesting to add here that the introduction of the fasts of the four seasons is referred by a later English council (that of Aenham [1009 A.D.], the locality of which appears to be unknown,) to Gregory the Great, "et jejunia quatuor temporum, quae *Imbren* vocant et caetera omnia prout sanctus Gregorius imposuit genti Anglorum, conservantur" (*Concil. Aenham.* can. 16; Labbe ix. 792).

Among other evidence in favour of this theory may be mentioned an epistle in the False Decretals bearing the name of pope Callistus (ob. 223 A.D.), which orders that to the three already existing fasts, a fourth should be added. Now it may be reasonably argued that the author, Isidore, put the matter in accordance with what he himself believed to be the state of the case, and that thus we obtain an insight into the tradition existing in his time (circa 800 A.D.). A similar remark as to Callistus, occurs in a MS. of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, in the Ambrosian library. Although the statement is of course false, still the origin of the forgery may have been that the writer wished to embody what he himself believed to be the fact, namely, that the fourth (spring) fast was added on later. A capitulary also of Ahyto or Atto, bishop of Vercellae about 945 A.D., mentions the three fasts in a similar way (*Patrol.* cxxxiv. 43).

Not only does this doubt exist as to the origin of the spring fast, but there seems much reason for supposing that at one time it did not necessarily fall in Lent at all, but was fixed in the first week in March, though afterwards as a matter of convenience it was fixed within Lent; always; also the summer fast was at one time placed in the second week of June, and therefore did not necessarily fall at Pentecost. The council of Mainz, it will have been observed, speaks of the fast as occurring in the first week of March, Lent not being mentioned at all; similarly also for the summer fast. So too the *Ordo Romanus*, "in primo mense (i.e. March) quarta et sexta feria et Sabbato in prima hebdomada ipsius mensis primum jejunium celebratur. Secundum in quarto mense (i.e. June) in secunda hebdomada ipsius mensis. Tertium jejunium septimi mensis, id est Septembris, tertia hebdomada ipsius mensis. Quartum decimi mensis, id est Decembris, quarta hebdomada ante Natalem Domini" (i. 33, ed. Hittorp; cf. also Rabanus Maurus *de Inst. Cler.* ii. 24; and Amalarius *de Eccl. off.* ii. 1). Again in many ancient sacramentaries we have many things pointing to the same result; e.g. in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*, we find a notice "Istae orationes quar

sequantur primo Sabbato in mense primo sunt dicendae" (*Patrol.* lxxiv. 1069, and cf. others cited by Muratori, p. 26). One more example may suffice: the council of Aix la Chapelle (817 A.D.), orders that no fast should be in the week of Pentecost, "nisi statuti fuerint dies jejunii" (*Conc. Aquisgran.* can. 51; Labbe vii. 1511). Consequently, while the summer fast might fall in the week of Pentecost, it did not necessarily do so. It seems therefore not unreasonable to infer that at one time the church celebrated the fasts of the four seasons according to this rule, a change being subsequently made to the present plan.

We must now refer to the Ember seasons as times specially fixed for the ordinations of the clergy. We have before said that they were in all probability fixed at these times from the solemnity attaching to them, and it is noticeable that we find no trace of such a connexion earlier than the time of Gelasius, who enjoins "ordinationes etiam presbyterorum et diaconorum nisi certis temporibus et diebus exercere non debent, id est quarti mensis jejunio, septimi et decimi, sed et etiam Quadragesimalis initii ac mediana Quadragesimae die sabbati jejunio circa vesperam noverint celebrandas" (*Epist. 9 ad Episcopos Lucaniae et Bruttiorum*, c. 11; *Patrol.* lix. 52). It will be observed that two periods in Lent are specified here, a piece of evidence in favour of Muratori's view that the spring fast is Lent itself.

The *Gelasian Sacramentary* also furnishes a form for this ordinance, which is headed, "Ordo qualiter in Romana sedis apostolicae ecclesia presbyteri, diaconi vel subdiaconi eligendi sunt, mensis i. iv. vii. et x. Sabbatorum die in xii. lectionibus . . ." (*Patrol.* lxxiv. 1069). Again, the *Gregorian Sacramentary* enjoins that the greater orders are to be conferred only "in Sabbatis duodecim lectionum per quatuor tempora" (*Greg. Sac.* 219, and cf. Menard's note). The same order is laid down in the Pontifical of Egbert, archbishop of York from 732-766 A.D. (p. 8, ed. Surtees Society).

The irregularity as to the time of the Ember seasons evidently continued down to a late period. Thus the plan laid down by the council of Mainz is repeated two hundred and fifty years after (1072 A.D.), by a council of Rouen (*Concil. Rothom.* can. 9; Labbe ix. 1227); and the frequency with which conciliar rules occur on the subject prove how unsettled the matter was. (See e.g. the regulations of the council of Seligenstadt [1022 A.D., can. 2; Labbe ix. 845], of those of Placentia [1095 A.D., can. 14; *ib.* x. 504], and Clermont [can. 27; *ib.* 508], and even of Oxford [1222 A.D., can. 8; *ib.* xi. 274], in the very last of which we still meet with the mention of *Martii prima hebdomada*.) The system followed in later centuries is ordinarily referred to the rule as laid down in the councils of Placentia and Clermont.

It may be well very briefly to sum up our results. The observance of the Ember seasons is purely a western institution, there being no certain trace of it whatever in the eastern church. It was doubtless at first a rite merely of the local Roman church, whence it gradually spread throughout the west, and established itself in Gaul and Spain by the eighth century, and in England possibly earlier, through its special connection with Gregory.

CHRIST. ANT.

It is perhaps not impossible that the development of the practice in the Roman church may have been something to this effect. Fasts at the times of Lent, Pentecost, and the Nativity, are certainly very ancient; the periods of these would roughly correspond with three of the four seasons, and thus some bishop of Rome, Leo or one of his predecessors, may have conceived the idea of making them symbolize the return of the seasons, and so added the one necessary to complete the four. It would soon come to pass then that they would be spoken of as originally ordained with that view. The length of each fast having been more or less settled, and the fasts being now more specially associated with the seasons, the spring and summer fasts would come more and more to be viewed independently of Lent and Pentecost, and hence they would fall occasionally outside these seasons. Finally, the inconveniences arising from such irregularities may have caused the ultimate settlement of the matter in its present form.

For the matter of the foregoing article, I am especially indebted to Muratori's *De iv. Temporum jejuniis disquisitio* (in his *Anecdota*, vol. i. 246-266; Mediolani 1697); also to Bingham's *Antiquities of the Church*, book xxi. ch. 2, and Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Katholischen Kirche*, vol. v. part 2, 133 sqq. Reference may also be made to Valfredus, *De usu et institutione jejunii quatuor temporum*, Bononiae, 1771. [R. S.]

#### EMBLEM. [SYMBOL.]

EMBOLISMUS, also EMBOLIS, EMBO-LUM, (1) an inserted or intercalated prayer; the name given to the prayer which in almost all ancient liturgies follows the Lord's Prayer, founded on one or both of the two last petitions. It is so called because it is interposed here, and what had been already asked in the Lord's Prayer is expanded, and it is more clearly expressed what evils we seek to be delivered from, viz. past, present, and future, together with the saints by whose intercession we strengthen our prayer, viz. the B. V. Mary, St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Andrew (Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* ii. c. 15 § 2). Amalarius (A.D. 810) says of it, "in consummatione orationis venit clausula universas petitiones et preces nostras collecta brevitate concludens" (*Amalar. De Eccl. Offic.* iii. 29). The *Embolismus* was usually repeated by the priest in a low voice, symbolizing the silence during the period that our Lord lay in the grave; but in the Ambrosian rite it was always pronounced aloud (Macri, *Hierolox.* s. v.). This practice, which has left very faint traces in the Western church, being reduced in the Roman and Ambrosian rites to "Libera nos quaesumus Domine ab omni malo," holds a more important place in Oriental liturgies. The *Embolismus* is not, however, found in the liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, but appears in those of St. James, St. Mark, and Theodore the Interpreter, as well as in the Armenian, Mozarabic, and Coptic St. Basil. As examples of the shorter *Embolismus* we give that of the church of Jerusalem, "And lead us not into temptation, O Lord, the Lord of Hosts, who knowest our infirmity; but deliver us from the Evil One, and his works, and every assault and will of his, for the sake of Thy Holy name which is called upon our lowliness" (*Asseman.* vol. v. p. 51), and the Syriac St. James,

"O Lord our God, lead us not into temptation which we devoid of strength are not able to bear, but also with the temptation make a way of escape, that we may be able to bear it, and deliver us from evil through Jesus Christ," &c. (Renaud. vol. ii. p. 40).

(Neale, *Eastern Church*, part i. 1, p. 513; 2, pp. 627-629; Scudamore, *Notit. Euchar.* p. 572; Binterim, *Denkwürd.* iv. 3, p. 465; Macri, *Hierolex.*; Ducange, *Glossar.* s. v.) [E.V.]

(2) *Embolismus* also designates the excess of the solar year over twelve lunar months, commonly called the EPACT. See Durandus, *Rationale*, viii. 10. (Ducange, s. v.) [C.]

**EMBOLOS.** A covered portico or cloister; in ecclesiastical language a cloister surrounding the external walls of a church, serving as an ambulatory in hot, rainy, and dirty weather, and also affording a convenient passage for the priests and ministers of the church from the *bema* and *diaconicum* to the *narthex*, used at Constantinople by the patriarch when he proceeded to wash feet in the *narthex*. Codinus speaks of these cloisters being vaulted, and Goar of their walls being ornamented with mosaic pictures. Such porticos ran along the N. and S. sides of the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople (Ducange, *Constan. Christian.* lib. iii. c. 16), and surrounded the churches of St. Michael at Anaplis, and the Deipara at Jerusalem, on all sides but the east (Procop. *de Aedific.* lib. i. c. 8, lib. v. c. 6). It was in "the right *embolos*" of St. Sophia—that the summary of the proceedings of the so-called eighth general council, that of Constantinople in 870, were drawn up (Labbe, *Concil.* viii. 1421). In Moschus (*Prut. Spiritual.* § 66 apud Coteler. *Eccl. Graec. Monum.* ii. 390) we read of an archimandrite named George, who buried in "the right *embolos*" of a church he was erecting, the body of an ascetic who had appeared to him in a dream and warned him where he would find his corpse.

(Goar, *Eucholog.* p. 627; Allatus, *de Templis*, Epist. ii. § 4; Ducange, *Gloss. Graec.*) [E.V.]

**EMERENTIANA**, virgin, martyr at Rome; commemorated Jan. 23 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**EMERITENSE CONCILIUM.** [MERIDA, COUNCIL OF.]

**EMILIANUS.** (1) Martyr in Lower Armenia with Dionysius and Sebastian; commemorated Feb. 8 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr in Numidia, with Agapius and Secundinus, bishops; commemorated April 29 (*Mart.* Adonis, Usuardi).

(3) Martyr at Dorostorum; commemorated July 18 (*Mart.* Usuardi).

(4) Deacon, martyr at Cordova with Hieremias; commemorated Sept. 17 (*Mart.* Usuardi).

(5) Presbyter and confessor in Tarragona; commemorated Nov. 12 (*Ib.*)

(6) Confessor in Africa; commemorated Dec. 6 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**EMILIUS.** (1) Martyr in Africa, with Castus; commemorated May 22 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi, *Cal. Carth.*).

(2) Martyr in Sardinia; commemorated May 28 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(3) Martyr at Capua; commemorated Oct. 6 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**EMITHERIUS**, martyr with Celedonius at Calagurris; commemorated March 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**EMPHOTION** (*Ἐμφότιον*) is one of the names for the white robe (*ἀναβόλιον*) with which persons were invested at baptism. The name is no doubt derived from the "enlightening" attributed to the baptismal ceremony. See BAPTISM, pp. 156, 163. [C.]

**EMPHYTEUSIS** (*Ἐμφύτευσις*), a manner of letting real property, at first confined to waste lands requiring much outlay to bring them under cultivation, but afterwards applied to any real property.

Emphyteusis is a contract by which the beneficial ownership of real property (*res immobilis*) is transferred by the proprietor to another, either for a term of not less than ten years, or for a life or lives, or in perpetuity, in consideration of an annual payment. It differs from mere letting (*locatio*), in that by emphyteusis beneficial ownership is transferred for the term, while by letting only the use and enjoyment of produce is transferred; in that its use is confined to real property; and in that it cannot be for a less term than ten years. It differs from feudal tenure (*feodum*), in that it requires periodical payments, not personal service, to be given to the lord or proprietor.

Emphyteusis is either ecclesiastical or lay. Ecclesiastical emphyteusis is a contract by which property belonging to a church, monastery, or other religious foundation, is granted. This differs from lay emphyteusis [See SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQ. s. v.] principally in that it requires the assent of the bishop, and must clearly be for the benefit of the church or foundation which grants it; a provision no doubt intended to check the alienation of church property by ecclesiastical persons. [ALIENATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY: PROPERTY OF THE CHURCH.]

(Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, s. v. "Emphyteusis.") [C.]

**EMPRESMUS** (*Ἐμπρησμός*), the great conflagration; commemorated Sept. 1 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EMUNITAS.** [IMMUNITIES.]

**ENAFOTA, ENAFODIA** (*Ἐναφότα*). In the *Liber Pontificalis*, we read that pope Paschal gave to a church "canistra enafota ex argento duo, pens. lib. x." two coronae of nine lights, weighing ten pounds. And Valentine II. gave "canistra enafodia duo pens. lib. xv." Compare CANISTER, CORONA, EXAFOTA. (Ducange, s. v.) [C.]

**ENCAENIA.** [DEDICATION-FESTIVAL.]

**ENCHANTMENT.** [MAGIC.]


**ENCHEIRION** (*Ἐγχείριον*), the napkin with which the priest wipes his hands, worn at the girdle. Towards the end of the letter of Nicephorus of Constantinople to pope Leo (in the *Acta Conc. Ephes.* p. 313, ed. Commelin, 1591), we read of a stole and an encheirion embroidered with gold. It is described by Germanus of Constantinople (*Theoria Myst.* p. 150,



ed. Paris, 1560) thus: "The encheirion, which hangs to the girdle, is the napkin which wipes his hands; and to have a napkin at the girdle is typical of him who washed his hands and said, 'I am innocent' (Matt. xxvii. 24)." (Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v.) [C.]


**ENCOLPION** (Ἐγκόλπιον, that which is worn on the breast), the name anciently given to small caskets worn round the necks of the faithful, containing usually either relics or a copy of the Gospels.

The use of these portable reliquaries is of the highest antiquity; Chrysostom (*Quod Christus sit Deus*, p. 571 E, ed. Ben.) speaks of particles of the true Cross being suspended from the necks both of men and women, enclosed in gold.



In 1571 two such reliquaries, made of gold, were found in tombs belonging to the ancient cemetery of the Vatican; they are square in form, and are furnished with rings which indicate their use; on one side they bear the monogram of Christ, between the A and Ω (see woodcut). These probably date from the 4th century.

The pectoral cross worn by bishops was also called encolpion. The oldest specimen now



existing is one which was found not long since upon the breast of a corpse in the basilica of St. Laurence, outside the walls. It came to light in clearing the interior of that church, and we are indebted to De Rossi for a careful drawing of it (*Bulletino*, Apr. 1863). On one side it bears the inscription, EMMANOVHA [Emmanuel] NO-

BISCVM DEVS; on the other, the following

words, addressed apparently to Satan: CRVX EST VITA MIHI || MORS INIMICK TIBI; a cavity closed by a screw appears to have been intended for relics. Reliquaries in the form of a cross are first mentioned by Gregory the Great. He sent one of them to queen Theodelinda with a fragment of the true cross; this still exists at Monza, and is used by the provost of the ancient church in that city when he officiates pontifically. An engraving of it may be found in Frisi's *Memorie della Chiesa Monzese* (p. 52). Two amulets given to this princess by the same pontiff for the use of her children are still preserved among the celebrated treasures of Monza, one of which contains a piece of the true cross, the other a fragment of the Gospels (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* xiv. 12). Engravings of these objects are given by Mozzoni (*Tavole cron. della stor. eccl.* vol. vii. p. 79). The same volume of the same work also contains (pp. 77 and 84) drawings of other reliquaries of the highest interest—namely, some of the vases in which oil from the sacred lamps of the tombs of the martyrs had been sent by Gregory to Theodelinda. [AMPULLA.]

From the same pope we also learn (*Epist.* i. 36; vii. 26) that filings from St. Peter's chains were sometimes enclosed in small golden keys. He himself had sent one of these consecrated keys to Childebert, king of the Franks, to wear hung from his neck "as a protection from all evils" — "Claves sancti Petri, in quibus de vinculis catenarum ejus inclusum est, excellentiae vestrae direximus quae collo vestro suspensae a malis vos omnibus tueantur" (*Epist.* vi. 6). An illustrious Gaul named Dinamius also received, from the same pontiff, a small cross of gold, containing a similar relic (*Epist.* iii. 33)—"Transmisimus autem B. Petri apostoli benedictionem crucem parvulam, cui de catenis ejus beneficia sunt inserta." [EULOGIAE.]

Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople († 828), speaks of an encolpion set in gold, one side of which was formed of crystal, the other of enamel (εἰκονισμένη δι' ἐγκαύσεως); containing another encolpion, in which fragments of the true cross were arranged in a pattern (ἐντετυπωμένοι) (*Acta Conc. Ephes.*, pp. 312, 313, ed. Commelin, 1591).

The whole subject of these reliquaries might receive abundant illustration from the records and the remains of mediaeval antiquity, were that period within the scope of the present work. [See AMULET.]

(Meursius's *Glossarium* and Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v. Ἐγκόλπιον; De la Cerda, *Adversaria Sacra*, c. 36 § 7; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chrét.*) [C.]

## ENCYCLICAL LETTERS

(Ἐπιστολαὶ ἐγκύκλιοι, γράμματα ἐγκύκλια). Letters of a circular nature, not addressed to a particula-

person or community; as, the Catholic Epistle (Oecumenius on St. James i.). The letters in which the members of a council signified their conclusions to all the churches were called encyclical; and Nicephorus Callisti (*Hist.* xvi. 3) speaks of the encyclical letters (ἐγκύκλια γράμματα) which the emperor Basiliscus wrote against the fourth council (Chalcedon, A.D.

451), addressed to all the bishops of the church. The same writer (c. 4) speaks of divine and apostolic encyclos (ἐγκύκλιος). The circulars of Basilicas just referred to are styled by Evagrius (H.E. III. 4) ἐγκύκλιος; συλλαβή; an encyclical letter of Photius is mentioned (ib. v. 3).

It is to be observed, that the phrase ἐγκύκλιος γράμματα sometimes (as Euseb. H.E. vi. 18) denotes those subjects which the Greeks included in the "circle of the sciences," or cyclopaedia. (Saicer's *Theoriae*, s. v. Ἐγκύκλιος.) [C.]

**ENDOWMENT.** The property given by the founder of a church for the maintenance of the edifice and of the clerks who served it was called *dos ecclesiae* or endowment. Justinian (*Novel* 67), compelled those who built churches also to endow them; and without a competent provision for their maintenance, no clerks were to be ordained to any church (*Conc. Ephem.*, A.D. 517, c. 25); whoever desired to have a parish church (diocesan) on his estate was to set apart a sufficient landed endowment for its clerks (*Conc. Aurel.* iv., A.D. 541, c. 33); a bishop was not to consecrate a church until the endowment of it had been regularly secured by a deed or charter (*Conc. Bragar.* ii. [iii.], A.D. 572, c. 5); founders of churches were to understand, that they had no further authority over property which they had given to the church, but that both the church and its endowment were at the disposition of the bishop, to be employed according to the canons (*Conc. Tolet.* iv., A.D. 633, c. 33).

In the ninth council of Toledo, A.D. 655, a special provision was made (c. 5), that a bishop was not to confer on any monastic church which he might found within his diocese more than a fiftieth part of the funds at his disposal; nor on any non-monastic church, or church destined for his own burial-place, more than one hundredth part of the revenues of the diocese.

If one who held a "fiscus," or *shof*, from the king, built and endowed churches, the bishop was desired to procure the royal confirmation of the gift (*Conc. Tolet.* iii., A.D. 589, c. 15).

See **ALMS**; **BENEFICE**; **CHURCHES**, **MAINTENANCE OF**, p. 388; **PROPERTY OF THE CHURCH**.

During the period with which we are concerned, the **BISHOP** [p. 233], with the advice and assistance of his presbytery, took charge of church endowments.

(Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchen-Lexicon*, s. v. *Dotatut*; Ducange, s. v. *Dos Ecclesiae*.) [C.]

**ENERGUMENI.** [DEMONIACS.]

**ENOCH**, the patriarch, translation of; commemorated Ter 27 = Jan. 23 (*Cal. Ethiop.*); July 19 (*Cal. Copt.*). [W. F. G.]

**ENTALMA** (Ἐντάλμα, ἐντάλμα γράμματα), the document by which a bishop confers on a monk the privilege of hearing confessions (Daniel, *Codes*, iv. 588). The form of such a letter is given by Gear, *Ecclolog.* p. 300. [C.]

**ENTHRONIZATION.** 1. The solemn placing of a bishop on his throne. See **BISHOP**, p. 224.

2. The word *ἐνθρονισμός* is also used to designate the placing or "enthroning" of relics of the saints in the altar of a church on consecration [**CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES**]. Hence *relii ἐνθρονισμένοι* designates a regularly consecrated church and not a mere oratory. Thus Germa-

nus (in Daniel's *Codes*, iv. 701) speaks of a church as dedicated in the name of martyrs and consecrated ever (or by virtue of) their holy relics (*ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀνδράσιν ἀσκήσαντες ἐθρονισμένοι*).

3. The word *ἐνθρονισμός* is perhaps sometimes used to designate the installation of a presbyter in his church (Reiske on Constant. Porphyrog. *De Caesar.* 617). [C.]

**ENTHUSIASTAE** (ἐνθουσιастαί). Those who pretended to prophesy by the motion of an indwelling daemon which they thought to be the Holy Spirit (see Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 11; Suidas, *sub voce* *ἐνθουσι*; Bingham, *Ant.* 16, 5, 4).

In A.D. 428 Theodosius and Valentinian ordained that these heretics (with many others) "*nequaquam in Romano solo conveniendi orationibus habent facultatem*." This constitution was inserted in the Theodosian Code (16, 5, 25), and in that of Justinian (1, 5, 5), but with the reading (if it be the correct one) "*nequaquam in Romano loco conveniendi orationibus habent facultatem*." The same exclusion is decreed in general terms by Justinian in his 37th *Novell.*, "*nulla omnino sacrosancta domus est locum orationis habet*." [L. B.]

**ENTRANCE** (Ἐνέστροφος). Two of the most remarkable ceremonies of Eastern liturgies are the Lesser and the Greater Entrance—that of the Word and that of the Sacrament.

1. *The Lesser Entrance* is the bearing in of the book of the gospels in solemn procession. In the *Liturgy of St. Chrysostom* (c. 17, p. 343, Daniel) after the prayer of the third antiphon (our 'Prayer of St. Chrysostom') the rubric runs: "Then the priest and the deacon, standing before the Holy Table, make three genuflections (*προσκυνησάμενοι*): Then the priest, taking the Holy Book of the Gospels, gives it to the deacon; and so, going out by the north side, with lights going before them, they make the Lesser Entrance." That is, the deacon and priest pass from the sanctuary into the chapel of the prothesis, which is to the north of it, and so out into the body of the church, where, by a devious path, they return to the Holy Doors, which are open; the volume, often decorated with great magnificence, is laid on the Holy Table, whence it is again taken to the ambo when the gospel is to be read.

The rubric in St. Mark's liturgy (Dan. iv. 142) is simply, "*καὶ γέγρεται ὁ σταθὸς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*."

This "Entrance" corresponds to the carrying of the gospel by the deacon to the ambo or rood-loft in the Western church, once a rite of great importance; for the book was preceded not only by tapers but by a crucifix (Durandus, *Rational.* iv. 24, 16). Compare **ALLELUIA**, **GRADUAL**.

In the Coptic St. Basil, the Greater Entrance precedes the Lesser. See below.

2. *The Greater Entrance*.—This ceremony has probably, like others, been developed from simple beginnings into very great prominence and magnificence.

The liturgy of St. James (c. 17, Daniel iv. 96) simply alludes in passing to the bringing in of the elements: "the priest bringing in the Holy Gifts says the following prayer." St. Mark (c. 10, Dan. iv. 146) is even more vague: "the

Holy Things (τὰ ἁγία) are brought into the sanctuary, and the priest prays as follows." Similarly the Mozarabic (Dan. i. 67), "while the choir chants *Alleluia*, the priest offers [i. e. places on the altar] the Host and Chalice, with the prayers following." In the Armenian rite (Dan. iv. 460) the celebrant lies prostrate before the altar while the Great Entrance is made; in this rite (anomalously) the elements are spoken of as the body and blood of Christ before consecration (Neale, *East. Ch. Int.* 428).

In the much more developed rit. of Constantinople (*Lit. Chrysost.* Neale, u. s. 373), after the chanting of the Cherubic Hymn, the ceremony proceeds as follows. During the previous part of the eucharistic office, the elements have remained on the table in the chapel of the prothesis. At the proper point, the deacon censes the altar and the sanctuary, and then goes before the priest into the prothesis. The priest then lifts the "aer," or covering, from the chalice and paten, and lays it on the deacon's shoulder, and then places upon it the paten, covered with the *ASTERISK* and veil. The deacon takes hold of these with his left hand, bearing the censer in his right; the priest takes the chalice and follows the deacon, and so, preceded by tapera, they move round to the Holy Doors, as in the Lesser Entrance. In great churches, where there are dignified clergy and many attendants, this procession is one of great magnificence. Where there is but a single priest and no deacon, he bears the paten on his shoulder, supporting it by his left hand, and the chalice in his right hand before his breast.

In the Coptic St. Basil, the Great Entrance is made at the very beginning of the liturgy; the directions for it are very curious and minute. "The priest goes to the Takaddemet [Prothesis] from which he shall take the lamb [ELEMENTA, p. 600], looking attentively that there be no flaw in it. . . . When he hath all that he needs, the lamb, the wine, and the incense, . . . he takes the lamb in his hand and wipes it lightly, as Christ the Lord was first washed with water before He was presented to Simeon the priest; then he shall bear it round to the altar in his hands, as Simeon bare Him round the Temple. At last the priest shall lay it down on the altar and shall place it on the paten, which signifies the cradle; and shall cover it with a linen cloth, as the Virgin did at His Nativity" (Renaudot, *Lit. Orient.* i. 186). A deacon seems to have borne the cruet.

Compare INTROIT.

[C.]

**ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.** This event in our Lord's life is very frequently represented in the earlier art of the Christian Church, occurring on some of the first sarcophagi, though not, as far as the present writer knows, in fresco or mosaic in the catacombs or elsewhere, excepting in an ancient mosaic of the Vatican (Blanchini *Demonstr. Aust. Sac. Sac.* i. tav. 2, No. 17), and one from the basilica at Bethlehem, reproduced by Martigny (p. 331) from Count de Vogüé (*Les Églises de la Terre Sta.* pl. v.). The earliest MS. representation of it is probably that in the Rabula or Laurentian Evangelary. The treatment is almost always the same; the Lord is

mounted on the ass, sometimes accompanied by her foal, and the multitude with their palm-branches follow, or lay their garments before Him (Aringhi t. i. pp. 277-329; ii. p. 159 and *passim*; Bottari, tav. xxi.). His right hand is generally raised in the act of blessing. The



From the Sarcophagus of Paulus Romanus.

multitude frequently raise their hands in thanksgiving. In one of the oldest MSS. of the New Testament in existence, the Gregorian Evangelary of St. Cuthbert (*Paleographia Sacra*) the Lord is represented mounted on an ass, and bearing a large whip—evidently with reference to the scourge of small cords used in the expulsion of buyers and sellers from the temple. There is a certain variety in the examples taken from different carvings. In Bottari (i. tav. xvi. xxii. xxxix.) Zaccheus is represented in the "fig or sycamore tree" behind the Lord, as if to call attention to the beginning of His last journey at Jericho. In the last example the sycamore and palm branches are carefully and well cut. In i. tav. 40, garments are being strewn before the Lord (as in the others). See also vol. ii. tav. 88, 89; iii. tav. 133. In one instance, without Zaccheus, the colt accompanies the ass (iii. 134). The small stature of Zaccheus is often dwelt on. Or the figure may represent a person in the act of cutting down branches. [R. St. J. T.]

**ENVY—HOW CENSURED.** Envy was always reckoned a diabolical sin, and one of the first magnitude (Chrys. *Hom.* 41 in *Matth.*; Cyprian, *De Zelo et Livore*, p. 223); but there are no distinctive penalties attached to it, inasmuch as before it could bring a man under public discipline, it required to be displayed in some outward and vicious action, which received its appropriate punishment (Bingham, *Ant.* 16, 14, 1; Thom. Aq. *Summa* 2, 2, qu. 36). [I. B.]

**EPACT**, *ἐπακτός*, *sc. ἡμέρας*; Lat. *epactos*, in Mediaeval writers, *adjectiones Lunae*; the number of days required to make up the lunar year to the solar:—and so the numeral of the moon's age on the 1st January. Or we may say, with Scaliger, on the 1st March, which

\* There is an evident confusion here between Simeon and the high-priest.

comes to the same thing, and has the advantage of escaping the ambiguity of Leap year. In the Easter canon of Dionysius Exiguus, the epact meant the numeral of the moon's age on the 22nd March.

The old Latin cycles of 84 years, of which we have an example in Ideler, ii. 249, indicated Easter by means of the epacts of the 1st January, and the day of the week on which the 1st January fell.

The method of determining the months (lunar), was as follows. For the first month of the year that month was taken, whose age was expressed by the epact. The day of December on which it commenced is found by subtracting the epact (when more than one) from thirty-three. The first month was always counted full, then hollow and full succeeded by turns, so that the last month in the year in a common lunar year was hollow, in an intercalary year full. From the last begins the new moon of the following year.

The Easter new moon being found, Easter-day was, according to the Latin rules, that Sunday which fell on or next after the 16th of the moon, not therefore later than the 22nd of the moon. The choice of the month was determined thus. New moon must not be earlier than the 5th March, and full moon not later than the 21st; the first of these rules sometimes having to give way, to avert the violation of the latter.

The following rule is given for the 1st January epact, viz., multiply the Golden Number by eleven, and divide the product by thirty; the remainder is the epact. But this rule will not give the epacts mentioned above, which were constructed as we have just described—with a saltus lunae, or addition of twelve after the 19th year of the cycle, &c.

For the determination of Easter according to the Alexandrian rules, with which the later Roman rules agreed, see under EASTER.

The elaborate system of epacts afterwards devised by Lilius, and Clavius, belongs to the system of the Gregorian calendar. [L. H.]

**EPAGATUS**, martyr at Lyons, under Marcus Aurelius, with Photinus bishop, Zacharias presbyter, and others; commemorated June 2 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EPAPHRAS**, bishop of Colossae, and martyr; commemorated July 19 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EPAON, COUNCIL OF** (*Epaonensis concilium*), held A.D. 517 at a town in Burgundy, whose name is thought to have been preserved in the modern village of Iene on the Rhone. It was attended by twenty-five bishops at the joint summons of Avitus, bishop of Vienne, and Viventolus, bishop of Lyons, who presided. Forty canons on discipline are given to it in its acts; but two more, called canons of Epaon by Egbert of York, and by Gratian, are not among them. By the 4th of them, bishops priests and deacons are forbidden to keep hawks or dogs for hunting. By the 9th, no abbot may preside over two monasteries. By the 26th no altar, not of stone, may be consecrated with chrism. By the 39th slaves, taking sanctuary, that have committed heinous crimes, are only to be let off corporal punishment. Most of these regulations had previously become law elsewhere (*Mansi*, viii. 535 and seq.). [K. S. FF.]

## EPHESUS (COUNCILS OF)

### EPARCHIA. [PROVINCE.]

**EPARCHUS**, monk, confessor at Angoulême; commemorated July 1 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

[W. F. G.]

**EPARECHIUS**, commemorated with Severianus Oct. 29 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

**EPENDYTES** (*ἐπενδυτής*). The *ependytes*, the "fisher's coat" of St. Peter (John xii. 7), was a kind of cloak used especially by monks, and, as the etymology would seem to indicate, worn over another garment. Thus e.g. in the Græco-Latin Glossary cited by DuCange (s. v. *epidocra*), the Greek word is rendered *Inculta* (leg. *Instrata* or *Instita*) *hoc superaria*. Abn Augustinus naturally enough speaks of *ἐπενδυτής* as equivalent to *superindumentum* (*Quæst. in Jud.* 41; iii. 938, ed. Gaume). Suidas also observes this distinction (*ἐπενδυτής ὁ ἐπενδυόμενος ὑποδύτης, ἐπενδυτής δὲ ὁ ἐπὶ τῷ ὑποδύτῃ*). It is thus surprising that some should have taken it to mean an under-garment, as e.g. the Lexicon of Zonaras (col. 788, ed. Tittmann), which defines it as *ὁ ἐπὶ ὑποδύτῃ ὑδύτης, ὅς ἐστιν ἐπενδυόμενος ὑποδύτης*. Athanasius mentions this dress as worn by St. Antony (*Vita S. Anton.*, c. 46; i. 631, ed. Bened.), and Jerome refers to it in the case of Hilarion (*Vita S. Hilar.* c. 4; ii. 15, ed. Vallardi). It appears, at any rate in the east, to have been made of skins; thus the *ἐπενδυτής* of St. Antony is frequently mentioned, and Jerome describes that of Hilarion as *pellionus*. For other references to the dress, see Pseudo-Athanas. *de Virginitate*, c. 11 (ii. 116), and Basil of Seleucia. *De vita S. Theodor.* l. 63 (*Patrol. Gr.* lxxxv 516).

The *ependytes* would appear to be the dress worn by the two figures (*ADONIS* AND *SENNAN*), victims of the Decian persecution) who are being crowned by the Saviour in a fresco in the cemetery of Pontianus, on the *Via Portuensis* near Rome. [See p. 8.] [R. S.]

### EPHEMERIS. [CALENDAR, p. 256.]

**EPHESUS (COUNCILS OF)**.—(1) A.D. 197 under Polycrates its bishop, on the Easter question. His letter to Victor and the Roman church is in part preserved by Eusebius (v. 24), shewing that it had been customary there, down from the days of St. John the Apostle, to keep Easter day on the 14th of the moon (*Mansi*, i. 719-24). The interest of this fragment is enhanced from its having been translated by Rufinus and St. Jerome.

(2) A.D. 245, otherwise called Asiatic, against the errors of Noëtus (*Mansi*, i. 789-90).

(3) A.D. 431, the third general, held in the church there dedicated to St. Mary, soon after the feast of Pentecost in the month of June, to sit in judgment on Nestorius patriarch of Constantinople, who contended that while the blessed Virgin might with propriety be styled the mother of Christ, she could not and ought not to be styled the mother of God (*Theotocus*). In other words he looked upon Christ as a compound of two persons, as well as two natures, instead of two natures, the Divine and Human, hypostatically joined together in the single Person of the Son of God. The controversy on this point culminated in the celebrated letter addressed by St. Cyril in synod to Nestorius, ending with twelve anathemas, to which he is called



upon to subscribe (Mansi, iv. 1067-84), and the twelve counter anathemas which formed his only reply to it (*ib.* p. 1099).

To end the dispute, the emperors Theodosius the Younger and Valentinian issued orders for the meeting of a general council, to which the letter summoning St. Cyril himself is still extant. It is dated Nov. 19, A.D. 430, and directs him to repair to Ephesus by the Feast of Pentecost ensuing. It forbids the introduction of any innovation privately till then, and directs that all the disputes that have produced so much strife shall be there settled canonically. Copies of this letter had been sent to all metropolitans. The council met accordingly for its first session June 22, as is stated in its sentence deposing Nestorius (comp. Bev. ii. 103) which was the first thing done: St. Cyril heading the list of the bishops present, as bishop of Alexandria first, and then as vice-gerent of the archbishop of Rome, Celestine: Juvenal bishop of Jerusalem came next: Memnon of Ephesus followed. About 160 were there when they commenced: 198 subscribed.

It met for its sixth session, July 22, to publish what it had defined on doctrine. First it recited the Nicene Creed; secondly, those passages from the fathers which had been quoted in its first session; and lastly, its own definitive sentence, that no other profession of faith but that of Nicaea should be framed or propounded to any desirous of coming over to the communion of the church from Paganism, Judaism, or any heresy whatsoever. Bishops and clergy framing or propounding any other were deposed, and laymen anathematised. What induced the council "to define" this, was a case just then brought under its consideration by Charisius, steward and priest of the church of Philadelphia, shewing that two priests who had come thither from Constantinople had been procuring subscriptions to a formula purporting to be the doctrine of the church, but in many respects heterodox. The council condemned all who approved of it. At the seventh and last session, held August 31st, on the petition of Rheginus, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, and two of his suffragans, complaining of attempts made by the bishop of Antioch to ordain in their island, contrary to the canons and established custom, a no less stringent rule was laid down on discipline; "that no bishop may act in any province which has not always been subject to him. . ." [BISHOP, p. 234: DIOCESE.] In most of the Greek collections eight canons are attributed to this council; but only seven by Photius and John Scholasticus, and none at all in the Latin collections. Beveridge shews conclusively (ii. 104) that they were not in fact published as separate canons. The first six, as he points out, form part of a synodical letter addressed by the council to all bishops, presbyters, deacons, and laymen, on the defection of John of Antioch, and were caused by it; being directed against all deserters or despisers of the council, whether favourers of Nestorius, or Celestius the Pelagian, and upholding all who had been deposed by them. Where this letter should come in the acts he omits to explain. It is placed by Mansi without comment at the end of them (iv. 1469-74). Its proper place doubtless is at the end of the fifth session, to the final proceedings of which (*ib.*

1323) it is in effect a corollary. Then the business of the sixth session led to the "definition," since termed improperly the seventh canon; and that of the seventh session to the decree since termed with less impropriety the eighth canon. Most of the principal documents relating to this council are to be found in Mansi, iv. 577 to the end, and v. to p. 1046, too numerous to be specified. Some few more are supplied by Marius Mercator *Opp.* P. ii. (Patrol. xlviii. p. 699 and seq. ed. Migne) Cassian *de Incarn.* (*ib.* l. p. 10 and seq.) Soc. vii. 29-34. Evag. i. 2-7, with Garnier's five Diss. on Theodoret (Patrol. lxxxiv. 89-864).

(4) A.D. 440, under Basil: reversing the appointment of Bassianus to a distant see by Memnon his own predecessor, and giving him episcopal honour and rank at home (Mansi, v. 1199-1204).

(5) A.D. 447 under Dioscorus of Alexandria, when Bassianus its bishop was deposed and Stephen appointed in his room. The council of Chalcedon, however, on considering their case, decided that neither had been canonically consecrated, Oct. 30, A.D. 451 (Mansi, vi. 493-4, and then vii. 271-94).

(6) A.D. 449, Aug. 10, under Dioscorus bishop of Alexandria, convened by the Emperor Theodosius like the last general council, and held in the same church of St. Mary where the last had been; but its acts having been reversed in the first session of the council of Chalcedon, where they are recited at length, it was designated the "robbers' meeting" (*Latrocinialis*, see the title to c. 9, B. i. of Evagrius) and abandoned. It was inspired throughout by the eunuch Chrysaphius, who patronised Eutyches and was hostile to Flavian. There are three letters from the emperor to Dioscorus in reference to its composition. First he was to bring with him ten of his own metropolitans, and ten other bishops distinguished for their learning and orthodoxy, but not more; others having received their summons from the emperor himself similarly. Next he was told that Theodoret had received orders not to appear there, unless invited unanimously by the council when assembled. Another letter bade him admit the archimandrite Barsumas to sit in it as representing all the eastern archimandrites. A third letter assigned him the first place in it, with the archbishops of Jerusalem and Caesarea to support him. St. Leo was likewise summoned from Rome, and sent three representatives, one of whom Julius, bishop of Puteoli, seems to have sat next after Dioscorus. Altogether 128 bishops were present, but several confessed to subscribing through others as being unable to write. Eutyches having been introduced, made profession of his faith, and complained of the treatment he had received from Flavian in the council of Constantinople condemning him. The acts of this council, as well as of the council held five months afterwards to reconsider its sentence, were read out next; his acquittal and restoration followed. Afterwards a petition was received from some monks of his begging that his deposer might be deposed. On this the acts of the sixth session of the third general council were recited, and both Eusebius of Dorylaeum and Flavian of Constantinople deposed, as having contravened the definition respecting the creed that was laid down there

Flavian who was present said at once that he appealed from their sentence. Hilary, the deacon from Rome, "contradicted" it; others accepted it only through misapprehension, as they affirmed at Chalcedon on recanting. Ibas of Edessa, Theodoret of Cyrus, Domnus of Antioch, and several more, were similarly deprived of their sees, as we learn from Evagrius. Liberatus adds (Brev. 12) that great intimidation was practised by the soldiers and monks present, that Eusebius and Flavian were both given into custody, and that the latter died of the injuries which he there received (Mansi, vi. 503-8, and then 587-936). [E. S. Ff.]

EPHESUS, the Seven Holy Children of, or SEVEN SLEEPERS, are commemorated Aug. 4 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

EPHORI. [BISHOP, p. 210.]

EPHPHATHA. [EARS, OPENING OF.]

EPHRAEM. EPHRAIM, or EPHREM.

(1) Syrus, deacon of Edessa, Holy Father; commemorated Ter 7 = Jan. 2 (*Cal. Ethiop.*), Jan. 28 (*Cal. Byzant.*), Hamle 15 = July 9 (*Cal. Ethiop.*), Feb. 1 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*); deposition, July 9 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(2) Bishop and martyr, A.D. 296; commemorated March 7 (*Cal. Byzant.*); one of the martyrs of the CHERSONESUS. [W. F. G.]

EPICLESIS (*Ἐπίκλησις*) = "invocation," generally; but specially the invocation of the Holy Spirit to sanctify the elements displayed on the Holy Table, occurring in Eastern liturgies after the recitation of the Words of Institution.

The evidence of Irenaeus in the second, Firmilian in the third, and of Cyril of Jerusalem and Basil in the fourth century, as to the practice of the church with regard to the Epiclesis, has been already quoted [CANON OF THE LITURGY, p. 269]. To this may be added Chrysostom, *Hom. In Coemeterio* (Opp. ii. 401, ed. Ben.), where is described the priest standing before the table, invoking (*καλῶν*) the Holy Spirit to descend and touch the elements.

Of the liturgical forms, we may take the Clementine (*Constt. Apostt.* viii. 12, § 17) as an early example. The priest beseeches God to send down His Holy Spirit upon the sacrifice, "that He may declare [or make] \* (*ἀποφῆνῃ*) this bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this cup the Blood of Thy Christ, in order that they who partake of it may be confirmed in piety, obtain remission of their sins, be delivered from the devil and his deceits, be filled with the Holy Spirit, be made worthy of Thy Christ, obtain eternal life, Thou being reconciled unto them, O Lord Almighty." Compare the liturgy of St. James, c. 32.

The Epiclesis in the Byzantine liturgy (Chrys. c. 30; Daniel, *Codex Lit.* iv. 359, 360), after praying God to send down the Holy Spirit on the gifts and the worshippers, proceeds, "and make (*ποιήσον*) this Bread the precious Body of Thy Christ, and that which is in this cup the precious Blood of Thy Christ, changing them (*μεταβαλὼν*) by Thy Holy Spirit."

\* Neale (*Tetralogia*, p. xv.) compares, for this sense of the word, Plato's *Protag.* 349 A. See also von Drey, *Ueber die Constit. Apostol.* p. 110; and Hefele, *Beiträge zur Archäol.* ii. 56.

St. Mark (c. 17; Dan. iv. 162) has: "Send forth . . . Thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these loaves, and upon these cups, that He may sanctify and consecrate (*τελειώσῃ*) them, as God Almighty; and may make (*ποιήσῃ*) the bread the Body and the cup the Blood of the New Covenant, of the very Lord and God and Saviour, our Almighty King, Jesus Christ."

Several of the Mozarabic *Post Secrets* contain similar invocations of the Holy Spirit; for instance, that for the second Sunday after Epiphany (Neale, *Eastern Ch.*, Introd. 499) has the following: "We thy servants beseech Thee, that thou wouldest sanctify this oblation by the permixture of Thy Holy Spirit, and wouldest conform it, with full transformation, to the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, that we may merit to be cleansed from the pollution of our sins by this sacrifice, whereby we know that we were redeemed."

"The Syrian churches postponed the oblation until after the Invocation of the Holy Spirit; while in the Jerusalem, Alexandrian, and Constantinopolitan offices it precedes that prayer." (Neale, *u.s.* 500.)

The question, whether the consecration is complete without the Epiclesis, has been much debated in modern times; but for our purpose it is sufficient to observe that an Epiclesis is universal in Oriental liturgies, and common in liturgies influenced by the East, as the Mozarabic; while in liturgies of the Roman type it is altogether wanting. [C.]

EPICTETUS, and companions, martyrs at Rome, A.D. 296; commemorated Aug. 22 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

EPIGONATION (*ἐπιγονάτιον*; also *γονάτιον*, *ὑπογονάτιον*). This ornament, peculiar to the Eastern church, consists of a lozenge-shaped piece of some stiff material, hanging from the girdle on the right side as low as the knee, whence its name. It seems to have been at first, like the maniple in the West, merely a handkerchief, and it apparently continued in this form in the patriarchate of Antioch, as late as the 11th century (Ducange, *Glossarium*, s. v. *ὑπογονάτιον*), and in the Armenian church it has remained thus to the present day (Neale, *Eastern Church*, Introd. p. 311). Writers who delight in finding symbolical reasons for the use of vestments, have connected it either with the towel with which our Lord girded Himself, or more generally with the sword and Christ's victory over death; in connection with which latter idea, Psalm xlv. 3, 4, is repeated on assuming this ornament (*Liturgia S. Chrysostomi*; Goar, *Euchologion*, pp. 59, 60). The epigonation is properly part of the episcopal dress, but is allowed by the rubric in this place to be worn by other ecclesiastics of a certain rank . . . *εἰ ἔστι πρωτοσύγκελλος τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας ἢ ἄλλος τις ἔχων ἀξιοσύνην τὰς* (Goar, *l. c.*, and see his note, p. 112; cf. also the rule as laid down at a much later period by Symeon Thessalonicensis in the 15th century, where the wearing of the epigonation by priests is spoken of as granted *κατὰ δαρεὴν ἀρχιερατικῆν*; Marriott, *Vestiarius Christianus*, p. 171). In one form given by Goar of the consecration of a bishop in the Greek church, we find a mention of this ornament as given to him immo-

diately after a declaration of his faith and the subsequent benediction by the presiding bishop (Goar, p. 310). [R. S.]

**EPILEPTICS.** The 11th council of Toledo (A.D. 675), after mentioning the case of those possessed with demons [DEMONIACS], who are excluded altogether from the service of the altar, speaks separately (c. 13) of the case of those who sometimes fall to the earth from bodily disease, who are excluded from ministering until they can show that they have passed a whole year without such attacks; and desires (c. 14) that persons liable to such attacks should (if possible) not be left alone in the performance of divine offices. These provisions clearly refer to the case of those who are afflicted with epilepsy or (to use the old English name) "falling sickness." [C.]

**EPIMACHIUS**, martyr at Alexandria, with Alexander; commemorated Dec. 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**EPIMACHUS.** (1) Martyr at Rome, with Gordianus, under Julian; commemorated May 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr A.D. 255; commemorated Oct. 31 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EPIMANIKION.** [MANIPLE.]

**EPINIKION.** [SANCTUS.]

**EPIPHANIUS.** (1) Bishop, and martyr in Africa, with Donatus and thirteen others; commemorated April 6 (*Mart. Hieron.*), April 7 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, A.D. 402; commemorated May 12 (*Mart. Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi, Cal. Byzant.*), June 17 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

**EPIPHANY, FESTIVAL OF** (ἡ ἐπιφάνεια, τὰ ἐπιφάνια, ἡ θεοφάνεια, τὰ θεοφάνια; τὰ φῶτα, ἡμέρα τῶν φώτων, τὰ ἅγια φῶτα τῶν ἐπιφανίων; τὰ φαγιφάνια:—*Epiphania, Theophania, Apparitio, Manifestatio, Acceptio, festum trium regum* [magorum, sapientum], *festum stellae; dies heminum; festum lavacri; Bethphaniis, dies natalis virtutum Domini*. The names of this festival in European languages are mainly either (1) as in the case of those of Latin derivation and others, mere reproductions of the Latin name or renderings of it; or (2) refer to the manifestation to the Magi as the three kings, as the Dutch *Drie-koningen-dag*, the Danish *Helligtre-kongersdag*, and an equivalent form in Breton; also the Welsh *Ystyryll*, if, as is not improbable, it is a corruption of the Latin *stella*; or (3) indicate it as the final day of the Christmas festivity, as in the familiar English *Twelfth-day*, the old German *der Zwelfte, Dreizehnde*, or the Swedish *Trettonde-dagen*).

1. *History of Festival.*—It has already been shown in a previous article [CHRISTMAS] that the festival of the Epiphany was originally viewed in the Eastern church as a commemoration of our Saviour's manifestation to the world in a wide sense; including, that is, His Nativity, or His manifestation in the flesh, together with the manifestation of the Trinity at His baptism. In the Western church, on the other hand, so far as the matter can be traced back, the Nativity appears to have been always celebrated as

a separate festival, and in their commemoration of the Epiphany it is the manifestation to the Magi that is mostly dwelt on: and further, Christ's manifestation in yet another sense is associated with these, His Divine power and goodness, as shown in His miracles; primarily the turning of water into wine at Cana of Galilee, and sometimes the feeding of the five thousand. Thus there are, besides the Nativity itself, three manifestations commemorated, variously dwelt on and variously combined in different branches of the church.

In the Eastern church till nearly the end of the 4th century, we find, as has been said, a combined celebration of Christ's Nativity and Baptism on January 6.<sup>a</sup> The date of the severance of the two can be approximately fixed, for Chrysostom refers to it as a matter of merely a few years' standing, in a sermon probably delivered on the Christmas day of 386 A.D. How far back we are to refer the origin of this twofold festival it is not easy to determine, the earliest mention of any kind being the allusion by Clement of Alexandria to the annual commemoration of Christ's baptism by the Basilidians (*Stromata*, lib. i. c. 21).<sup>b</sup> At any rate by the latter part of the 4th century the Epiphany had become one of the most important and venerable festivals in the Eastern church.

It may not unreasonably be assumed that the festival of the Epiphany first took its rise in the east and then passed into the west. This may be argued (1) from the comparatively very early date at which we find a trace of it in the east; (2) from the Greek name by which the Western church as well as the Eastern knows it, while Christmas is designated there by a Latin name; (3) from the nature of the earliest allusions to the existence of a festival of the Epiphany in the west. These it may be well to state somewhat fully.<sup>c</sup>

The earliest instance of all is the reference by Ammianus Marcellinus to the emperor Julian's visit when at Vienne in Gaul to a church, "feriarum die quem celebrantes inense Januario Christiani Epiphania dictitant" (lib. xxi. c. 2); and we find Zonaras, apparently alluding to the same event, speak of it as happening τῆς γενεθλίου Σωτῆρος ἡμέρας ἐφεστηκυίας (*Annal.* xlii. 11). Now if it is remembered that this took place in Gaul, where the church had close affinities with the east, we are perhaps not claiming too much in assuming that the Gallican church at this time celebrated Epiphany and Nativity together on January 6; and we shall subsequently find a confirmation of this view from an ex-

<sup>a</sup> In a passage in one of the spurious sermons once wrongly ascribed to Chrysostom is a mention of the Epiphany as celebrated on the 13th day of the 4th month, κατὰ Ἀσιασούς (*Opp.* vol. vii. App. p. 275). It is not stated who these Asiatics were, but the explanation of the reckoning may probably be found in a comparison with that given by Epiphanius (*Haer.* li. 24).

<sup>b</sup> Neander (*Church History*, i. 346, trans. Rose) considers it probable that this Gnostic sect derived the practice from the Judæo-Christian churches in Palestine.

<sup>c</sup> Besides the instances given above, an early allusion to the Epiphany is found in the *Acta* of Philip, bishop of Heraclea (in Ruinart's *Acta Primorum Martyrum*), who suffered early in the 4th century. It would be unsafe, however, to argue from a passage in a document itself of doubtful date.

amination of the Gallican liturgy, where it is rather the manifestation at the Baptism than that to the Magi that is dwelt on. Again we find a mention of the emperor Valens, in the course of his futile attempt to overawe Basil of Caesarea, entering the church in that place with a great train on the festival of the Epiphany (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xliii. 52). Another early allusion may be mentioned: Augustine (*Serm.* ccii. § 2; vol. v. 1328, ed. Gaume) speaks of the Donatists as refusing to join in the celebration of the Epiphany, "quia nec unitatem amant, nec orientali ecclesiae . . . communicant," obviously pointing to an eastern origin of the festival. We may take this opportunity of remarking that there is no mention of the Epiphany in the Calendar of Bucherius, but in the Cal. Carthaginense we find viii. *Id. Jan. Sanctum Epiphania* (*Patrol.* xiii. 1227).

On these grounds we think it probable that while on the one hand the Eastern church, at first commemorating Nativity and Epiphany as one festival, afterwards in compliance with western, or perhaps, more strictly speaking, Roman, usage, fixed the former on a separate day; so too, the Western church, at first celebrating the Nativity alone, afterwards brought in from the east the further commemoration of the Epiphany, but with the special reference somewhat altered. For the early history of the Epiphany in the Eastern church, and the gradual severance from it of the Nativity, we must again refer to the discussion already given [CHRISTMAS], and it may now be desirable briefly to review further historical notices, arranging them according to the special manifestation of Christ to which they mainly refer.

*a. Manifestation at the Baptism.*—This manifestation of our Saviour as Messiah and as God is the prevailing idea dwelt upon throughout the Eastern church, though in the Western church as a rule this commemoration has been quite secondary to the manifestation to the Magi. References are continually met with in the writings of Chrysostom and others of and after his time to this idea of the festival. Thus Chrysostom, in a homily apparently delivered on December 20, 386 A.D., and therefore after the western plan of celebrating Christmas separately had been introduced, speaks of the Nativity as in a certain sense the parent of all the other great festivals, for, to take the case of the Epiphany, had He not been born—*οὐκ ἂν ἐβαπτίσθη, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὰ θεοφάνια* (*Hom.* 6 in *B. Philogonium*, c. 3; i. 497, ed. Montfaucon). So also in a homily probably delivered on the following Epiphany, 387 A.D. (*Hom. de Baptismo Christi*, c. 2; ii. 369). In another place (*Hom. de Sancta Pentecoste*, c. 1; ii. 458) he says, *τολὺν παρ' ἡμῶν ἐστὶν πρῶτη* (i.e. in the order of the year) *τὰ Ἐπιφάνια*, where Montfaucon (*Monitum in Hom.*) gives the probable explanation that Chrysostom is speaking according to the old fashioned way. Reference may also be made to an oration of Gregory of Nazianzum, spoken apparently on the Epiphany of 381 A.D. (*Oratio 39 in Sancta Lumina*, c. 1; i. 677, ed. Bened.), and to one of Gregory of Nyssa (*Orat. in Bapt. Christi*, iii. 577; ed. Migne).

From this view of the Epiphany it naturally became one of the three great seasons for baptism, and on this day was the solemn consecra-

tion of water for the rite (*infra*). Hence the origin of the names for the day, *τὰ φῶτα, ἡμέρα τῶν φῶτων*, referring to the spiritual illumination of baptism. It is needless to say that to explain the name by a reference to the free employment of lighted candles in the solemnities of the day in the Greek church, is a simple inversion of cause and effect. For the strange mistake of some writers who have supposed that "the day of lights" is to be interpreted of Candlemas day, see Suicer's *Thesaurus* (s. v. *φῶς*, § 12) and Bingham's *Antiquities* (xx. 4, 7).

In the west also, this manifestation of Christ, though not the one most dwelt on, is still occasionally referred to, as by Maximus Taurinensis (*Hom.* 22, 23, 29, 32, 33, &c., where see the prefatory remarks in the Roman edition), and Jerome, "quintam autem diem mensis adjungit, ut significet baptismum, in quo aperti sunt Christo caeli, et Epiphaniarum dies hucusque venerabilis est, non ut quidam putant, Natalis in carne, tunc enim absconditus est et non apparuit" (*Hom. in Ezech.*, lib. i. c. 1, v. 3; v. 6, ed. Vallarsi). To the allusions in the Gallican liturgy already mentioned we shall again refer, and it will be remembered that our own church makes the Baptism of our Lord the subject for the second lesson on the evening of the Epiphany.

Further, the association of this day with the administration of baptism occurred also in the west, for we find Himerius, a bishop of Tarraco, in Spain, complaining to pope Damasus (ob. 384 A.D.) of the practice of baptizing on the Epiphany; and the latter having died, his successor, Siricius (ob. 389 A.D.), enters his prohibition against it and restricts baptism as a rule to Easter and Pentecost (*Epist. i. ad Himerium Tarraconensem Episcopum*, c. 2; *Patrol.* xiii. 1134); and somewhat later, Leo I. speaks of it as "irrationabilis novitas" (*Epist.* 16, *ad Siciliæ episcopos*, c. 1; i. 715, ed. Ballerini). The same prohibition was laid down at a still later period (517 A.D.) by the Spanish council of Gerunda (can. 4; Labbe iv. 1568). See also *Codex veterum can. Eccl. Hispanae*, lib. iv., tit. 26 in Cajetan Cenni's *De antiqua Eccl. Hisp.* i., xcvi., where reference is made to Leo's injunctions. Further, Victor Vitensis alludes to this as the practice in the African church (*de persecutiōe Vandalica*, lib. ii. c. 17; *Patrol.* lvi. 216). See also Pamelius's note to Tertullian *de Baptismo*, c. 19.

*β. Manifestation to the Magi.*—It has been on this idea that the Western church has specially dwelt, with the exceptions mentioned above; but even in these, save perhaps in the Gallican liturgy, the manifestations at the Baptism and at Cana of Galilee are brought in as subsidiary to the main topic. Hence has arisen one common western name for the day, *festum trium regum*, in accordance with the legend by which the wise Magi of the east became exalted into kings and their number restricted to three. We shall speak briefly hereafter of the origin and growth of this wide-spread legend (below, § 3). We have numerous homilies of the Latin fathers, dwelling mainly, or exclusively (as e.g. eight by Leo I.), on this aspect of the day.

*γ. Manifestation at the Marriage in Cana of Galilee.*—The manifestation of Christ's Divine power by His first miracle of turning the water into wine is not unfrequently dwelt on in docu-



ments of the Western church. Thus Maximus Taurinensis, to whom we have already referred, associates this with the two previous manifestations. See e.g. *Hom.* 29, "ferunt enim hodie Christum Dominum nostrum vel stella duce a gentibus adoratum, vel invitatum ad nuptias aquas in vino vertisse, vel suscepto a Joanne baptisinate consecrasse fluentia Jordanis." Hence he speaks of the day as *virtutum (Domini) natalis*. From this cause comes the later name *Bethphania* (see Ducange, s. v.). Cf. also Gregory of Tours (*de miraculis S. Martini*, ii. 26).

We find in the Eastern church too traces of an association of the miracle at Cana with this season, for Epiphanius (*Haeresis* li. c. 30; i. 451, ed. Petavius) speaks of it as happening about Tybi 11 (= Jan. 6), and adds, doubtlessly in perfect good faith, that sundry fountains and rivers (e.g. the Nile) were changed into wine on the anniversary of the miracle.

3. *Manifestation at the Feeding of the Five Thousand*.—Less frequently met with than any of the preceding is the commemoration of the above act of miraculous feeding, which may be specially associated with the one preceding. Under this point of view the day was known as *φαισιφάνια*. We have mentioned below a reference to this in the Gallican use.

The first three of these manifestations are all referred to by Isidore of Seville (*de off. eccl.* ii. 26), and the *Ordo Romanus* also adds the fourth. We may also mention here a passage in a sermon once attributed to Augustine, but palpably not his, in which all the four manifestations are alluded to (*Serm.* 136 in *Append.*; v. 2702, ed. Gaume).

For the special association of the festival of the Innocents with that of the Epiphany reference may be made to the article on the former.

Before we proceed to speak briefly of the various liturgical forms for this day, we may remark that it was usual to give notice on the Epiphany of the day on which the Easter of the ensuing year would fall. Letters were sent about this time by metropolitans to their provincial bishops (*epistolae Paschales, hortatorie*), in which at the end of a discourse of a more general kind was given the requisite information. An allusion to the existence of this practice in Egypt is found in Cassian, "Intra Aegypti regionem mos iste antiqua traditione servatur, ut peracto Epiphaniarum die . . . epistolae pontificis Alexandrini per universas dirigantur ecclesias, quibus initium Quadragesimae et dies Paschae . . . significantur" (*Coll.* x. 2; *Patrol.* xlix. 820). Instances of such letters are those by Dionysius of Alexandria (referred to by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* vii. 20), Athanasius (fragments of whose once numerous series were first brought to light in a Syriac version by Mai, *Nova Bibliotheca Patrum*, vi. 1-168), Theophilus of Alexandria (three of which were translated into Latin by Jerome, and are included among his works, *Epp.* 96, 98, 100, ed. Migne), and Cyril, no less than thirty of whose are still extant (vol. v. part 2, ed. Aubert); and besides these purely Egyptian examples may be further cited those of Innocent I. (*Ep.* 14 *de ratione Paschali*; *Patrol.* xx. 517), and Leo I. (*Ep.* 138 *ad episcopos Gall. et Hispan.* i. 1283, ed. Ballerini). We find traces of the custom as existing in Spain, but there the notice was to be given on Christmas day, according to

the third council of Braga, 578 A.D. (*Conc. Bracar.* iii. can. 9; Labbe v. 898).

This duty is insisted on by several early councils (e.g. *Conc. Arelat.* i. can. 1; *Conc. Carth.* iii. cann. 1, 41; *Conc. Carth.* v. can. 7; Labbe, i. 1427; ii. 1167, 1173, 1216), and we cite especially the fourth council of Orleans (541 A.D.), which after enjoining that Easter is to be kept uniformly according to the Paschal table of Victorius, adds "quae festivitas annis singulis ab episcopo Epiphaniarum die in ecclesia populis denuntietur" (*Conc. Aurel.* iv. can. 1; Labbe, v. 381. See also *Conc. Antissiod.* [578 A.D.], can. 2, *op. cit.* 957). The form of the announcement as given in the Ambrosian liturgy, under the Epiphany, runs thus: "Noverit charitas vestra, fratres charissimi, quod annuente Dei et Domini nostri Jesu Christi misericordia, die *talis mensis talis* Pascha Domini celebrabimus" (Pamelius, *Liturgg. Lat.* ii. 314).

2. *Liturgical Notices*.—It need hardly be said that the festival of the Epiphany is recognised in some form or other in all liturgies both of the west and the east. The earliest form of the Roman liturgy, the Leonine, is defective for this part of the year, but it cannot be doubted that a service for the Epiphany entered into it; the more so that no less than eight homilies for this festival are found in the works of Leo. In the next form, the Gelasian, we find a mass both for the festival of the Epiphany itself, and for the vigil. Throughout the service for both days the only Manifestation of our Lord referred to is that to the Magi (*Patrol.* lxxiv. 1062).

In the Gregorian Sacramentary we find the further addition of a form for the Octave, though it should be added that both this and that for the vigil are wanting in some MSS., as the *Codex Rodrudi* (Greg. Sac. 15), and the same remark is true for the *Liber Antiphonarius* (ib. 660). In this last-named book the seventy-second psalm is largely used, and very probably the poetic imagery of this psalm suggested the special form of the legend of the *festum trium regum* (Ps. lxxii. 10). In this Sacramentary also, from which, it may be remarked, the collect for the day in our own prayer-book is derived, the reference is solely to the manifestation to the Magi; except in the solemn eucharistic benediction, where a mention of the manifestation both at the baptism and at the marriage in Cana of Galilee is added, ". . . qui super Unigenitum suum Spiritum Sanctum demonstrare voluit per columbam, eaque virtute mentes vestrae exercentur ad intelligenda divinae Legis arcana, qua in Cana Galilaeae lympa est in vinum conversa" (ib. 16), and see also the *Liber Responsalis* (ib. 751). The *Ordo Romanus* prescribes three lections for the vigil from the prophet Isaiah (lv., lx., lxi. 10-lxiv. 4), as well as some homilies.

The Ambrosian liturgy contains forms for the vigil and the festival; the manifestation to the Magi is the only one dwelt on, except in the prefaces for the two days, in the former of which the three manifestations are alluded to, and the latter of which refers solely to the baptism, mentioning also the solemn consecration of the water; "susceperunt hodie fontes benedictionem tuam et abstulerunt maledictionem nostram" (*Missa Ambros.* in Pamelius' *Liturgg. Lat.* i. 315).

We may refer next to the liturgies of the old Gallican church, and here as before we find a recognition of the festival and its vigil. In the ancient lectionary published by Mabillon (*de Liturgia Gallicana*, lib. ii. pp. 116, 117), the lection for the vigil introduces the reference to the Magi, while on the day itself the prophetic lection, the epistle, and the gospel, are respectively Isaiah lx. 1-16; Titus i. 11-ii. 7; Matt. iii. 13-17; Luke iii. 23; John ii. 1-11, where it will be seen that the gospel is compounded of passages from three of the evangelists (as on Good Friday it is compounded of all the four), dwelling on the baptism and the miracle at Cana of Galilee. In the so-called Gothico-Gallic Missal, we first meet with a number of different prefaces and collects for the vigil in which all the three manifestations are referred to, but that to the Magi most frequently, and also the manifestation of the Divine power in the miraculous feeding of the five thousand (lib. iii. pp. 207 sqq.). In the actual masses given for the vigil and the festival, we find that in the case of the former the baptism is referred to in the preface and the collect, the miracle of Cana in the preface, and the manifestation to the Magi in the *collectio ad pacem*, while the benediction, as in the Gregorian Sacramentary, embraces all three. In the latter, the baptism forms the special subject of the *collectio ad pacem* and the *contestatio*, the miracle of Cana that of the *collectio post nomina*, and the manifestation to the Magi that of two other prayers; while in the benediction, besides the manifestation at the baptism and at Cana, that at the feeding of the five thousand is also referred to. The same blending of references characterizes also the Gallican Sacramentary edited by Muratori (*Patrol.* lxxii. 471).

We pass on next to the Mozarabic or Spanish Missal. Here, as well as in the Breviary, we find a mention first of a Sunday before Epiphany, and next comes a mass "in jejunió Epiphaniæ," that is a fast for January 3-5, a relic doubtless of the earlier state of things when the subsequent festival of the Circumcision was observed as a fast.<sup>d</sup> [CIRCUMCISION.]

For the Sunday referred to, the prophetic lection, epistle, and gospel are respectively Isaiah xlix. 1-7, Heb. vi. 13-vii. 3, John i. 1-18; and for the following fast are Ecclesiasticus iv. 23-34, Numbers xxiv.-xxvi. with omissions, 1 Cor. xv. 33-50, John i. 18-34 (p. 58, ed. Leslie).

The mass for the festival itself is headed *In Apparitione seu Epiphania Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, the title in the Breviary being *In festo Apparitionis Domini*. The prophetic lection, epistle, and gospel are Isaiah lx. 1-20 (with omissions), Galatians iii. 27-iv. 7, Matt. ii. In the prayers, &c., there are passing allusions to the baptism (as in the *Officium*, Rom. vi. 3) and the miracle in Cana of Galilee, but, as in the various Roman liturgies, it is the manifestation to the Magi that is mainly referred to. In one passage of the mass (p. 63), as well as in the Breviary, is an allusion to a name of the festival evidently in use among the Visigoths in Spain,

*acceptio*, an obvious reference to Christ's acceptance of the first fruits of the Gentiles. We may take this opportunity of remarking that in Spain the Visigoth law enjoined a total cessation of legal business on this festival (*Codex leg. Visigoth.* lib. ii. tit. 1, lex 11; lib. xii. tit. 3, lex 6; in *Hispania Illustrata*, iii. 863, 1004; ed. Frankfurt, 1606. See also *Cod. Justin.* lib. iii. tit. 12, lex 7), and the Code of Theodosius forbade the public games on this day (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. xv. tit. 5, lex 5 [where there is an allusion to Christ's baptism], v. 353, ed. Gothofredus, whose note see *in loc.*). It may be added that the Apostolic Constitutions (viii. 33) enjoins upon masters the duty of giving their servants rest on the Epiphany, in memory of the great events commemorated. For additional remarks as to the vigil of the Epiphany, reference may be made to those on the vigil of the Nativity. [CHRISTMAS.]

The practice of the Greek church of making the Epiphany one of the solemn seasons for baptism and of the holding a special consecration of the water has been already referred to. The prophetic lection, epistle, and gospel for this latter rite are respectively Isaiah xxxv., lv., xii. 3-6; 1 Cor. x. 1-4, Mark i. 9-11 (Goar, *Euchologion*, pp. 453 sqq., and see his remarks, p. 467); the epistle and gospel at the liturgy are respectively Titus ii. 11-14, iii. 4-7, and Matt. iii. 13-17.

We find this practice of consecrating the water, which was done at night, alluded to by Chrysostom (*supra*, ii. 369), who speaks of people taking home with them some of the consecrated water, and of their finding it to keep good for a year, or even three years. This nocturnal ceremony of consecrating the water is referred by Theodorus Lector to Peter Gnapheus, who appointed τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων ἐν τοῖς θεοφανοῖς ἐν τῇ ἐσπέρᾳ γίνεσθαι (lib. ii. p. 566; ed. Valesius; and see also Cedrenus, *Hist. Comp.* i. 530, ed. Bekker; and Nicephorus Callist., *Hist. Eccles.* xv. 28; ii. 634, ed. Ducaeus). It is however justly remarked by Valesius (*not. in loc.* p. 169) and Goar (*Euchologion*, p. 467), that since we find Chrysostom at an earlier period alluding to this practice as a familiar one, all that Peter Gnapheus can have done must have been to transfer the consecration from midnight to evening. (For remarks on the ceremony at a later period, see Georgius Codinus, *de off.* c. viii. [cf. c. vi.], and refer to Gretser's and Goar's observations, pp. 303 sqq. ed. Bekker. See also Neale, *Eastern Church*, Introd. p. 754, for remarks as to the superstitious ideas connected with this water in Russia at the present day.)

Gregory of Tours mentions that on this day those who lived near the Jordan bathed in the river in memory of Christ's baptism and of their cleansing through him (*De gloria martyrum*, i. 88).

Two miscellaneous notices may be added here as illustrative of the ideas with which the festival was viewed. Chrysostom censures those who communicating on the Epiphany did so because it was the custom rather than after due reflection (*Hom.* iii. in *Eph.*; xi. 25, ed. Gaume); and we learn from a decree of Gelasius that the dedication of virgins took place especially on this day (*Epist.* 9 ad *episc. Lucaniae*, c. 12; *Patrol.* lix. 52).

3. *Legend of the Three Kings*.—We have al

<sup>d</sup> For an earlier allusion to the festival of Epiphany in the Spanish church reference may be made to a canon of a council of Saragossa (381 A.D.) evidently aimed at the Priscillianist practice of fasting at the Lord's Nativity (*Concil. Caes. Aug.* can. 4, Labbe ii. 1010).

really alluded in passing to the title of *festum trium regum* given in the Western church to the festival of the Epiphany, viewed as a commemoration of the visit of the three Magi to the infant Saviour. Whence then has tradition invested them with royalty, and why has their number been fixed as three? The idea that the Magi were kings, probably first suggested by an arbitrary interpretation of Psalm lxxii. 10 and similar passages, was early believed in. Thus Tertullian, after alluding to the above-mentioned psalm, adds: "Nam et Magos reges fere habuit Oriens" (*adv. Judaeos*, c. 9), though curiously enough the apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy, which gives a somewhat lengthy account of the visit of the Magi, is silent as to this point. The number three is not improbably due to the number of the recorded gifts, though early patristic writers have thought it to symbolise other special reasons. Thus some believed that under this number was implied the doctrine of the Trinity, and others saw in it an allusion to the threefold division of the human race, an idea which is also referred to in sundry early representations of the Magi. See e.g. Bede's *Collectanea*, if indeed the work is really his, where this point seems referred to (*Patrol.* xciv. 541). Not only did early tradition fix the number of the Magi, but it also assigned them names. These are variously given, but the generally received forms are Caspar, Melchior, Baltazar, which are apparently first met with in the passage of Bede referred to above. These names point, Mr. King thinks, to a Mithraic origin, from the apparent reference in their etymology to the sun (*Gnostics and their Remains*, pp. 50, 133).

Merely to fix the names, however, was not sufficient, and accordingly we find that bodies, firmly believed at the time to be those of the Magi, were brought by the empress Helena to Constantinople, where they were received with great honours. These remains were subsequently transferred to Milan through the influence of Eustorgius, bishop of that see; and in 1162 A.D. they were again removed by the emperor Frederick Barbarossa to Cologne, where they still remain, and hence has arisen the appellation by which they are so commonly known, the Three Kings of Cologne. A further discussion of this legend is beyond our present scope, and reference may be made to the 'Bible Dictionary,' s.v. MAGI, and besides the authorities there mentioned, a vast mass of information on the whole subject may be found in Crombach's *Prinitiae Gentium seu Historia SS. trium regum magorum*. Colon. Agr. 1654.

4. *Literature*.—Reference has been made to Martene, *de Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, iii. 42 sqq., ed. Venice, 1783; Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, bk. xx. ch. 4; Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Katholischen Kirche*, v. pt. 1, pp. 310 sqq.; Guericke's *Antiquities of the Church*, pp. 163 sqq. (Eng. Trans.); Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s.v. 'Επιφάνεια, &c.; Ducange's *Glossaria*; besides other authorities cited in the article. The following may also be consulted: Kindler, *De Epiphaniis*, Vitebergae, 1684; Hebenstreit, *De Epiphania et Epiphaniis apud Gentiles et Christianos*, Jenae, 1693; Blumenbach, *Antiquitates Epiphaniarum*, Lipsiae, 1737 (also in Volbeding, *Thesaurus*. i. 1, Lipsiae, 1846, unum. 10); Wernsdorf, *Tà 'Επιφάνια* V-

terum, ad illustrandum Hymnum: Was fürchtest du Feind Herodes sehr. Vitebergae, 1759.

[R. S.]

EPIPODIUS, martyr at Lyons under Antoninus and Verus; commemorated April 22 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

EPISCOPA, the wife of a bishop. The second council of Tours (c. 13) expressly forbids a bishop who has no wife (episcopam) to surround himself with a set of women. [C.]

EPISCOPALIA, the ring and pastoral staff, the distinctive marks of the authority of a bishop. Thus Gerbod is said (*Capitul. Francofurt.* A.D. 794, c. 8) to have received his *Episcopalia* from Magnard his metropolitan (Ducange, s. v.). [C.]

EPISCOPATE. [BISHOP.]

EPISCOPI CARDINALES. [CARDINAL.]

EPISCOPI SUFFRAGANEI, VACANTES. [BISHOP, p. 240.]

EPISCOPUS EPISCOPORUM. [BISHOP, p. 210.]

EPISTEME, martyr, with Galaction, A.D. 285; commemorated Nov. 5 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

EPISTLE. Lections from Holy Scripture form part of every known liturgy. These lections, as we learn from Justin Martyr, were originally taken from the Old as well as from the New Testament. The *Apostolical Constitutions* speak of "the reading of the Law and the Prophets, and of the Epistles, and Acts and Gospels" (*Ap. Const.* viii. 5; ii. 57). Tertullian mentions that the African church united the reading of the Law and the Prophets with that of the writings of the evangelists and apostles (*De Praescript.* 36). St. Augustine repeatedly refers to the first of the lections being taken from the Prophets: "primam lectionem Isaiae prophetarum" (*Serm.* 45, ed. Bened. vol. v. p. 218), "lectio prima prophetica" (*Serm.* 47, v. 268), though, as we shall see, this was not universally the case. In comparatively early times the Old Testament lection in many places dropt out of use on ordinary occasions, and the first Scripture lection in the liturgy was that generally known as *the Epistle*. The most ancient designation was *the Apostle*, the lections being almost universally taken from the writings of St. Paul. Thus we find, "*Apostolum* audivimus, Psalmum audivimus, Evangelium audivimus" (*Aug. Serm. de Verb. Apost.* 176, vol. v. p. 796), "*sequitur apostolus*" (*Sacram. Gregor.* Menard, p. 2); ἀναγινώσκειται ἀπόστολος (*Liturg. Chrys.*); "in quibusdam Hispaniarum ecclesiis laudes post apostolum decantantur" (*Concil. Tolet.* iv., A.D. 633, can. xii.; Labbe v. 1700); "Statim post Apostolum id est post Epistolam" (*Hincmar, Opusc.* vii. vol. ii. p. 149); κατέπεργεν . . . ψαλτήριον διδάξαι με καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον (*Cyrril. Scythop. Vit. S. Sabas*).

In all ancient Sacramentaries of the Western church the *Epistle* succeeds the COLLECT. This is not the case in the Eastern liturgies. In the liturgy of St. Chrysostom we find a PROKIMENON (προκείμενον) or short anthem preceding the Epistle as its epitome, consisting of a verse and response, generally, but not always, taken from

the Psalms. Before the epistle the deacon imposed silence (*ὑποσχόμεν, attendamus*), "not," observes St. Chrysostom, "as doing honour to the reader but to Him who speaks to all through Him," *Homil. III.*, i. 2 Theas. After the Epistle is read, the priest says, "Peace be to thee," which is technically called *εὐχέλαιον τῆς ἐπιστολῆς*. Instead of this "Thanks be to God" follows in the Mozarabic liturgy. In the Western church the anthem epitomising the Epistle, taken from the Psalms, followed instead of preceding it. From being sung on the steps of the ambo, it was called the *Gradual* [*ALLELUIA. GRADUAL*]. St. Augustine frequently alludes to its position between the Epistle and Gospel, e.g. "Primum lectionem audivimus apostoli... deinde cantavimus psalmum.... posthæc evangelicæ lectio" (*Aug. Serm. de Verb. Apost. 176; Serm. 45, 46, 48, u.s.*). Neither in the Eastern nor the Western church was the Epistle always selected from the writings of the apostles. We find it sometimes taken from the Acts and the Revelation, and in the Western, but never in the Eastern church, even from the Old Testament. Several of the Oriental liturgies present more than one lection in the place of the Epistle. In the Coptic liturgy of St. Basil there is first a lection from an epistle of St. Paul, then the *Catholicon*,\* i. e. a lection from one of the Catholic epistles, then a lection from the Acts, each followed by an appropriate prayer; a psalm is then sung, and the Gospel is read (Renaudot, i. pp. 5-8). The *Liturgy Communis Aethiopum* gives the same five lections in the same order (*Id.* pp. 507-510), in which they also stand in the Syriac liturgies (*Id.* ii. p. 68). Canons of the Coptic church ordaining these five lections—the psalm being counted as one—are given by Renaudot (*Id.* i. p. 203). The last lection is always the Gospel.

The origin and date of the arrangement of these Scripture lections will be more properly discussed when the early lectionaries are treated of [*LECTIONARY*]. Binterim carries them back as early as the 3rd century (*Denkwürdigkeit. iv.* 1. 228-230; 2. 323). If the ancient *Lectionarium* of the Roman church, known by the title of *Comes* [*COMES*], in which we find the epistles and gospels very much as they stand in the English liturgy at the present day, were really drawn up, as is asserted, by Jerome, we should have certain evidence of their arrangement at least as early as the 5th century. But the authorship of the *Comes* rests only on the authority of writers of the 11th and 12th centuries, and though accepted by Bona (*Rer. Liturg. lib. iii.* c. 6, p. 624) and Binterim (*u.s.*), must be regarded as exceedingly questionable. The fact, however, that the same lections were employed by the fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries as the subjects of their homilies proves the very early date of their assignment to particular days (of the examples given by Augusti, *Handbuch d. Christ. Arch. bk. vi.* c. 8, vol. ii. p. 239).

\* "Catholicon. Ita vocatur apud orientales Epistola Jacob, Petri, Joannis et Jude, quæ Catholicæ appellantur, quia ad omnes scriptæ sunt, ex quibus unus vultum conficitur quod Catholicum dicitur. Itaque cum Theologi laudent aliquam ex istis Epistolis scribitur dicitur Jacobus in Catholicis, Petrus, &c." *Renaudot, i.* 216. [*CATHOLICON*].

According to the Eastern ritual the Epistle was read by the Reader, standing at the Royal Doors. In the Western church it was read in the 8th century from the ambo by the subdeacon standing on the second step, the Gospel being subsequently read by the deacon from the third step. Amalarius (*De Offic. Eccl. lib. ii.* c. 11) expresses his surprise that this office is assigned to the subdeacon, since it is not mentioned in the commission at his ordination; but the 4th canon of the council of Rheims, A.D. 813, after directing that "the Apostle" should be read by the subdeacon, all sitting, adds "qualiter subdiaconi ministerium est apostolorum legere" (Augusti, *Hæc.*; Binterim, *Denkwürdigk.*; Bingham, *Orig.*; Bona, *Rer. Liturg.*; Martene, *de Eccl. Rit.*). [K. V.]

**EPISTOLAE CANONICAE, COMMENDATORIAE, COMMUNICATORIAE, ECCLESIASTICAE, FORMATAE, PACIFICAE, SYSTATICAE** [*COMMENDATORY LETTERS: FORM.*]

**EPISTOLAE DIMISSORIAE** [*DIMISSORY LETTERS*]

**EPISTOLAE ENTHRONISTICAE** [*BISHOP, p. 224.*]

**EPISTOLAE SYNODICAE** [*SYNODICAL LETTERS*]

**EPISTOLAE TRACTORIAE** [*TRACTORIA*]

**EPISTOLIUM**. A term used (*II. Conc. Turon. c. 6*) for the letters formatae the granting of which is expressly limited to bishops. See *COMMENDATORY LETTERS: DIMISSORY LETTERS*. [C.]

**EPITAPH** [*CATACOMBS, p. 306: INSCRIPTIONS*]

**EPITRACHELION**. [*STOLE*]

**EPOCH**. [*ERA*]

**EPOLONIUS**, martyr at Antioch, with Babylas the bishop, under Decius; commemorated Jan. 24 (*Mart. Bedae, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EPOMADION** (*Ἐρωμάδιον*), the cord or ribbon by which a pectoral cross or ENCOLPION is suspended from the neck. (Saidas; Daniel's *Codes*, iv. 702.) [C.]

**EQUI CURSUALES**. [*CURSUALES EQUI*]

**ERA**. A succession of years, reckoned on some common principle from a specified event, or date, called its epoch. The terms era and epoch are frequently used as synonymous.

*The Julian Period*.—1. To compare dates belonging to different eras, there is no method more useful than to refer them all to the Julian period, a period introduced or revived by Scaliger. It consists of 7980 years, that number being formed by multiplying together  $28 \times 19 \times 15$ , the respective periods of the cycle of the sun, of the cycle of the moon, and of the indictions, the last being a period used in the administration of the Roman empire. It is the great cycle in which the solar, lunar, and indictional cycles synchronize, after the completion of 285 cycles of the sun, 420 of the moon, and 532 of the indictions. The great cycle then recurs as before. No two years in the same period agree in all the three numerals of



the subordinate cycles, so that by naming them all, the year is completely designated.

2. The first year of the current Julian period, in which each of the subordinate cycles had the numeral one, was the year 4713 B.C., and the noon of 1st January of that year, for the meridian of Alexandria, is its chronological epoch.

The years are Julian years, i.e., of 365 days in common years, 366 in leap year, which is every fourth year, that year in fact whose date-numeral being divided by four, leaves the remainder one.

3. To find the place of any specified year of the Julian period.—Divide its numeral by the respective divisors 28, 19, 15. The respective remainders give the years in the several cycles. The remainder 0 is to be construed 28, 19, 15.

4. To determine the year of the Julian period from the numerals of the three cycles.—Multiply the numeral of the solar cycle by 4845, that of the lunar by 4200, and that of the indictions by 6916, and divide the sum of these products by 7980. The remainder is the year sought.

5. To find the day current of the Julian period of any date in the Julian period.—Subtract one from the numeral of the year-day, and divide the remainder by four, calling Q the integer quotient, R the remainder. Then will Q be the number of entire quadriennia of 1461 days each, and R the residual years, the first of which is always a leap year. Convert Q into days by taking the right multiple of 1461, and R by using the annexed table; then add the days for the current day of the given year, remembering February 29th in leap year.

Residual Year	0	1	2	3
Day . . .	0	366	731	1096

6. To convert a year of the Julian period into the year B.C., or A.D.—If the numeral be less than 4714, subtract it from that number, the difference will be the year B.C. If the numeral be greater than 4713, take that number from the numeral, and the difference will be the year A.D.

The Olympiads.—1. The era used in Greece, instituted in 776 B.C. (3938 J. P.) consisting of four years. July 1st A.D., is considered to correspond with the commencement of the first year of the 195th Olympiad.

2. To reduce any given year of an Olympiad to the Christian era, multiply the Olympiad immediately preceding the one in question by four, and add to the product the number of years of the given Olympiad. If before Christ, subtract the amount from 777; if after Christ, subtract 776 from the amount, and the remainder will be the beginning of the year required, commencing from July.

3. For an exact calculation of days tables are required, showing the order of the months in the different years of the Metonic cycle. These may be found in Ideler i. 386.

4. The fathers of the Greek church and the ecclesiastical historians, as Eusebius and Socrates, use the era of the Olympiads in a peculiar manner. It would have been natural to begin them with the commencement of their civil

year, September 1st, or ten months too early, but they really commence them a year earlier still, or nearly two years too early. The same reckoning is used in the Chronicon Paschale. It is necessary to add one year and ten months to their date to make them accord with the common era of the Olympiads.

Era of the Building of Rome.—Amongst the variety of dates assigned to this event, the Varronian epoch is adopted, being April 22nd, B.C. 753, or 3961, J. P. The consular year began on the 1st January.

To reduce the year of Rome, to the year before or after Christ.—If the year of Rome be less than 754, deduct its numeral from 754; the difference is the year before Christ. If the year of Rome be not less than 754, deduct 753 from it, and the remainder will be the year after Christ.

Era of the Seleucidae.—The era of the Seleucidae, also called the era of the Greeks, was widely used in Syria, and by the Jews from the time of the Maccabees. It is used in the book of the Maccabees. It is still used by the Arabs. Its epoch is October 1st, B.C. 312, or 4402 J. P.

Julian Reformation of the Calendar.—This took place 707 U.C., or January 1st B.C. 45. 4669 J. P.

The Christian Era.—The Christian era was first introduced by Dionysius Exiguus, a Scythian abbot in Rome, in the 6th century, and gradually superseded the era of Diocletian, which had been used till then. It was first used in France in the 7th century, but was not universally established there till the 8th century, after which time it became general. Great diversity, however, long subsisted as to the day on which the year should be considered to commence.

It commenced on the 1st day of January, in the middle of the 4th year of the 194th Olympiad, the 753rd U.C., and the 4714th of the Julian period. It is now generally acknowledged not to be the true year of the Saviour's birth, but its use as a chronological epoch does not allow of its being altered.

The era of Diocletian.—This era was prevalent till the adoption of the Christian era; its epoch was 29th August, A.D. 284. It was introduced in Egypt by Diocletian, after the siege of Alexandria, and gave the Egyptians, for the first time, the advantage of a fixed year. The first Thoth, the beginning of the Egyptian year, was August 31st, and it is supposed that a change was made from a moveable to a fixed year, after the lapse of five years. This era is still used by the Copts. To reduce this era to the Christian era add 283 years and 240 days, and as the intercalation was made at the end of the year, in the Diocletian year next after leap year, add one day, from the 29th August to the end of the ensuing February.

The era of Constantinople.—The era of Constantinople, or the Byzantine era, first appears in the Chronicon Paschale. It fixed the creation of the world in the 5508th year before Christ, so that A.D. 1, fell in the 5509th year of this era. The Russians followed this calculation till the time of Peter the Great, having received it from the Greek church, by whom it is still used. The year began on the equinox, March 21st. It was afterwards made to begin, for civil purposes, on September 1st.

The Alexandrians had used an era of the creation, fixed at 5502 years before Christ; but in A.D. 285, they reduced the date by ten years.

To pass from the year of our Lord to the era of Constantinople, or conversely, add or subtract 5508 from January to August, and 5509 for the rest of the year.

*The Jewish era.*—The Jews now reckon by the year of the world, and they place the creation 3761 B.C.

By adding 952 to the numeral of the Jewish year we get its date in the Julian period; and by subtracting 952 from the year of the Julian period we get the Jewish date.

For the Christian era we must subtract 3761, and add the same for the converse process. The Jewish year begins in the autumn.

The following results are selected from a Table in Sir J. Herschel's 'Outlines of Astronomy.'

INTERVALS in Days between the Commencement of the JULIAN PERIOD and that of some principal Chronological Eras.

Names by which the Era is usually cited.	First Day current of the Era.	Chronological Designation of the Year.	Current Year of the Julian Period.	Interval Days.
Julian Period . . . . .	Julian Dates Jan. 1	B.C. 4713	1	0
Olympiads (mean epochs in general use) . . . . .	July 1	776	3938	1,438,171
Building of Rome (Varronian epoch, U.C.) . . . . .	Apr. 22	753	3961	1,446,502
Era of the Seleucidae (or Era of the Greeks) . . . . .	Oct. 1	312	4402	1,607,739
Julian reformation of the Calendar . . . . .	Jan. 1	45	4669	1,704,987
Spanish Era . . . . .	Jan. 1	38	4676	1,707,544
Actian Era in Rome . . . . .	Jan. 1	30	4684	1,710,466
Actian Era of Alexandria . . . . .	Aug. 29	30	4684	1,710,706
Dionysian or Christian Era, "of our Lord" . . . . .	Jan. 1	A.D. 1	4714	1,721,424
Era of Diocletian . . . . .	Aug. 29	284	4997	1,825,030

[L. H.]

**ERACLEAS.** [HERACLEAS.]

**ERACLIUS.** [HERACLIUS.]

**ERASMUS.** (1) Bishop, and martyr in Campania, under Diocletian; commemorated June 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr at Antioch; commemorated Nov. 25 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**ERASTUS** and Olympos and companions, "Apostle;" commemorated Nov. 10 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EREMITES.** [HERMITS.]

**ERENAEUS.** [IRENAEUS.]

**ERENACH**, or **HERENACH**, a term applied to a class of officials who appear prominently in the annals of the Irish church prior to its reconstitution in the 12th century, after which time the word was used to denote an ecclesiastic having a position akin to that of archdeacon.

In its earliest use the Erenach, or *Airchinneach*, appears to have been hereditary steward and tenant of the lands granted by temporal chiefs to the church-founding abbots of Ireland; his duties being to superintend the farmers or tenants of the church or monastery—according to Colgan, "Omnium colonorum certi districtus praepositus seu praefectus." [J. S—T.]

**ESICHIUS** or **ESICIUS.** [HESYCHIUS.]

**ESPOUSALS.** [ARRHAE: BENEDICTION, NUPTIAL: BETROTHAL: MARRIAGE.]

**ETHELDREDA** or **EDILTRUDIS**, virgin-queen, martyr in Britain; commemorated June 23 (*Mart. Bedae*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**ETHERIUS**, bishop; deposition at Auxerre July 27 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**ETHIOPIAN MONKS.** Monasticism spread rapidly from Egypt into Ethiopia, and gained as strong a hold there as in Egypt or Syria, if not a

stronger. Helyot (*Histoire des Ordres Monastiques*, i. xi.) speaks of all the monasteries in Ethiopia as professing to obey the so-called "Rule of Antony," but with different observances. An attempt at reformation, such as invariably recurs in the life of a monastic order, was made in the 7th century; Tecla-Haimanot, as Helyot writes it, being the second founder or Benedict of Ethiopian monasticism. He endeavoured to consolidate the system under a Superior-General, second in ecclesiastical rank only to the Patriarch of Ethiopia, who was to visit and inspect the monasteries personally or by proxy. Several of them, however, preferred to retain their independence, like congregationalists. Monks swarmed in Ethiopia, according to Helyot, long after the first fervour of asceticism; and the constitution of the Ethiopian church was monastic (Robertson, *Church Hist.* i. 300). The story of a military order of monks, like the knight-templars, originating in the 4th century is purely fabulous (Helyot, *u. s. l.* xiii.). [I. G. S.]

**EUCHARIST** (Εὐχαριστία). This article treats of the use of the word *Eucharistia*. For the nature of the offices accompanying the sacrament, see LITURGY, and the several articles on its component parts, especially CANON OF THE LITURGY and COMMUNION, HOLY.

I. The primary meaning of the word εὐχαριστία seems to be a feeling of thankfulness or gratitude (2 Macc. ii. 27; Sirac. xxxvii. 11; Acts xxiv. 3).

II. The expression of the feeling of gratitude:

1. In words = thanksgiving; 2. In act = thank-offering.

1. Εὐχαριστία, in the sense of thanksgiving, occurs frequently in the New Testament; it is used for the thanksgiving in public worship (1 Cor. xiv. 16; 2 Cor. iv. 15, etc.), and for the expression of thankfulness generally.

2. Philo uses εὐχαριστία in a wider sense.

He speaks, for instance (*De Victimis*, c. 9), of *eucharistia* as including hymns, prayers, and sacrifices; of *τὰς εὐχαριστίας εὐχαριστίας* (*ib.* c. 4); and of giving thanks (*or* thank-offering, *eucharistia* *τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ*) to God for the creation of the world—a phrase noteworthy as suggesting one of the aspects of the Christian eucharist (Irenaeus, *Haer.* iv. 18, 4). The word does not occur in the LXX. though it is used by Aquila.

III. We have to consider the application of the word *eucharistia* to the Supper of the Lord, or the elements used in it.

1. The verb *eucharistein*, like the corresponding substantive, means both to feel thankfulness and to express it. The use of the word *eucharistein*, in 2 Cor. i. 11, implies further that *eucharistein* might be used with an accusative of the object for which thanks are given.

The Lord in the Last Supper gave thanks after taking the Cup (*εὐχαριστῶντες ἀλλήλους*, Luke xii. 17; *λαβὼν ὡραίων καὶ εὐχαριστήσας*, Matt. xvi. 27); and before breaking the Bread (*εὐχαριστήσας ἑαυτοῦ*, 1 Cor. xi. 24; Luke xii. 19). Compare Matt. xv. 36; Mark vii. 6; John vi. 11, 23. So the disciples of the 2nd century gave thanks over the Bread and the Cup in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as we see from the description of it in Justin Martyr.

2. From this uttering of thanksgiving over the elements of Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, the word *eucharistein* came to mean, to bless, hallow, or consecrate by the utterance of the proper form of thanksgiving (Grimm, *Lexicon Novæ Test.* s. v.). Thus Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 65) speaks of the Bread and Wine and Water which had been made eucharistic (*εὐχαριστήσας ἄρτον καὶ σῖτον καὶ ὕδωρ*), immediately after mentioning the thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστία*) of the president for God's mercy in granting us the blessings of creation and redemption. And again (c. 66), he speaks of *τῶν ἐκ' εὐχῆς λόγων τοῦ σωτῆρος εὐχαριστήσας ὑμῶν* (CAZON OF THE LITURGY, p. 268). Compare "panem in quo gratias actae sint" (Irenaeus, *Haer.* iv. 18, 4).

By an easy transition the *eucharistia* *ὑμῶν* or consecrated elements came to be called simply *eucharistia* (*ib.* c. 66). Similarly in the Ignatian letter ad Smyrn. 7. Irenaeus (*Haer.* iv. 18, 5) says that the Bread after the EPICLISIS is no longer common bread, but eucharistic, consisting of two parts, an earthly and a heavenly.

3. But the conception of thank-offering is also found in the word *eucharistia* and its corresponding verb, when applied to the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv. § 132, p. 623) speaks of the martyr's blood poured out as a thank-offering (*εὐχαριστήσας αἷμα*) [Dindorf's text: vulg. *εὐχαριστήσας*]; and we might interpret Justin's *εὐχαριστήσας ὑμῶν* in the same way were it not for its close connexion with *eucharistia*, where the latter evidently means thanksgiving in the *Dialogus with Tryph.* (c. 117), when Justin speaks of the Christian sacrifice which takes place (he says) *ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τοῦ ὡραίου*, it is evident that he regards the Bread and the Cup as being themselves made a thank-offering or eucharistia. And again, when (c. 41) he refers to the lover's offer-

ing of *flor* as a type of the eucharistic bread (*τὸ ἄρτον τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ*) which the Lord commanded us to offer (*ωσείν*) in thanksgiving (*ὡς εὐχαριστῶμεν*) for the blessings of creation and redemption, he regards the elements as themselves an expression of thankfulness; i. e. as a thank-offering. When Celsus objected to the Christians that they were ungrateful in not paying due thank-offerings (*εὐχαριστία*) to the local deities, Origen replied (c. *Celsus*, viii. 57; pp. 415, 416, Spencer) that the bread called eucharistia (*ἄρτος εὐχαριστίας ἀναλόγως*) was the symbol or outward token of thankfulness towards God (*τῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν θεῶν εὐχαριστίᾳ*); that is, he regards the bread itself as of the nature of a thank-offering.

4. Whether the original meaning was, "that over which thanks have been given," or "that which has been made a thank-offering," the word *eucharistia* came to be simply equivalent to "the consecrated elements of bread and wine," or sometimes of bread alone. Thus Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. § 5, p. 318) speaks of the ministers distributing the eucharist (*τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ διανέμοντας*), i. e. the elements, to the communicants; and the epistle to Victor (Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24, § 15) of sending the eucharist to neighbouring churches. [Compare EULOGIAN.] Cyprian (*Epist.* xv. c. 1) explains *eucharistia* by the words, "id est, Sanctum Domini Corpus."

5. The eucharist (i. e. the consecrated bread, was employed in the following ways, besides that of ordinary administration. It was taken home and preserved in a casket (ARCA); it was sent by bishops to other churches as a token of Christian brotherhood (EULOGIAN); it was borne before the pope at a pontifical mass (*Ordo Rom.* i. c. 8; see Martene, *R. A. i.* iv. 2, § 2); it was reserved in churches (DOVE: RESERVATION); it was enclosed in altars at consecration (CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES); it was carried on a journey (Ambrose *De Officiis Satyr.* iii. 18); Gregory the Great *De Off.* iii. 38; *Dial.* c. 37); it was sometimes worn suspended from the neck in an EUCOLPION (Giraldus Cambren. *Topograph. Hibern.* Dist. ii. c. 19); it was used in the cure of disease (Augustine, c. *Julian.* iii. 162); it was placed in the mouth of the dead (BURIAL OF THE DEAD); and the administration of the eucharist was one of the forms of ordeal (Martene, *De Rit. Antiq.* i. v. 4).

IV. The Greeks interpret the *eucharistia* of 1 Tim. ii. 1 to be hymns or anticles sung to the honour and glory of God (Daniel, *Code Liturg.* iv. 406). [C.]


EUCCHARIST (IN CHRISTIAN ART). The earliest eucharistic representations, as may be expected, seem to refer principally to the agapae, or suppers which preceded the actual eucharistic breaking of the bread in the earliest times (1 Cor. xi. 20). It is to be presumed at least that the order of the Lord's Supper itself was followed, and that the celebration, or symbolic breaking of the bread, took place after, or towards the end of, the meal. (St. John xii. 2-4.) In the earliest days of persecution they naturally began to be celebrated in the catacombs

\* The writer wishes to acknowledge his obligation to the Rev F. J. A. Hort, Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, for several suggestions on the matter treated in this article.

or near the tombs of martyrs. [CELLA MEMORIAL.] It is not the business of the present writer to enquire into the connexion of the arrangements for public celebration of the eucharist and Christian rites in general with the ancient usages of funeral rites. But these usages were so familiar to the early church, that it is not to be wondered at that the agape at least is so frequently represented and the eucharist so distinctly implied in the various catacomb paintings. Dr. Mommsen (*Contemp. Review*, May 1871, 164 and 171) mentions an agape with bread and fish in that very ancient crypt of Domitilla on the Ardeatine Way, which De Rossi refers to Flavia the granddaughter of Vespasian.\* The bread and fish occur again repeatedly in the Callistine catacomb, with a man in the act of blessing the bread; seven, eight, or more baskets of bread are placed near a table at which seven persons are sitting. The table is round, and fishes are also placed on it. The use of the vine is frequent in the oldest work, as in the Domitilla vault, where boys are gathering the grapes, and the art is quite of the Augustan age, and probably executed by Pagan hands. A parallel work in mosaic, of later though still very early date, exists in the church of Sta. Constantia at Rome [VINE]. (Parker, *Ancient Mosaics at Rome and Ravenna*.) A connexion must always have existed in the Christian mind between the last supper at Jerusalem, the bread and wine, and the last repast of the Lord with His disciples, the bread and fish by the sea of Galilee (John xxi.). And His words on the former occasion cannot have been unconnected with this discourse of Himself the bread of life in St. John vi. 58 sqq. But the earlier representations of a memorial banquet seem to point rather to the agape or commemorative repast, than to the breaking of the bread and pouring forth of the wine in commemorative sacrifice. A sense of mystery and

treated by M. Raoul Rochette (*Mém. de l'Institut des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, t. xiii. 775, &c.). They may, he thinks, account for the relics of cups and platters, knife-handles, and egg-shells [see Egg] found in the Christian sepulchres (Boldetti, lib. ii. xiv. tav. 5, 59 and 60, and *passim*), though there can be no doubt, as he implies, that old Etruscan (or indeed human) custom or instinct, made survivors bury many objects used in life along with their dead.

One of the earliest known representations of the eucharistic offering is that of the mosaic in St. Vitale at Ravenna, dating from the 6th century. (See woodcut.) On one side Abel is repre-



sented as standing with hands raised in prayer, clad in cloak and short tunic, and just issued from a house; it is possible that this, with the streaked sky of the mosaic, may indicate a morning or evening sacrifice. At all events the presence of Abel connects the other figure of the priest and king Melchisedech, with the idea of the sacrifice of the lamb, and therein of the death of the Lord. Melchisedech is standing before an oblong altar-table, on which is a chalice and two loaves of bread; his hands are raised in prayer, not in the act of blessing, and he is clad in the penula or cloak over a long tunic and girdle.



Agape from an ancient sculpture in the church of St. Ambrogio at Milan.

awe, a pious reticence, which appears for the present almost erased from the Christian consciousness, seems to have prevented representation of the Lord's act of typical sacrifice of Himself; as representation of His actual death by crucifixion was also long delayed. [CRUCIFIX.]

The subject of the agapae, and the disorders to which they sometimes gave occasion, is admirably

This mosaic is an important illustration of the fundamental principle of Christian symbolic ornament, which appears to have been from the earliest times devoted, as a central object, to displaying the fulfilment of the Old Testament by the New. In the Laurentian MS., A.D. 556, our Lord is represented as administering a small rounded object, evidently bread, to one of eleven standing figures. (See woodcut.)

The frequent introduction of the fish in the various representations of eucharistic repasts, which are found particularly in the Callistine catacomb, is connected of course with the

\* This vault is mentioned in Boldetti (p. 551); it is called the Sepulchre of SS. Achilles and Nereus, the relics of those martyrs having been conveyed there. Of its date, he says only, "tempo vicino agli Apostoli."



anagrammatic meaning of the word *Ichthys*, as well as with the miracles of the bread and fish, or the Lord's words in John vi. The connexion of the last repast by the sea of Galilee with the last supper is expressed in the words of Bede, *In Joann.* xxi. "*Piscis assus*,



*Christus passus.*" It is no part of our duty to pursue it here, except in its frequent illustrations on the walls of St. Callixtus. These will be found in De Rossi's *Roma Sotterranea*, and the author refers them, from the beauty of their execution, to an early period of the 3rd century. It cannot be denied, however, that a certain uncertainty and suspicion of repainting attaches more particularly to this catacomb in the minds of many antiquarians. Nevertheless, if, as Mr. Parker thinks, the most extensive paintings and repaintings took place in the time of St. Paulinus of Nola, a highly respectable antiquity still belongs to these subjects. We have given a woodcut [CANISTER, p. 264], of the most important of these paintings. Its subject is the mystic fish bearing loaves on his back; they are not decussated or crossed, as is most frequently the case where they are represented [ELEMENTS, p. 603], but bear a central mark, which, as Martigny thinks, connects them with Eastern and Jewish offerings of cakes made from first-fruits of corn (called *mamphula* or Syrian bread). The fish bears them in a basket, which has in it besides another object. This is supposed to represent a vessel of wine, but, as he admits, it is not very easy to decipher in the original, and the lithograph in De Rossi is somewhat of a restoration. What it is like in the actual fresco must be very difficult to determine. But his reference to St. Jerome (*Ep. ad Rustic.* c. xx.), "*Nihil illo ditius qui corpus Domini canestro vimineo, sanguinem portat in vitro,*" corresponds with great exactness and very impressively with this painting. In any case there can be no doubt whatever that it represents the Lord offering the bread of life to mankind. These paintings are in the crypt named from St. Cornelia; another represents seven persons at a table with bread and fish, with seven baskets of decussated loaves at hand, referring, of course, to the Lord's miraculous reproduction of them. Without disputing that the anagrammatic fish is a symbol of the

greatest antiquity for our Lord, and that it associates itself naturally in the mind with the two miracles, the repast of Tiberias, &c., it should not be forgotten that the anagram is not a scriptural emblem. Our Lord never likened Himself to fish as to bread, and His own use of the fish in parable makes them represent mankind and not Himself. Nevertheless, His act of blessing and breaking the fish on three distinct occasions must always connect them in our minds with the eucharistic banquet.<sup>b</sup> (See woodcut.)



From the Cemetery of St. Priscilla.

Representations of other events or objects symbolic of the body of the Lord, or anyhow to be connected with Him as the bread of life, have of course a relation to the eucharist. The decussated loaves are offered to Daniel by Habbacuc, on a sarcophagus found near the altar of St. Paul without the walls of Rome (Martigny, *Art. Sarcophages*, with woodcut), and the author refers to the custom of sending a portion of the eucharist round to imprisoned confessors in time of persecution. The manna and the rock cloven for the life of the people are naturally connected with John vi. 59. [ROCK.] The latter is frequently in bas-relief; the former appears to occur only in one unmistakable example, though those in Bottari, tav. 164, from the cemetery of St. Priscilla, and tav. 57 from the Callistine, are probably connected with it.

The miracle of Cana has been held in art to possess an eucharistic signification, at all events since Giotto's fresco in the Arena chapel at Padua. Ruskin, in *Arundel Society's* account of that building. But in the earliest examples, very frequent as they are on the bas-reliefs, the Saviour does not raise his hand in the act of blessing, as the artist might be expected to represent him, had he designed to connect the miracle with the last supper. Nor is He so depicted on the tablet of the *Diadema* at Ravenna (Bandini *In tab. diadema. Florence, 1746*), nor on the beautiful silver *urceolus* supposed by Blanchini (Not. in Anastas. in Vit. St. Urbani) to be of the 4th century. [CANA, MIRACLE OF.]

In treating of representations of the eucharist in Christian art, it is not necessary for our

<sup>b</sup> Martigny gives (a. v. 'Même') a woodcut of a fresco from the Callistine catacomb, where the bread and fish are apparently under the act of consecration by a man in a pallium which leaves his right arm and side bare, while a woman prays with uplifted hands. She may be the tenant of one of the tombs near which the fresco is placed, or may represent the church. The date of this work seems exposed to that uncertainty which hangs over so many of the catacomb paintings, more particularly those of the Callistine cemeteries.

purpose to consider anything beyond their expressed meaning—that is to say, beyond the meaning which the artist or inspirer of the work distinctly meant to convey. The further ideas he may have suggested to fervent imaginations, or to minds predetermined to read meanings of their own into his work, are not his or our affair, though they may often be ingenious and beautiful, and even right and true as matter of spiritual thought. [R. St. J. T.]

#### EUCCHARISTIA. [MAUNDY THURSDAY.]

**EUCHELAION** (Εὐχέλαιον) is the "prayer-oil," blessed by seven priests, used in the Greek church for the unction of the sick; see **SICK, VISITATION OF: UNCTION** (Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s.v.; Daniel's *Codex Liturg.*, iv. 503, 606). [C.]

**EUCHERIUS**, bishop of Lyons, and confessor; commemorated Nov. 16 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUCHOLOGION**. The most comprehensive and important Service-Book of the Eastern church corresponding to the Western *Sacramentarius*, and *Liber officiorum* of the Latins. In its simplest state the *Euchologion* includes the liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil, and that of the Presanctified, which for no very certain reason bears the name of Gregory the Great. To these are usually added the offices of administration of the other sacraments and other forms of prayer, and benedictions. It cannot be affirmed with any certainty that the present *Euchologion* existed previous to A.D. 800, though the Eastern church cannot fail to have had an office book, or books more or less corresponding to it. The edition of the *Euchologion* with learned notes by James Goar, Paris, 1645, frequently reprinted, is the standard authority on the subject. (Binterim, *Denkwürdig.* iv. 1, 274; Neale, *Eastern Church*, i. 2, 828). [E. V.]

**EUDOCIA**, ὁσιομένης, A.D. 160; commemorated March 1, Aug. 4 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EUDOCIMUS**, Martyr under Theophilus the Iconoclast; commemorated July 31 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EUGENDUS**, abbot at the monastery of the Jurenses in Celtic Gaul; commemorated Jan. 1 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUGENIA**. (1) Virgin, martyr at Rome under Gallienus; commemorated Dec. 25 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*); ὁσιομένης, commemorated Dec. 24 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) and Bagan, virgins; commemorated Jan. 22 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

**EUGENIANUS**, martyr; commemorated Jan. 8 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUGENIUS**. (1) martyr with six others in Africa; commemorated Jan. 4 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Neocaesarea with three others; commemorated Jan. 24 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr in Syria, with Paulus, Cyrillus, and four others; commemorated March 20 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(4) Martyr at Tibur in Italy, with Sympho-

rosa, his mother, and her six other children; commemorated June 27 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*); July 21 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(5) Bishop of Carthage, and martyr with his 500 companions, or more ("universi cleri ecclesiae ejusdem"); commemorated July 13 (*Ib.*).

(6) Bishop of Toledo, and confessor; commemorated Nov. 13 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(7) Martyr at Paris; commemorated Nov. 15 (*Ib.*).

(8) Martyr with Candidus, Valerianus, Acylas, A.D. 292; commemorated Jan. 21 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(9) Bishop, and martyr A.D. 296; commemorated March 7 (*Ib.*).

(10) Martyr, with four others, A.D. 290; commemorated Dec. 13 (*Ib.*).

(11) and Macarius; commemorated Aug. 5 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

(12) Invention of the relics of those who were martyred with Eugenius (ἐν τοῖς Εὐγενίου); Feb. 22 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [C.]

**EUGRAPHIUS** or **EUGRAPHUS**, martyr with Mennas (or Mennas) and Hermogenes, A.D. 304; commemorated Dec. 10 (*Cal. Byzant.*) Dec. 3 (*Cal. Armen.*).

**EULALIA**. (1) Virgin, martyr at Barcelona in Spain, under Diocletian; commemorated Feb. 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*); Dec. 10 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(2) Virgin, martyr at Merida in Spain; commemorated Dec. 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi, Cal. Carthag.*). [W. F. G.]

**EULAMPIA**, martyr with **EULAMPIUS**, her brother, A.D. 296; commemorated Oct. 10 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EULOGETARIA** (Εὐλογητάρια) are certain antiphons occurring in the Greek Morning Office, so called from the frequent repetition in them of the words εὐλόγητος εἰ, Κύριε. (Daniel, *Codex Lit.* 304, 703; Neale, *Eastern Church*, Introd. 919.) [C.]

**EULOGIAE** in an eucharistic sense.

(1) *Eulogia* was used down to the middle of the 5th century as synonymous with εὐχαριστία for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. This signification was naturally derived from St. Paul's words, τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν (1 Cor. x. 16). In commenting on this passage Chrysostom's language shows that the word was beginning to be used in this restricted sense, εὐλογία δταν εἶπω πάντα ἀναπτύσσω τὸν τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Θεοῦ θησαυρὸν, κ.τ.λ. (Chrys. *Homil.* xxiv. in 1 Cor. x. 16), in which it is of constant occurrence in the writings of Cyril of Alexandria, sometimes by itself (*Lib.* iv. c. 2 in *Joann.* vi. p. 260; *ib.* 364; *Catena ad Joann.* iii. 27, p. 343, &c.); sometimes with a qualifying epithet, μυστικὴ εὐλογία (*lib. Glaphyr. in Levit.* pp. 351, 367; in *Deut.* p. 414; *de Adorat.* lib. ii. p. 80); εὐλ. πνευματικὴ (*ib.* lib. vi. p. 177); εὐλ. ζωοποιὸς (*ib.* lib. vii. p. 231). To this we may add "tunc *eulogia*, non *alogia* celebratur" (Aug. *Ep.* 86 *Cusul. presb.*).

(2) *Eulogia* then came to be used specifically for that portion of the eucharist, ἡ εὐχαρισθεῖσα τροφή (Just. *Mart. Apolog.* § 67), which was conveyed in the primitive church by the hands

of the deacons to those who were absent as well as for that sent by the bishops, notably those of Rome, to their daughter churches, and to foreign bishops and churches, as a symbol of Christian love and brotherhood. Irenaeus is the earliest authority for this practice, which he speaks of as long established. In his letter to Victor bishop of Rome, at the end of the 2nd century, in which he entreats him not to make a difference as to the time of the celebration of Easter a ground for breach of communion, he refers to the example of his predecessors, who, notwithstanding this difference, were in the habit of sending the eucharist to the presbyters of other dioceses who observed the Oriental rule (Iren. apud Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24). With the increased reverence for the material eucharist this practice dropt into disfavour, and was distinctly forbidden by the 14th canon of the council of Laodicaea, A.D. 365. This canon prohibits "the sending of the holy things into other dioceses, at the feast of Easter, by way of eulogiae" (*εἰς λόγον εὐλογιῶν*). Easter seems to be specially mentioned as the chief period for this interchange of pledges of communion, the prohibition itself being general. The 32nd canon of the same council, which forbids the reception of the *eulogiae* of heretics, which is also prohibited by the second council of Braga, A.D. 572, probably refers to the eulogiae of unconsecrated, but blessed bread (see below).

Forbidden in the East, the practice lingered considerably longer in the West. Sirmond, indeed, the learned Jesuit, affirms that the custom of sending the eucharist round to other churches and congregations arose subsequently to the times of Cyprian and Tertullian, since in their writings there is no allusion to it, and all Christians who were present at divine service had the opportunity of communicating, and were bound to avail themselves of it, and that the *eulogiae* distributed consisted of bread blessed but not consecrated (*de Azymo*, iv. 527 sq.). But the passages adduced cannot be satisfactorily interpreted on any other hypothesis. Suicer undoubtedly states the case correctly when he says, "*εὐλόγια* istae quae mittebantur per paroecias ipsissimae erant Eucharistiae sive panis *εὐχαρισθέντος*, ex quo communio data fuerat praesentibus, particulae, quae absentibus Presbyteris per paroecias Dioecesis mittebantur. Sic enim perfecta ex eodem pane sanctificato communio inter omnes illas paroecias unius dioecesis institui videbatur" (*Thes.* sub voc. *εὐλογία*). After the church had been invaded by heresy, the eucharist was distributed to the orthodox presbyters by the bishop as a pledge of their adhesion to the true faith, as is shewn by the ordinances relating to the *fermentum* of Melchiades, A.D. 311, and Siricius, A.D. 385. The letter of Innocent I. to Decentius, c. 410, informing him of the custom of sending the "fermentum" to the presbyters of the "tituli," on Sundays as a token of communion, and expressing his disapprobation of carrying the leaven through a whole diocese, "quia nec longe portanda sunt sacramenta," illustrates the same practice [FERMENTUM]. A practice very nearly allied to this of which we have been speaking, was that which prevailed among the faithful in the first ages of the church, of carrying home themselves and transmitting to others a portion of the consecrated bread to be con-

sumed hereafter. Thus Tertullian speaks of Christian women being accustomed "secretly before all other food" to partake of the eucharist (Tert. *ad Uxor.* ii. 5), and answers the objection of some against receiving the eucharist on a day of abstinence lest they should break their fast, by the suggestion that they could "take the body of the Lord and reserve it till the fast was over" (id. *de Orat.* 19). Cyprian tells of a woman who had lapsed being terrified by the sudden outburst of flame when she opened her chest [ARCA] in which "the holy thing of the Lord" (*Domini sanctum*) was kept (Cypr. *de Lapsis*, p. 132). Satyrus, the brother of Ambrose, when fearing to be lost by shipwreck obtained "that divine sacrament of the faithful" from some of his fellow-passengers (Ambros. *de Obi. Fratris*, iii. 19). Gregory Nazianzen speaks of his sister Gorgonia "treasuring up with her hand the antitypes of the precious Body and Blood" (Greg. Naz. *Orat.* xi. p. 187). We learn from Basil that it was the almost universal custom at Alexandria and in Egypt for the laity to have "the communion" in their houses; that solitaries did the same, where there was no priest near; and that it was generally customary in times of persecution (Basil, *Epist.* 93). Jerome speaks of some who scrupled to receive the eucharist at church, but were not afraid to take it at home (Hieron. *Epist. ad Pammach.*), and of those who "carried the Lord's Body in a wicker basket and His Blood in a glass vessel" (id. *Epist. ad Rusticum*, 95). But universal as this practice seems to have been, its natural tendency to degenerate into irreverence and superstition gave rise to evils which led the church to discountenance and ultimately to suppress it. There is no trace of its general observance after the 4th century (Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 793).

(3) With the cessation of the practice of sending the consecrated eucharist to persons who were not present grew up as a substitute that of distributing the unconsecrated remains of the oblations among those who had not received under the name of *eulogia*, or in still later times of *antidoron* or substitute for the *δῶρον*, or eucharist proper. According to the rule laid down in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. viii. c. 31) these remains (*τὰς περισσευούσας ἐν τοῖς μυστικοῖς εὐλογίας*), were distributed by the deacons, at the pleasure of the bishops or presbyters, to the clergy in proportion to their rank. The rule prescribed by Theophilus bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 385, permits "the faithful brethren" to share them with the clergy, but prohibits a catechumen to partake of them. That the catechumens, however, in the time of Augustine partook of some kind of sacrament is plain from his words (*de Peccator. Meritis*, ii. 26), "quod acceperunt (catechumeni) quamvis non sit corpus Christi, sanctum tamen est et sanctius quam cibi quibus alimur, quoniam sacramentum est." As the first love of the church grew cold and non-communicating attendance became common, the unconsecrated remains began to be regularly distributed among those who had not received, that they might not depart without a semblance of a blessing. The Greek names for this practice, *εὐλογία*, *ἀντίδωρον*, sufficiently indicate where it originated. The word occurs in Socrates' account of Chrysanthus, the bishop of the Novatians at Constantinople in the 5th cen-

tury, who declined to receive anything from his churches but "two loaves of the *eulogia* every Lord's Day," *δὺς ἄρτους εὐλογιῶν* (Socr. *H. E.* vii. 12). In the liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil the distribution of the antidoron by the priest is prescribed—*μετὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἐξέρχεται ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ στὰς ἐν τῷ συνήθει τόπῳ δίδωσι τὸ ἀντίδωρον* (Goar, *Eucholog.* 85, § 190). But this is evidently an addition of late though uncertain date. Balsamon deduces it from a desire to evade the force of the threat of the second canon of Antioch against non-communicating attendance, so that even those who were not able to receive the undefiled mysteries might take the *eulogia* of the hallowed fragment from the hand of the celebrant. But if its original be Greek, the earliest certain notice of it is found in Latin writers, and not earlier than the 9th century. The decree of Pius I. A.D. 156 (Labbe, i. 578), which prescribes it, is an undoubted forgery, as is acknowledged by Card. Bona (*Rer. Liturg.* lib. i. cap. 23). This decree appears nearly *verbatim* both in the *Capitula* of Hincmar, A.D. 853, c. 7 and c. 16 (Labbe, viii. 570), and in the canons of Nantes, c. A.D. 896 (Labbe, ix. 470, canon ix.). It runs: "ut de oblationibus quae offeruntur a populo et consecrationi superfluent, vel de panibus quos deferunt fideles ad Ecclesiam, vel certe de suis, Presbyter convenientes partes incisas habeat in vase nitido et convenienti, et post missarum solemniam qui communicare non fuerint parati *Eulogias* omni die Dominico, et in omnibus festis exinde accipiant, quae cum benedictione prius faciat." This canon prescribes a form of prayer to be used in the benediction (c. 7). Leo IV. (847–855) also commanded that "the *eulogiae* be distributed to the people after the Masses on Feastdays" (Labbe, viii. 37). We should be transgressing our assigned limits still further if we traced the custom any later.\*

(4) When the custom of sending the eucharist to one another as a symbol of Christian communion had ceased among Christians, the practice arose of distributing cakes of bread, which had received a special benediction, as a token of mutual love. We have a reference to this practice in the writings of St. Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* xix. p. 306) when relating a dream of his sister Gorgonia when sick. "She thought that I . . . suddenly stood by her in the night with a basket and loaves of the purest flour, and having prayed over them and signed them as our wont is, fed her." During the disputes which succeeded the council of Ephesus, the bishops and presbyters of Cilicia and Isauria sent *Eulogiae* to John of Antioch, in token of communion (Baluz., *Nov. Coll. Concil.* 867). The writings of Paulinus, bishop of Nola, contain many notices of these *eulogiae*, sometimes under the name of *benedictiones*, which were interchanged between him and Augustine and others. The latter writes to Paulinus, "the bread we have sent will become a richer blessing, for the love of your benignity in accepting it" (*Aug. Epist.* xxxiv.). The compliment is returned by Paulinus. "The single loaf which we have sent to your charity, as a token of unanimity, we beg that you will bless (i.e. make a true *eulogia*) by accepting it" (Paulin. *Epist.*

iv. p. 13). Paulinus also sends a trifid loaf to Alypius, "panem unum . . . in quo Trinitatis soliditas continetur," which he will turn into a *eulogia* by his kindness in receiving it, (*ib.* iii. p. 12). He sends five loaves to Romanianus and Licinius (*ib.* vii. p. 27). To Severus he sends "a Campanian loaf from his cell, as a *eulogia*," together with a boxwood casket, and begs him, as before, by accepting the loaf in the name of the Lord to convert it into a *eulogia* (*ib.* v. § 21, p. 30). The large number of stories in Gregory of Tours in which the expressions *eulogias accipere, dare, flagitare, ministrare, petere, porrigere, postulare, &c.* occur, prove how common the practice was as a token of Christian communion and a symbol of episcopal benediction in the 6th century (Greg. Turon. *Hist.* iv. 16; v. 14, 20; x. 16; *de Glor. Confess.* 31). From some of these passages we learn that to drink a cup of wine, and to partake of a morsel of bread blessed by him in a bishop's house was considered equivalent to receiving his benediction, (*eulogia*) (*id.* *Hist.* vi. 51; viii. 2). Ducange (*sub voce*) affords a very large number of later references. Forms of *litterae salutatoriae* to accompany *eulogiae* sent by a bishop to a king or to another bishop, and of acknowledgment, are contained in the *Exemplaria* of Marculfus, lib. ii. 42, 44, 45, 46.

(5) This was not the only form which *eulogiae* assumed. We have seen Paulinus sending a wooden box as a *eulogia*. The presents sent by Cyril of Alexandria to Pulcheria and the ladies of the court to induce them to forward his interests in his disputes with John of Antioch and the Oriental bishops were delicately described as "blessings," "*eulogiae*." This use of the word is borrowed from Holy Scripture, where a gift is not unfrequently styled a blessing, in the LXX. *εὐλογία*; see Jud. i. 15; 1 Sam. xv. 27; xxx. 26; 2 Kin. v. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 5; Rom. xv. 29. We find Gregory the Great using this term of some relics of saints ("eulogias S. Marci") sent him by Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria; and "benedictio" of a small cross [ENCOLPION], containing some filings of the apostles' chains (Greg. Mag. *Epist.* lib. xiii. ep. 42). Some of Augustine's opuscula were brought to the abbot Valentinus under this title (*August. Ep.* 256). Even sweetmeats, nuts, and dry figs were included under this title, when blessed by the sender. Some curious stories illustrative of this custom are recorded in the *Vitae Patrum*. Thus some *bellaria* (sweetmeats) brought to the monastery where Valens was a monk by some guests and distributed by the abbot Macarius to each cell, were indignantly rejected by Valens, who beat the bearer and sent him back with the message, "Go and tell Macarius that I am as good as he. What right then has he to send me a *benediction*?" (Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* c. 31). They were withheld from those who were under excommunication, and excommunicated bishops were forbidden to send them to others (Greg. Turon. *Hist.* viii. c. 20). Thus the abbot Arsenius took umbrage at some dry figs not being sent him, and regarding himself as excommunicated refused to attend divine service with his brethren until the ban was taken off (*de Vit. Patr.* lib. v. Migne, lxxiii. p. 953). The *eulogia* was refused to the king Merwig, who had apostatized (Greg. Turon. *Hist.* v. 14). (Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* xv.

\* Those who wish to follow up this practice to more modern times will find the materials in Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, ch. xvi. § 2, pp. 774–780.



6, 8, and 8. Bona, *Rerum Liturg.*; Ducange's *Glossaries*; Juicer, *Thesaurus*; Binterim, *Denkwürdig.*; Augusti, *Christ. Arch.* li. 533. [E. V.]

(6) *Eulogias* in monasteries. In the Benedictine rule monks are forbidden to receive "litteras, eulogias, vel quaelibet munuscula" without the abbat's leave (*Reg. Bened.* c. 54, cf. *Reg. Donat.* c. 53). Here probably the word is used in its widest sense, for any offering or token of esteem (Martene *ad loc.* citing *Reg. Comment.*), or, more particularly, for bread sent with a blessing. See (4) and (5) above.

In some monasteries, e. g. that of Fulda (Mabill. *Ann. O.S.B. Praef. Saec.* III. vii.), eulogies were distributed daily to the monks, who had not already received, in the refectory before their meal; in others this was done only on Sundays and holy-days (cf. *Reg. Bened. Comment.* c. 54). In the life of Eligius, in the 7th century, it is related that he used to beg these "eulogies" or pieces of blessed bread from the monks of Solignac (Mabill. *Ann. O.S.B.* XII. xxi.). When the abbess who succeeded Radegunde in the convent of Ste. Croix at Poitiers was accused of feasting she replied that the alleged feasting was only the partaking of the "eulogies" (*ib.* VII. liii. 589 A.D.). "Eulogies," in this sense, were sometimes given by a bishop to an excommunicated person in token of reconciliation (*ib.* III. l.). The other spelling, "eulogium," is condemned by Menard (*Conc. Regul. Bened. Anian.* c. 61). [I. G. S.]

**EULOGIUS.** (1) Deacon, and martyr at Tarragona, with Fructuosus the bishop, under Gallienus; commemorated Jan. 21 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Constantinople; commemorated July 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) Presbyter, and martyr at Cordova; commemorated Sept. 20 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUMENIA**, martyr at Augusta, with Hilaria and others; commemorated Aug. 12 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUMENIUS.** (1) Bishop of Gortyna, *ἁγὸς πατριάρχης καὶ ἐπισκοπάρχης*; commemorated Sept. 18 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 143; commemorated Tekemt 10 = Oct. 7 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [W. F. G.]

**EUNUCHS**, not to be ordained. The feeling that one devoted to the sacred ministry should be un mutilated was strong in the ancient church. Hence, the council of Nicea (c. 1) enacted that if any one, being in health (*ὑγιαίνων*) dismembered himself, after ordination, he should be deposed from the ministry, or, being a layman, he should not be admitted to Holy Orders; and in the *Apostolical Canons* (c. 21) the reason for such exclusion is added, viz., that the offender is a self-murderer (*αὐτοκτονεὺς ἑαυτοῦ*) and an enemy of the workmanship of God. These reasons, and a later one in the 2nd council of Arles (c. 7), were aimed against that perverted notion of piety, originating in the misinterpretation of our Lord's saying (Matt. xix. 12), by which Origen, among others, was misled, and their observance was so carefully enforced in later times, that not more than one or two instances of the practice which they condemn

are noticed by the historian. The case was different if a man was born a eunuch, or had suffered mutilation at the hands of persecutors: an instance of the former, Decotheus, presbyter of Antioch, is mentioned by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. c. 32); of the latter, Tigris, presbyter of Constantinople, is referred to both by Socrates (*H. E.* vi. 15) and Sozomen (*H. E.* vi. 24) as the victim of a barbarian master (Bingham, *Antiq.* iv. iii. 9). [D. B.]

**EUNUS**, martyr, with Julian, at Alexandria; commemorated Feb. 27 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUODUS**, martyr with Calliste and Hermogenes; commemorated Sept. 1 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EUOTUS**, martyr at Caesaraugusta with seventeen others; commemorated April 16 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUPHEMIA.** (1) Martyr at Chalcedon, under Diocletian, A.D. 288; commemorated Sept. 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*); Sept. 16 (*Cal. Byzant.*); commemoration of the miracle which she is said to have wrought in the church of Chalcedon, July 11 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Martyr at Rome, with Lucia; commemorated Sept. 16 (*Mart. Hieron., Cal. Aletii et Frontonis*). [W. F. G.]

**EUPHRASIA** or **EUPRAXIA.** (1) Virgin; deposition at Alexandria, Feb. 11 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Virgin; deposition in the Thebais, March 13 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUPHRASIUS.** (1) Bishop, and martyr; natale Jan. 14 (*Mart. Usuardi*); deposition Jan. 14 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

(2) Confessor at Eliturgis in Spain; commemorated May 15 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUPHROSIUS**, martyr in Africa; commemorated March 14 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUPHROSYNE** or **EUFROSINA.** (1) Virgin, of Alexandria; commemorated Jan. 1 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Virgin, martyr, with Domitilla and Theodora, under Trajan; commemorated May 7 (*ib.*). [W. F. G.]

**EUPHROSYNE**, *ἁγία ὑψίστη*, A.D. 410; commemorated Sept. 25 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EUPLUS**, deacon, and martyr at Catania in Sicily, under Diocletian and Maximian, A.D. 296; commemorated Aug. 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*); Aug. 11 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EUPRAXIA**, and Olympias; commemorated July 25 (*Cal. Byzant.*). See **EUPHRASIA**. [W. F. G.]

**EUPREPIA**, martyr at Augusta, with Hilaria and others; commemorated Aug. 12 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUPREPIUS**, one of the three brothers of Cosmas and Damianus, martyrs under Diocletian; commemorated Sept. 27 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUPROBUS**, bishop and martyr, at Saintes in Gaul; commemorated April 30 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUPSYCHIOUS**, martyr at Caesarea, under Julian; commemorated April 9 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

[W. F. G.]

**EUSEBIUS**. (1) **PALATINUS**, martyr with nine (*Rom. Vet.* eight) others; commemorated March 5 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr with Aphrodisius, Carilippus, and Agapius; commemorated April 28 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) The historian, bishop, and confessor, of Caesarea in Palestine; commemorated June 21 (*Mart. Hieron., Flori, Usuardi*).

(4) Bishop and martyr at Vercelli under Constantius; commemorated Aug. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*).

(5) Presbyter, and confessor at Rome, under Constantius Augustus; commemorated Aug. 14 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi, Cal. Frontonis*).

(6) Martyr at Rome, with three others, under Commodus; commemorated Aug. 25 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(7) Martyr at Adrianopolis in Thrace, with Philip the bishop and Hermes; commemorated Oct. 22 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(8) Monk, and martyr at Tarracina in Campania, with Felix the presbyter, under Claudius; commemorated Nov. 5 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*).

(9) Bishop of Samosata, and martyr under Valens; commemorated June 22 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

[W. F. G.]

**EUSIGNIUS**, martyr at Antioch, A.D. 361; commemorated Aug. 5 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EUSTACHIUS**. (1) Bishop and confessor at Antioch in Syria, under Constantine (Constantius, *Ado*); commemorated July 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Presbyter and martyr in Syria; commemorated Oct. 12 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) **PLACIDUS**, martyr at Rome, with his wife and two children, under Adrian; commemorated Nov. 2 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUSTATHIUS** or **EUSTASIUS**. (1) With his companions, *μεγαλομάρτυς*, A.D. 100; commemorated Sept. 20 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) ab Msketha or Mzcheta; commemorated July 29 (*Cal. Georg.*).

(3) and Theodotus; commemorated Oct. 1 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(4) Abbot of Luxeuil; deposition March 29 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUSTORGIUS**, presbyter and martyr at Nicomedia; commemorated April 11 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUSTOSIUS**, martyr at Antioch with Demetrius the bishop, Anianus the deacon, and twenty others; commemorated Nov. 10 (*Ib.*)

[W. F. G.]

**EUSTRATIUS**, martyr with Eugenius and three others, A.D. 290; commemorated Dec. 13 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EUTHYMIUS**. (1) Magnus, *δσιος καὶ θεοφόρος*, A.D. 465; commemorated Jan. 20 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Deacon of Alexandria; commemorated May 5 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) of Athos; commemorated May 13 (*Cal. Georg.*).

(4) Bishop of Sardis, and martyr, A.D. 920; commemorated Dec. 26 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

[W. F. G.]

**EUTROPIA**, sister of Nicasius the bishop, martyr with him at Rheims; commemorated Dec. 14 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUTROPIUS** (1) and companions, martyr A.D. 296; commemorated March 3 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Bishop, and martyr at Arausio in Gaul; commemorated May 27 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr at Rome with sisters Zosima and Bonosa; commemorated July 15 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUTYCHIANUS**. (1) Martyr in Campania, with Symphorosa and eight others; commemorated July 2 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr in Africa with Arcadius and two others; commemorated Nov. 13 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) Pope, and martyr under Aurelian; commemorated Dec. 8 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EUTYCHIUS** (1). Deacon and martyr in Mauretania Caesariensis, with two others; commemorated May 21 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr in Sicily with Placidus and thirty others; commemorated Oct. 5 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr in Spain; commemorated Dec. 11 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(4) Presbyter, and martyr at Ancyra in Galatia with Domitianus the deacon; commemorated Dec. 28 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*).

(5) Patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 551-583; commemorated April 6 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

[W. F. G.]

**EUTYCHUS** or **EUTYCHES**. (1) Martyr in Thrace with Plautus and Heracleas; commemorated Sept. 29 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Naples with Januarius, bishop of Beneventum, and others, under Diocletian; commemorated Sept. 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr in Italy, with Maro and Victorinus, under Nerva; commemorated April 15 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(4) Disciple of St. John, and martyr; commemorated Aug. 24 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**EVAGRIUS**. (1) Martyr at Tomi in Scythia, with Benignus; commemorated April 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Tomi, with Priscus and Crescens; commemorated Oct. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EVANGELIARIUM**, **EVANGELISTARIUM** (*Εὐαγγελιστήριον*), the book containing the passages of the gospels to be read in the liturgy. [GOSPEL: LECTIONARY: LITURGICAL BOOKS.] [C.]

**EVANGELIARY**. [LITURGICAL BOOKS.]

**EVANGELIST**. The deacon is called "Evangelist" in his capacity of reader of the gospel. In the liturgy of Chrysostom (c. 19, p. 347,

Daniel) the deacon prays the priest, "Bless, sir, the evangelist (εὐαγγελιστὴν) of the holy apostle and gospel." [C.]

**EVANGELISTS.** The Four Evangelists are commemorated Oct. 19 (*Cal. Armen.*). [C.]


**EVANGELISTS**, symbolic representations of. We find from Aringhi (ii. 285) that the four symbolic creatures are (as might be expected) not the original emblems of the four evangelists. The four rivers of paradise are perhaps intended to represent the gospel, and the distinct channels of its diffusion throughout the world (Gen. ii.). These are found in some of the earliest specimens of unquestionably authentic Christian decoration, as in the Lateran cross (ROSS, p. 496), where the lamb and stag are introduced. The four books or rolls are also found in early work, Ciampini (*V. M.* i. 67 tab.; Buonarrotti, xiv. 2). In some instances, as in the baptism of our Lord in the cemetery of St. Pontianus (Aringhi, 275, 2, also at end of Bottari), the animals are introduced drinking in the Jordan. In this case, either the mystic river is identified with the four rivers of paradise, and made to accompany the ornamented cross below, representing the gospel, as in the Lateran cross (see s. v.), or the cross in St. Pontianus, below the baptism-picture, represents the Lord's death and baptism therein. Mr. Parker gives an admirably clear photograph of the present condition of this important work, which he dates from A.D. 772. The Lateran relic is supposed to be similar to the crosses of the time of Constantine.

The adoption of the four creatures of the Apocalypse (iv. 6) as images of the evangelists, does not seem to have taken place generally, or is not recorded on Christian monuments, before




the 5th century. It involves, of course, a peculiarly impressive connexion between the beginning of the visions of Ezekiel, and the unveiling of heaven to the eyes of St. John. This is unmistakable; although in the prophet's vision the living creatures were not only four in number, but each was fourfold in shape. "They four had the face of a man, and the face of a lion, on the right side; and they four had the face of an ox on the left side; they four also had the face of an eagle." While in the Apocalypse, "The first beast was like a lion, the second like a calf, the third had the face of a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle." This connexion is said by Mrs. Jameson, (*Sacred and Legendary Art*, 79) to have been noticed as early as the 2nd century, though no representations are found till the 5th. Nor was it till long after the four creatures had been taken as prefiguring the four evangelists, that a

special application was made of each symbol to each writer. This may be referred to St. Jerome on Ezekiel i. St. Matthew has the man, as beginning his gospel with the Lord's human genealogy: St. Mark the lion, as testifying the Lord's royal dignity, or as containing the ter-



rible condemnation of unbelievers at the end of his gospel: St. Luke the ox, as he dwells on the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ: St. John the eagle, as contemplating the Lord's divine nature. Ingenuity and devotion have done their utmost on this subject for centuries with little result. An ivory diptych of the 5th century,



given by Bugati (*Memorie di S. Carlo in fin.*) is the earliest known representation of this emblem, which does not occur in the glass devices recorded by Garrucci or Buonarrotti. The well-known representation of the four creature-symbols in the great mosaic of the church of St. Pudenziana at Rome, must we think be left out of reckoning altogether as an historic document. (See Mr. J. E. Parker's photographs, and the articles thereon in his *Antiquities of Rome*, by the author of the present paper; also Messrs. Crows and Cavalcaselle's *Early Italian Art*, vol. i. chap. i.) The symbols are placed above a 7th century



cross, and on close inspection of the photographs, appear to have been repaired in fresco, or by painting of some kind. The appearance of the whole mosaic in fact is that of a quantity of material of different ages, some doubtless very ancient and of great merit, combined as a whole

by a painter and mosaicist of the greatest skill and power in the 18th century. However, the use of the quadruple symbols is universal, in east and west, and throughout the Christian world, in every kind of situation, and by use of all vehicles and methods. They are very frequently placed on crosses of the 7th century, about the same time as that in which the change took place from the lamb at the intersection of the limbs of the cross to the human form crucified. They occur on the cross of Vellitrae, and on some ancient German crosses mentioned under CRUCIFIX, as the station cross of Planig, &c. But the most interesting 6th century representation of them known to us is the quaintly but most grandly-conceived tetramorph of the Rabula MS., which represents the Lord at the ascension, mounting a chariot of many wings and cherubic form. It shows that the Syrian miniaturist had a most vivid imagination, and the highest power of realising his conceptions, as appears in so many parts of that extraordinary work. The wheels of the chariot, as well as the cherubic forms, connect the vision of Ezekiel with the griffins of Lombard Church-art as at Verona. Mrs. Jameson gives a very interesting tetramorph or cherubic form bearing the evangelic symbols, from a Greek mosaic. This symbol is certainly not of the age of the earlier catacomb paintings, and occurs first with frequency in the tessellated apses and tribunes of Byzantine churches, and is of course specially worthy of note as explaining the connexion between the vision of Ezekiel and that of St. John. The four animals separately represented occur *passim*, both in Eastern and Western Church-work. (See Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.* i. tab. 48.) There are grand examples in the spandrels of the dome of Galla Placidia's chapel in Ravenna, as in St. Apollinaris in Classe, and particularly in the chapel of St. Satyrus at Milan. [For a singular specimen of Carolingian grotesques of them see MINIATURE.] (The woodcuts, p. 633, are from the latter.) The eagle given below is taken from the Evangelary of Louis le Debonnaire; but the Hours of that emperor and the MS. of St. Medard of Soissons, also contain whole page emblems of the four evangelists.

In St. Vitale at Ravenna the symbols of the evangelists accompany their sitting figures. St. Matthew has the man, St. Mark the (wingless) lion; the calf, also wingless, belongs to St. Luke, and the eagle to St. John. The nimbus is sometimes added, and sometimes the creatures bear the rolls or books of the gospel (Ciampini, *V. M.* II. xv.; in St. Cosmas and Damian. See also *ibid.* II. xiv. for St. Apollinaris in Classe, temp. Felix IV. about 530).

There is a very strange missal painting referred to by Martigny, where the human forms of the evangelists in apostolic robes are surmounted by the heads of the creatures. This occurs also, he says, in an ancient church of Aquileia (Bartoli, *Le Antichità di Aquileia*, 404). Two examples are given in woodcut by Mrs. Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, 83. One is by Fra Angelico, and the hands, feet, and drapery of the other, which is not dated, seem too skillfully done to be of early date.

But the four creatures occur alike in bas-reliefs on altars, on sacred vessels and vestments, and even on bronze medals. See Paciaudi *de Cufis & Joas. Bapt.* p. 183, for a bronze coin with the

man and the eagle on one side, the lion and calf on the other, lettered respectively ΝΑΘΕΟC (sic), ΙΟΗΑΝΝΙC, ΝΑΡC, ΛΥCΑC. Nothing is known of the history of this relic. It may be supposed that where the Lord is surrounded by saints and apostles the bearers of books are intended for the evangelists, especially if they are four in number, though on the sarcophagus in Bottari cxvii. t. only three are represented,



probably St. Matthew and St. John, with St. Mark as companion and interpreter of St. Peter. Four figures in the baptistery at Ravenna holding books, and placed in niches of mosaic arabesques, are considered of doubtful meaning by Ciampini (*V. M.* i. tab. 72); but Martigny is perfectly satisfied that the evangelists are intended by them (Martigny, *Dictionnaire s. v. Evangelistes*). [R. St. J. T.]

#### EVE. [VIGIL.]

**EVENING HYMN.** In the vespers of the Eastern church, after certain fixed psalms, concluding with Ps. cxviii., expressive of intense expectation, followed by the "Entrance," so called, of the Gospels considered as enshrining Christ Himself, with an exhortation to the acknowledgment and hearing of Him as there present ("Wisdom, stand up")—the *Evening Hymn* is appropriately sung; the triumphant "Hymn of the Evening Light," at once giving thanks for the gift of artificial light, and praising the true "Light that shineth in darkness, in Whom is Life, and the Life is the Light of men"—hence called by St. Basil *φωτιστικὸς ὑμνος*. "Joyful Light of the holy glory of the immortal Father, the heavenly, the holy, the blessed Jesu Christ, we having come to the Setting of the Sun and beholding the Evening light, praise God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It is meet at all times that Thou shouldst be hymned with auspicious voices, Son of God, Giver of Life: wherefore the world glorifieth thee."

There is reference to the "Evening Psalm"



(τὸς ἐπιλύχνιον ψαλμὸν, i. e. Ps. cxli.) in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which may be considered to represent the Eastern system of the 3rd or 4th century (lib. viii. c. 35).

So in the West, Hilary (in Ps. lxiv.) writes—“The day is begun with prayers, and the day is closed with hymns to God.”

Bingham; Palmer, *Orig. Lit.*; Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*. [D. B.]

EVENTIUS, presbyter and martyr at Rome with Alexander the pope and Theodulus the presbyter, under Trajan; commemorated May 3 (*Mart. Bedae, Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi, *Cal. Frontonis*). [W. F. G.]

EVIGILATOR (Ἀφυνιστής), an officer in Greek monasteries whose duty it was to waken the monks for nocturnal and matutinal services. Another officer of the kind was the “excitator,” who had to waken a monk asleep in church (Ducange, *Gloss. Lut. et Gr. s. vv.*). [I. G. S.]

EVILASIUS, martyr at Cyzicus with Fausta the Virgin, under Maximian; commemorated Sept. 20 (*Mart. Rom. Vet. Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

EVIL SPIRITS. [DEMON: DEMONIACS: EXORCISM.]

EVODIUS. (1) Martyr at Syracuse, with Hermogenes; commemorated April 25 (*Mart. Usuardi*).


(2) Bishop, and martyr at Antioch; commemorated May 6 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(3) Martyr at Nicaea, with Theodota his mother and her two other children, under Diocletian; commemorated Aug. 2 (*Ib.*, *Mart. Bedae*). [W. F. G.]


EVOVAE is an artificial word made out of the vowels in the words “seculorum Amen,” which occur at the end of the Gloria Patri. Its object was to serve as a kind of memoria technica to enable singers to render the several Gregorian chants properly; each letter in Evovae standing for the syllable from which it is extracted. It must be borne in mind that psalms, &c., were sung under antiphons, and that the music of the antiphon, being constructed in a particular ‘mode’ or ‘scale,’ such as Dorian, Phrygian, and the like, the chant or ‘tone’ (i. q. ‘tune’) to the psalm, being not intended to represent a full stop or close, might (and usually did) not end on the final belonging to the mode, leaving that for the concluding antiphon: thus different forms of the same mode or tone would arise, and these were called Evovae and sometimes *differentiae*, *finitiones*, *conclusiones*, and *species seculorum*. This only applies to the latter half (cadence) of the chant, as in the ‘mediation’ (at the middle of the verse of a psalm) scarcely any variety was admitted, except such as arose from local use. Thus in the various works on the subject, and in service books, varieties of endings are to be found of greater or less antiquity. Gerbert mentions the fact that in some cases the peculiar distinctive marks of the tones had become confused, notably in the 1st and 6th; and the only possible distinction would seem to be in the assignment of accents. It does not appear however that accent, in the modern musical sense of the word, was

recognised to any extent by the ancients, ACCENTUS being equivalent to what we should now call inflection. [ACCENTUS ECCLESIASTICUS.] For the first few centuries of the Christian era rhythm was regulated by quantity, which gradually gave place to accent; and it seems to the writer that musical accentuation remained in a very uncertain state until the 17th century. Still the Evovae must be regarded as containing the germ of the present accepted views respecting accent, as may be seen by comparing the following forms.

(1) Full form of the 1st tone, which is in the Dorian mode; the dominant or reciting note being a, and the final note D.



Sic - ut erat in principio, et nunc, et sem - per:



et in secula secu - lo - rum. A - men. . . .

This ending would be written thus:




E V O V A E.


The accents are supplied by the writer. Before the invention of notes the same would be expressed thus:

a a G F G a G F E D  
E V O V A E .

(2) A shortened form of the 1st tone, which does not end on the proper final D, leaving that correct cadence to be supplied by the antiphon.




Sic - ut erat in principio, et nunc, et sem - per:




et in secula secu - lo - rum. A - men.

The accents are as before, and the Evovae thus:



E V O V A E.

(3) Sixth tone, in the Hypolydian mode; dominant a, final F.




Sic - ut erat in principio, et nunc, et sem - per:



et in secula secu - lo - rum. A - men.

The Evovae would be expressed thus (accents being supplied):



E V O V A E.



ever (*Ep.* 181), speaks of an examination conducted by presbyters and deacons, and then referred to the chorepiscopi. The canon too of Theophilus, already quoted, mentions the orthodox clergy of the district as having the right of examination in certain cases. Thomassin (*Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* ii. 1, c. 32, § 11-12), thinks it probable that the task of examining candidates was delegated in the first place to the cathedral clergy, and afterwards, in the provinces, to the priests and deacons.

The examination in these cases appears to have been chiefly an enquiry into the moral character and general fitness of the candidates. The fourth council of Carthage (c. 1), directs that every bishop should be examined before ordination, as to his personal qualities, such as prudence, morality, and learning, both profane and sacred, and also as to his holding the right faith as contained in the creeds. It is not said by whom the examination was to be conducted. The council of Narbonne (c. 11), forbids any bishop to ordain either a priest or deacon who is utterly unlearned. This appears to imply a previous examination into literary as well as moral qualifications. [P. O.]

**EXARCH.** Generically the word *Ἐξάρχος* is applied to any one who takes the lead. Hence it is used of one who is chief in any department or undertaking. So Plutarch in his life of Numa has *Ἐξάρχος τῶν ἱερῶν* in the sense of *sacrorum princeps*, or *summus pontifex*.<sup>a</sup> In its specific ecclesiastical application it has more than one sense.

1. It is perhaps most commonly and most strictly applied to the great prelates who presided over the 'dioceses' (*Διοικήσεις*, see *DIOCESE*), as they were called, which were formed in imitation of the civil dioceses of Constantine. Each of these 'dioceses' comprehended several 'provinces' (*ἐπαρχίαι*), and the metropolitans of these latter were subordinated to the exarchs of the former. The 9th and 17th canons of the council of Chalcedon recognise, or give,<sup>b</sup> a right of appeal from the decision of the metropolitan to the exarch. The word therefore became nearly synonymous with patriarch. Accordingly, in the *Novels* of Justinian, when imperial sanction is given to the principle expressed in the canons of Chalcedon, the word exarch is turned into patriarch.<sup>c</sup> Yet though every patriarch had the power of an exarch, every exarch was not, properly speaking, a patriarch, the latter name being given only to the heads of the more eminent dioceses. Thus in the 'Notitia' given in Bingham, book ix. ch. 1, § 6, which seems to represent the state of things at the end of the 4th century, we find the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, but the exarchs of Asia, Pontus, Thrace, Macedonia, Dacia, and others.<sup>d</sup> [NOTITIA.]

<sup>a</sup> A well-known application of the term in secular government is the title of the exarch of Ravenna.

<sup>b</sup> "Utrum omnes exarchi hanc potestatem ante hoc concilium exercuerint necne, incertum est: Hoc tamen certum, eam ab hoc concilio illis primò confirmatam esse." Beveridge, *Pandect. Annot. in Canon. Concil. Chalced.* p. 115.

<sup>c</sup> Si vero contra metropolitam talis aditio fiat ab episcopo, aut clero, aut aliâ quâcumque personâ, diocesanos illius beatissimus patriarcha simili modo causam iudicet.—*Novel* 123, c. 22.

<sup>d</sup> Beveridge thinks that Balsamon and Morinus are in

Subsequently Constantinople absorbed Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, becoming a patriarchate. (See Neale, *Holy East. Church*, General Introduction.)

2. The word is also sometimes used in reference to metropolitans. For we find the phrase exarch of the province (*Ἐξάρχος τῆς ἐπαρχίας*) as well as exarch of the diocese (*Ἐξάρχος τῆς διοικήσεως*). It is used, for instance, in the 6th canon of the council of Sardica, where the sense seems beyond doubt.\* But the word is here probably used in its general sense of chief, rather than in any technical signification.

3. In later times the name exarch was also applied to certain legates of the patriarch of Constantinople, who appear to have been charged by him with the general maintenance of his rights and authority, and also entrusted with the visitation of monasteries subject to him. The name is also given to ecclesiastics deputed by him to collect the tribute payable by him to the Turkish government. These legates appear to have had large powers, and might even excommunicate, depose, or absolve in the name of the patriarch. (See Beveridge, *Pandectae Canonum, Annotations on the Canons of Chalcedon*, pp. 120, 121.)

*Authorities.*—Suicer, *Thesaurus*, s.v. *Ἐξάρχος*; Beveridge, *Pandectae Canonum*, Oxon. 1672; Bingham, *Antiquities*, bk. ii. ch. 17, and bk. ix.; Thomassinus, *Vetus et Nova Eccles. Discip.* part i. lib. 1, cap. 17. [B. S.]

**EXCAECATIO.** To deprive of sight was not a mode of punishment sanctioned by the Benedictine rules. But in the 8th century some abbats had recourse to this barbarity in the case of contumacious monks. It was forbidden by Charles the Great (*Capitul.* A.D. 789, c. 16) and by the council of Frankfort (A.D. 794, c. 18) and abbats were strictly ordered to confine themselves to the infliction of punishments prescribed in their rule (cf. *Reg. Bened. Comment.* c. 25 Mabilion, *Ann. Ord. Bened.* Saec. IV. Praef. i. 139). [I. G. S.]

**EXCEPTOR.** (1) The word *excipere* was used in later Latin to express the "faking-down" of a person's words. Thus Augustine (*Epist.* 110), "a notariis ecclesiae excipiuntur quae dicimus." Hence a reporter of judicial acts and sentences—as in the case of Christian martyrs—was called *exceptor*. A gloss on Prudentius (*apud* Ducange) speaks of "exceptores" who took down the dicta of the judge and the answers of the martyr. Compare *NOTARY*. (Ducange's *Gloss.* s. v.; Bingham's *Antiq.* III. xiii. 5).

(2) The word is occasionally used as equivalent to *ἀνάδοχος* [SPONSOR], for which "susceptor" is more commonly employed. [C.]

**EXCLUSION FROM COMMUNION.** [COMMUNION, HOLY : EXCOMMUNICATION.]

**EXCLUSIVA** designates, in modern times, the right claimed by certain Roman Catholic

error in speaking of a kind of metropolitans set over whole dioceses, and yet not patriarchs. May they not have meant such as the exarchs of Asia and Pontus? (See Bev. *Pandect. Can. Annot. in Conc. Chalced.* p. 121.) Valesius (*Obs. on Socrates' Hist. Eccles.* lib. 3, cap. 9) calls these exarchs "minores patriarchas," and says "Patriarchae nomen interdum usurpârunt."

\* The words are *διὰ γραμμάτων τοῦ ἐξάρχου ἐπαρχίας*, λέγω δὲ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς μητροπόλεως.

powers of excluding a particular cardinal from being elected pope.

The present form of this right is of course modern, and arises from the political circumstances of the age in Europe; but traces of the very decided influence exerted by princes in restraining the liberty of papal elections are found at a comparatively early date. The emperor Honorius, for instance, in the case of the double election and consecration of Eulalius and Boniface, decided (A.D. 418) in favour of Eulalius, afterwards drove him from the city, and (A.D. 419) ordered the installation of Boniface (*Auctarium Symmachianum*, *Epist.* 19–31; Baronius, an. 419, §§ 2 and 11, etc.). The same emperor, at the request of Boniface, made an ordinance that for the future, in case two candidates disputed the papal chair, neither should be pope but a fresh election should be held (*Corpus Juris Canon.* Dist. xcvi., cc. 1 and 2; Hardouin, *Concil.* i. 1237). Nor was the influence of the temporal power diminished when Germans ruled in Italy. Odoacer (A.D. 483) desired that no papal election should take place without his concurrence (*sine nostrâ consultatione*), and little heed was paid by subsequent princes to the canon of a Roman synod under pope Symmachus (A.D. 502) condemning such interference of the secular arm (Hardouin, ii. 977; *C. J. C.* Dist. xcvi. c. 1, § 7). Theodoric repeated the enactment of Odoacer. On the reconquest of Italy under Justinian the confirmation of the papal election fell into the hands of the emperors, who exacted considerable sums in consideration of it, until the fee was given up by Constantine Pogonatus in the year 678 (*Liber Pontif.*, in *Agatho*; *C. J. C.* Dist. lxi. c. 21). Somewhat later, in the case of Benedict II. (A.D. 684) the claim to confirm the pope was also resigned by the same emperor. This, however, led to so much disorder, that it was found necessary again to invoke the co-operation of the civil power; and the fact of the necessity of the emperor's concurrence is recognised in the *Liber Diurnus Pontiff. Rom.* (c. ii. lib. 3; see also Garnier's *Dissertation* in his edition of the *Lib. Diurn.*), probably of the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century. The necessity for the confirmation of the emperor continued when the Frankish chiefs acquired the imperial dignity. Compare POPE. (Jacobson in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* iv. 280.) [C.]

**EXCOMMUNICATION** (*Abstentio*, *Anathema*, *Excommunicatio*, ἀνάθεμα, ἀφορισμός). The partial or total, temporary or perpetual, exclusion of a member from the privileges of the church.

#### I. ORDINARY EXCOMMUNICATION.

Excommunication belongs to the class of corrective or medicinal penalties (*poenae medicales* or *censurae*), not to the vindictive (*poenae vindicativae*). Augustine (*Serm.* 351, c. 12), distinguishes between “*prohibitio medicinalis*,” and “*prohibitio mortalis*,” meaning (apparently) by the one, exclusion from the mysteries, by the other, exclusion from the church and Christian fellowship altogether. The canon law (*Corpus J.*, c. 37, can. xxiv. qu. iii.), lays down generally that excommunication is “*disciplina, non eradicatio*”; the excommunicated person is capable of being restored to his privileges, upon repentance [PENITENCE].

The exclusion of peccant members from social privileges is a right inherent in all societies; it was in practice among the Jews at the Christian era, and was incorporated by our Lord into the constitution of His church. It is no part of our purpose to discuss the theological bearing of the language in which our Saviour conveyed this power (St. Matt. xviii. 15–18, xvi. 19), nor to investigate the traces which the New Testament contains of the use to which the apostles put it (Rom. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. vi. 14, 17; Gal. i. 8, 9; 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14; Tit. iii. 10; 2 John 10, 11) (See Art. *Excommunication* in *Dict. of the Bible*). It is sufficient to note that a power of cutting off offenders was conferred on the apostles as rulers of the church, and was by them made a systematic part of church government. There are however two instances of direct excommunication by St. Paul, which must be noticed in more detail, because they supplied at once the language and the model after which the church framed in subsequent ages her censures. The apostle by a formal judgment delivered the incestuous Corinthian “to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh” (1 Cor. v. 5); a sentence which cannot signify less than this—that the man was thrust outside the Christian fold. When St. Paul wrote his second epistle, some six or nine months later, the man on his repentance was readmitted into the church. A similar sentence, but producing no similar penitence, was delivered against Hymenaeus and Alexander (1 Tim. i. 20). Hymenaeus is mentioned in 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18, as a teacher of heresy. His case therefore formed a precedent for excommunication for heretical opinion, as that of the Corinthian for immorality. The authority for the use of the formula, ANATHEMA, (ἀνάθεμα), so common afterwards in the Penitential Canons, is to be found in 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8, 9.

The proofs that the church has always claimed and exercised the power of excommunication, are everywhere patent. Fathers (e.g., Irenaeus, *Haeres.* iii. 3; Cyprian, *De Orat. Dom.* c. 18; *Epist.* 41, c. 2; 59 cc. 1, 9, 10, 11; Basil, *Epist.* 61, *ad Athanas.*; Leo the Great, *Epist.* 32, *ad Faustum*; Ambrose, *Epist.* 40, *ad Theodos.*), and councils (e.g., *Cann. Apostl.* c. 8, &c.; iv. *Carth.* c. 73; ii. *Arles*, c. 8; *Venet.* c. 3; *Toledo*, cc. 15, 16, 18), all claim the power of excommunication, of greater or less severity and duration, in the case of offenders, whether against morality or against orthodoxy. The PENITENTIAL BOOKS mention numberless cases in which excommunication is the penalty. See for instance the Penitential of archbishop Theodore (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Documents*, iii. 173).

*Persons subject to Excommunication.*—The power of excommunicating was held to be in some measure correlative to that of baptising; those who could admit into the church could also exclude. The unbaptised were never excommunicated, though catechumens might be, and were, put back into a lower grade, and their baptism postponed. Children were not excommunicated, nor (commonly) reigning princes or large sections of the church. With these exceptions all Christian people, men or women, might be cut off from communion with the faithful. But the sentence was invariably a personal one for personal offences; the innocent were not punished



with the guilty. Such a process as laying a whole nation under an interdict for some supposed offence of the people or their rulers was not known in the early ages, nor before the 12th century.

According to the *Apostolical Constitutions* (ii. cc. 37, 38, 39) the course of discipline was that if any offender did not voluntarily come forward and acknowledge his guilt he was to be summoned by the bishop, first in privacy, then in the presence of two or three witnesses; then if he would not yield, the case was to be told to the church, and if he was still obdurate, sentence would proceed against him. No one was to be excommunicated before he had been several times admonished, according to the apostolic injunction, "him that is an heretic, after the first or second admonition, reject." Nor could any offender be excommunicated in his absence, nor without legal conviction either by his own admission or by credible witnesses. On this safeguard against abuse of power, Van Espen quotes a passage from St. Augustine, "We cannot reject any from our communion unless they have either voluntarily confessed or been charged and convicted before some secular or ecclesiastical tribunal" (St. Aug. *Serm.* 351 *de Poenitent.*). One witness was not received as sufficient evidence of guilt, even though the one was a bishop. No one could incur excommunication for anything temporal; such matters were left to the civil courts, and excommunication in the early ages was a spiritual weapon, cutting off from spiritual privileges. Gregory the Great, writing to some bishop whose name has been lost, severely rebukes him for using for his own private ends, power conferred upon him for the good of the souls of his flock (*Epist.* ii. 34). It was forbidden also to excommunicate for sins of infirmity and frailty. "There are some sins," says St. Ambrose (*in exhort. ad Poenit.*), "which may be daily pardoned by mere supplication to God, in that petition 'forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.'" And it was necessary that the offence should be public; for it was always a maxim "De occultis non judicat Ecclesia." So St. Cyprian, "We so far as it is committed to us to see and judge, look only at the face (the conduct) of each one, his heart and his conscience we cannot investigate" (*Cypr. Epist.* 55).

It would be impossible within reasonable limits to enumerate the graver crimes for which the church cut off her unworthy members. They may in general be reduced under one of the three heads of uncleanness, idolatry, bloodshed. Upon the treatment which men guilty of these crimes should receive, many of the early controversies on discipline hinged. There were, moreover, many breaches of each of the commandments which rendered the offender subject to the highest censure of the church, which cannot be brought under this classification. Of these it will be sufficient to point out a few which were peculiar to the times, or which the opinion of the present day would deal with more leniently. The principle underlying the whole system of ecclesiastical censures, was the preservation of sound members of the Christian body from the evil example and contagion of the unsound. Hence, heresy was ever reckoned among the gravest sins. Hardly less dangerous, and hardly less rigorously pun-

ished in times of persecution, or during the barbarian invasions, was apostasy either to heathenism or to Judaism. Any tampering with idolatry was rigidly prohibited. A Christian was forbidden to be a public actor, or to be present at any theatrical representation, which commonly in that age ministered to lasciviousness; or to frequent the circus, for it was regarded as an appendage of false worship, and detrimental to the majesty of God; or to use divination or astrology, for that was to put destiny in the place of divine providence; or to follow any trade, such for example as the training of gladiators which in its nature was scandalous; or to be a talebearer, a gambler, or a vagrant. See Gregory Nyssen's canonical epistle to Letorius bishop of Melitina, which contains an elaborate classification of sins, and the penalties to be allotted to them.

*Degrees of Excommunication.*—Morinus distinguishes three degrees of excommunication: 1st. All those who were guilty of lighter sins were punished by exclusion from the offering of the oblations and partaking of the communion; 2nd. Those who sinned more grievously were not only altogether shut out from partaking of the communion, but also from being present at that service, and were moreover "delivered unto Satan," i.e. to certain bodily austerities and mortifications; 3rd. Those who persisted in offending, or fell into deadly sin, were expelled alike from all share in the sacred mysteries, and from the very building of the church. (Morin. *de Poenitent.*, lib. 4, c. 11.) Van Espen considers that there were two degrees only, one of which was called "medicinalis," the other "mortalis," (Aug. *Hom.* lib. 1.), or more commonly, "Anathema" (Van Espen *Jus Eccl.* Pars iii. Tit. xi. c. iv.); Bingham also discovers two degrees, lesser and greater excommunication (*ἀφορισμὸς*, *ἀφορισμὸς παντέλης*). The former, which corresponds with the first two classes of Morinus, excluded offenders from the eucharist, and the prayers of the faithful, but did not exclude them from the church, for still they might stay to hear psalms and the reading of the scripture, and sermon and prayer of catechumens and penitents, and depart when the service of catechumens ended. Greater excommunication was a rejection not only from the eucharist but from any presence in church whatever, and any association with Christian men (Bingham, *Antiq.* lib. xvi. c. 11). There remains a still more terrible form of censure, which undoubtedly was sometimes imposed, and which was an absolute and final excision from the church. St. Cyprian (*Epist.* 55 *ad Anton.*) speaks of some of his predecessors who closed the door for ever against adulterers, but adds, that other bishops admitted similar offenders after a period of penitence to the grace of the church. There are various canons in the council of Elvira (circa 305 A.D.), which utterly debar offenders from communion with the faithful for the remainder of their lives, "nec in fine communionem accipere" (*Con. Eliber.* cc. 1, 12, 13, 71, 73). Can. 46 declares that if any persist in sin after having been already punished, he should be totally cast out, "penitus ab ecclesia abjiciatur." The council of Ancyra (cc. 9, 16; circa 315 A.D.) fixes a limit to the penalty attached to those very crimes for which that at Eliberis had decreed final excision. It would appear there-

fore that total and irremediable exclusion was at no time a universal practice, but nevertheless, at certain periods, and in certain localities, where possibly the magnitude of offences required to be dealt with by a penalty of equal magnitude, it was unhesitatingly employed. The practice of excommunicating the dead had no existence in the early centuries, or if here and there it existed, was supported by no canonical authority. The second council of Constantinople (553 A.D.), first introduced it into the Eastern church, and about 100 years later it crept into the Western (Morin. *de Poenitent.* lib. x. c. 9).

*Effect of Sentence.*—The punishment inflicted by a sentence of excommunication varied not only with the gravity of the offence, but with the discretion of the bishop, the customs of the diocese or province, and still more with the age of the church in which the offender lived. In the early centuries the church was ruled with a gentler discipline than was possible when her ranks were filled up promiscuously from the multitude. The incestuous man, whom St. Paul expelled from among his Corinthian converts with such solemn denunciation, was received again on his repentance, probably within a few months, certainly within the year. And up to the time of Montanus, punishments even for grave breaches of the law of the gospel were equally lenient. The term of the penalty was left to the discretion of the bishop. Through the whole of Tertullian's *Treatise de Poenitentia*, and in the *Apostolic Canons*, with one exception, there is no mention of any time for the duration of the censure. And even in the increasing severity which prevailed for the next hundred years, punishments scarcely ever exceeded one or two years (Morin. *de Poenitent.* lib. iv. c. 9). Thenceforward, years would not suffice where weeks or months had been deemed sufficient before. Ten, fifteen, twenty years, were no uncommon penalties. St. Basil excludes a murderer from the church for twenty years (can. 56). The council of Ancyra decrees that a murderer should be a penitent for the rest of his life, and be received back into communion only at the hour of death (can. 22). For murder combined with other great crimes the council of Elvira (can. 11), forbids communion even in death. But at no period did any hard and fast law prevail; if an offender voluntarily confessed his guilt, a shorter term of exclusion was measured out to him; if on the other hand, a man who had before caused scandal was further rebellious and obdurate, his sentence was doubly severe. The lesser excommunication carried with it only an exclusion from communion, and from the inner mysteries and privileges of the faith. Three weeks of this separation was the punishment assigned by the council of Elvira to those who wilfully absented themselves from church for three successive Sundays; a year for some more venial forms of unchastity; another period for eating food in company with a Jew (*Conc. Eliber.* cc. 21, 14, 50). And when the term expired they were received again to all the privileges of full communion, without being called upon to submit to public penance. Very different from this was the punishment attending the greater excommunication, anathema. For the first 300 years the punishment was exclusively spiritual, laid

upon the souls, not the bodies of men, depriving them of spiritual blessings, and in no way interfering with their political relations. Heresiarchs however, and dangerous heretical teachers, were at all periods treated with exceptional severity; the church was forbidden to hold any intercourse with them, to receive them into their houses, or to bid them God speed. It was only gradually after the empire became Christian, that the weapons of the church's warfare began to be more carnal, and the secular power was invoked to uphold the ecclesiastical. At no time before Theodosius, who declared apostates either to Judaism or heathenism incapable of making wills or receiving bequests, and whose *Codex de Haereticis* attaches other pains and penalties to heretics, were any civil disabilities imposed upon those whom the church had cast off. Whatever rights a man had from the laws of God or man, as father, master, magistrate, these he retained after the door of the church was closed against him. Yet in the primitive ages, when the congregations of Christians were comparatively small and the members known to each other, and the spiritual censure was followed by an immediate and literal banishment from all sacred offices, from the society of their brethren in the faith, from all association whatever with holy men and holy things, the sentence fell with overwhelming severity. All the man most valued was taken from him. He was looked upon as under the ban of God's wrath; he was cut off from the kingdom of God on earth; like the leprous man among the Jews, he had the visible plague-spot of sin upon him; there had been passed upon him what was regarded as a presage of the future judgment, for what God had by his ministers bound on earth, he would certainly, it was believed, unless the man repented, bind in heaven. The *Apostolical Canons* (c. 11) forbid any one even to pray in a house with a man under anathema. The first council of Toledo (400 A.D.), ordered (c. 15), that "If any layman is under excommunication, let no clergyman nor religious person come near him nor his house. Also if a clergyman is excommunicated, let him be avoided, and if any is found to converse or to eat with him, let him also be excommunicated." His name was erased from the *DIPTYCHS*, [p. 561]; and there are instances of the erasure having been made after the man had died, and his sins had not come to light while he lived. His oblations were not received at the altar, and even gifts which he had presented to the church were rejected with him. His books might not be read, nor might any intermarry with him. And when his end came he was refused all sacred offices on his deathbed, and no Christian man might attend his funeral, and no Christian rite be performed at it, unless he had given proof of repentance and passed away before being formally absolved. Nor could any one hope to avoid judgment by a voluntary exile, for notice was sent to other congregations, and in the discipline of the early church, a stranger was not admitted into communion unless he brought with him *COMMENDATORY LETTERS* from his own diocese. A man once excommunicated was never ordained, or if it was discovered after his ordination, that he had been previously censured, he was removed from the ministry (*Conc. Eliber.* can. 30; *Conc.*

Nic. 10). This latter strictness was not invariably enforced, but the axiom "*Poenitentes ordinari non debent*," became universal in the Western church, although not always in practice in the Eastern.

*Excommunication of Clergy.*—In some cases the clergy, for offences for which laymen were excommunicated, were suspended and reduced to lay communion [DEGRADATION]; but they might incur both degradation and excommunication. The clergy were brought to trial with more legal formalities than the laity, because if found guilty they were deprived not only of spiritual privileges but of office and emolument. The *Apostolic Canons* (30) decree that any bishop, priest, or deacon guilty of simony shall be cut off from all communion whatever. Mention is also made of reducing clergy to "*peregrina communio*," communion of strangers, which would seem to signify that they were to be treated as strangers who came without commendatory letters, allowed a mere subsistence from the offerings, but denied communion [COMMUNION, HOLY, p. 417]. By the council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.) monks were subject to the same discipline as laity.

*Form or Rite.*—Judgment was delivered in the indicative mood, inasmuch as it decreed a punishment then and there inflicted. It was declared after the reading of the gospel, the bishop standing on the ambo. There is no record of any ceremony attending the delivery of the sentence in the early ages; but Martene publishes a MS. of about the year 1190 which prescribes that twelve priests ought to stand round the bishop with lamps or torches in their hands, and that after the conclusion of the sentence they should cast them on the ground and stamp out the light beneath their feet, and that the bishop should then explain to the people the meaning and effect of the ceremony they had witnessed. No recognised rite of excommunication was in general use before the 9th or 10th century. The formula ordinarily employed was founded on our Lord's words, "Let him be as an heathen man and a publican." The council of Ephesus degraded Nestorius in these terms. "Wherefore our Lord Jesus Christ, whose majesty he by his blasphemous words has assailed, pronounces Nestorius, through this sacred synod, deprived of his episcopal rank and degraded from the fellowship and office of the priesthood throughout the world." The sentence of excommunication of Andronicus, governor of Ptolemais, by his bishop, Synesius (410 A.D.), gives a more detailed account of the penalties involved in the sentence. "The church of Ptolemais makes this injunction to all her sister churches throughout the world. Let no church of God be open to Andronicus and his accomplices; but let every sacred temple and sanctuary be shut against them. The devil has no part in paradise; though he privily creep in he is driven out again. I therefore admonish both private men and magistrates neither to receive them under their roof nor to their table: and priests more especially, that they neither converse with them when living nor attend their funerals when dead. And if any one despise this church as being only a small city, and receive those that are excommunicated by her, let them know that they divide the church by schism. And whosoever does so, whether levite, presbyter, or bishop, shall be ranked in the same class with

Andronicus. We will neither give them the right hand of fellowship, nor eat at the same table with them, and much less will we communicate in sacred mysteries with those who choose to take part with Andronicus" (Synes. *Epist.* 58). [See PENITENCE.]

The following, from an Anglican Pontifical preserved at Gemblours, considered by Martene (*De lit. Ant.* ii. 322; ed. Venet. 1783) to have been written in the 8th century, may serve as a specimen of the later forms. The bishop, denouncing certain persons who, not having the fear of God before their eyes, had plundered the property of the church, and who, after being thrice summoned, contumaciously refused to appear, proceeds: "These therefore we, by the authority conferred upon us by God . . . and the statutes of the canons, excommunicate and cut off from the bounds of the Holy Church of God, and expel from the congregation of Christian men; and unless they speedily come to a better mind and make satisfaction to us, we condemn them with eternal malediction and condemn with perpetual anathema. May they incur the wrath of the heavenly judge; may they be deprived of the inheritance of God and His elect; may they neither in this present life have communion with Christians, nor in the life to come obtain part with God and His saints; but may they be numbered with the devil and his servants, and receive the punishment of avenging flame with everlasting mourning. In heaven and earth may they be abominable, and be tortured for ever with the pains of hell. Cursed be they in the house, cursed in the field; cursed be their food and their fruit; cursed be all that they possess, from the dog that barks for them to the cock that crows for them. May they have their portion with Dathan and Abiram, whom hell swallowed up quick, and with Ananias and Sapphira, who lied unto the apostles of the Lord and fell down dead, and with Pilate, and Judas who betrayed the Lord; may they be buried with the burial of an ass, and so may their light be quenched in the midst of darkness. Amen."

*Minister of Excommunication.*—The officer entrusted with the power of excommunication was the bishop of the diocese to which the offender belonged. [BISHOP, p. 231.] The administration of discipline was originally entirely in his hands; it was he who bound and he who loosed. As the church increased, the infliction of other forms of penance was delegated to the inferior clergy, but the great sentence of excommunication was a weapon which the bishop kept exclusively in the power of his own order. Within his diocese his jurisdiction was supreme; he might mitigate or increase censure at his discretion. In the exercise of this authority he was independent of his presbytery; he sat indeed with it to hear confessions which might criminate others, or to receive accusations against the brethren, or to decide rights and causes brought before him, and offences might then be divulged which would expose the offender to excommunication, but when once guilt was established, either by confession, or conviction, or notoriety, the bishop alone imposed the sentence. Instances also abound of bishops consulting with one another in special emergencies, and deciding amongst themselves the period of penitence to be allotted to special sins, but such

advice or support put no limitation on each bishop's original jurisdiction. The council of Nice (can. 5) forbids any one bishop to receive delinquents cut off by another bishop, which clearly points to each bishop possessing the power to act alone. The end of the same canon decrees that a synod of bishops shall be held in each province twice a year, before Lent and in the autumn (compare *Apost. Can.* 38), to examine into the cases of excommunication which had taken place in the province. There was thus a right of appeal against the sentence of an individual bishop, but only to the bishops of the province. This probably explains instances of synodical excommunication, which do not imply that the bishop had not an independent power to excommunicate, but that an appeal was made from his judgment to the provincial synod, whose sentence was only a more solemn confirmation of the bishop's.

The *Apostolical Canons* (74) decree that, if a bishop is accused he is to be summoned by the synod of bishops, and if he refuse to come two bishops are to go for him, and on his second refusal, to go again, and if he is still contumacious, the synod may proceed against him in his absence. Accordingly the episcopal rank of Nestorius required a synodical censure, which was pronounced by provincial synods under Cyril of Alexandria and Celestine of Rome, and confirmed 431 A.D. by the council of Ephesus. And Eutyches, who was an abbot and so far allowed the privileges of a bishop, was tried at the provincial synod of Constantinople under Flavianus, and on an appeal to a general council was again condemned and excommunicated at Chalcedon, together with Dioscorus of Alexandria.

*Literature.*—Marshall's *Penitential Discipline*, Lond. 1714, reprinted in 'Anglo-Cath. Library,' Ox. 1844; Bingham's *Antiquities*, bk. xvi. and xvii.; Morison, *De Discipline in Administr. Sacrament. Penitentiae*, Antv. 1682; Van Espen, *Jus Ecclesiasticum*, Ven. 1789, vols. 4 and 9; Martens, *De Ant. Eccl. ritibus*; Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christlichen Archäologie*, Leip. 1817. [G. M.]

## II. MONASTIC EXCOMMUNICATION.

By the Benedictine rule contumacious monks incurred the penalty of the greater or the lesser excommunication according to the gravity of the offence, but not till admonition, first private and then public, had been tried on them in vain, nor in cases where, owing to moral stupidity, flogging was likely to be more efficacious (*Reg. Bened.* c. 23). These two kinds of excommunication are further defined as excommunication only from the common meal (a *mensa*) for slighter faults, and excommunication from the chapel also (a *mensa et oratorio*) for faults less venial. Thus the subdivision of monastic excommunication corresponds in its main features with the more minute subdivisions of ecclesiastical discipline generally (*ib.* cc. 24, 25). Even under the lighter ban the offender was forbidden to officiate in the choir as reader or "cantor," and, according to some commentators on the rule, he was to lie prostrate before the altar-steps while the others were kneeling. In the refectory he was to take his food alone after the rest had finished (Martens, *Reg. Comment.* cc. 25, 44).

A monk under the graver excommunication

## EXECUTORIES

was debarred not only from the common board, but also from all the chapel services as well as from the benedictory salutation, and indeed from all intercourse whatever with his brethren (*Reg. Bened.* c. 25). He was to lie outstretched at the doors of the chapel till re-admitted by the abbot; nor even then might he take any public part in the services without express permission (Martens, *u. s. c.* 44). Any monk speaking to an excommunicated brother was "ipse facto" excommunicated himself (*Reg. Bened.* c. 26). But it was kindly ordered by Benedict, that the abbot should send some sympathising brother to console the offender in his loneliness (*ib.* c. 27; cf. *Reg. Mag.* cc. 13, 14; *Reg. Cass. Arelat.* c. 23; *Id. ad Virg.* c. 10).

The duration of the punishment varied, the intention being correctional rather than merely penal. By the rule of Fructuosus, a monk for lying, stealing, striking, false swearing, if incorrigible, was, after flogging, to be excommunicated and kept on bread and water in a solitary cell for three months (*Reg. Fruct.* c. 17). By the rule of Ferreolus, a monk for bad language was forbidden to be present at the mass or to receive the kiss of peace for six months (*Reg. Ferr.* c. 25). By the rule of Chrodegang a canon was excommunicated for what seems so slight an offence as sleeping after nocturns. It was for the abbot to fix the degree of excommunication (*Reg. Bened.* c. 24). Some commentators argue therefore, that the severest form of monastic excommunication cannot be tantamount to the severest ecclesiastical sentence of the kind (*Mart. Reg. Comm.* c. 25).

Mabillon cites instances (*Annal.* x. 46) of monks (Columbanus and Theodorus Studita) excommunicating lay people not belonging to their order. He relates an excommunication of one of the sisterhood by an abbeess in the 7th century (*ib.* xii. 36). Abbots and abbesses were themselves liable to this penalty. Gregory the Great reproves a bishop for harshness in excommunicating an aged abbot of good repute. The second council of Tours in A.D. 567 derived sentence of excommunication against any abbot or prior allowing a woman to enter the monastery (*Conc. Turon.* c. 10). See further *Bened. Anst.* *Concord. Regul.* cc. 30-34 with Menard's Commentary, and Ducange, *Gloss. Lat.* a. v. [L. G. S.]

## EXCUBIAE [VIGIL]

**EXCUBATIL** (1) Slaves who had fled for refuge to a church, and then—on the owners making oath upon the gospels that they would not punish them—been restored to their masters, were called *excubati*. If the master broke his oath he was punished by excommunication. See *Conc. Arelat.* I. cc. 1 and 3; *III.* c. 13; *IV.* c. 34.

(2) Those who under some terror or oppression had fled to a church or monastery and remained there were also called *excubati* (Charter of Charles the Great, quoted by Ducange, *u. s.*). [C.]

**EXECUTORES**. A name given either to the *DEFENSORES* themselves or to officers who performed analogous functions. In one of the canons of a council held at Carthage, A.D. 419 (*Col. Eccl. Afric.* c. 96), it is decreed that permission should be demanded of the emperor for the appointment of five "executores," who should reside in the provinces, and be employed on all occasions of necessity on behalf of the



church, "in omni... desideris quæ habet ecclesia." These are evidently distinct from the "defensores scholastici," mentioned in the canon that follows. In a capitulary of Charles the Great, quoted by Thomassin (*Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discipl.* i. 2, c. 99, § 12), executores are mentioned in connexion with advocates and defenders, "executores, vel advocati seu defensores." Thomassin (*Ibid.* c. 98, § 3) speaks of the title being given to certain officials when employed in carrying into execution the will of the bishop of Rome, who is himself the executor and protector of the canons. [P. O.]

EXEDRA is explained by Ducange, Binsard, and others as a general term including all buildings annexed to a church, or contained within the consecrated area. In classical usage an *ædria* was a semicircular room, or large alcove with seats against the wall for the purposes of conversation (*Cic. de Nat. Deorum*, l. 8; *d. Orat.* iii. 5). *Exedrae* are spoken of by Vitruvius (vi. 5) in connexion with *œci* (*œci*) as rooms for conversation and other social purposes. The two words are similarly coupled together by Eusebius (*H. E.* x. 4, § 44) when describing the church of Paulinus at Tyre. Here Eusebius writes "he provided spacious *ædriae* and *œci* on each side (*ἐξήκωσεν καὶ ὁσὺς τοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ περιήκοντες*) united and attached to the royal fabric (*βασιλικῆς*) and communicating with the entrance to the middle of the temple." The church built by Constantine at Antioch is also described as "being surrounded with a large number of *œci* and *exedrae* in a circle," *ὁσὺς καὶ ἀνὰ τοὺς ἐξήκωσεν τοὺς ἐν μέσῳ* (Euseb. *de Vit. Const.* lib. iii. c. 50). Augustine uses the word in the sense of a large room or hall annexed to the great church at Caesarea (*de Gest. cum Amico*). The sixth canon of the council of Nantes prohibits interments except "in atrio aut porticu, aut in *exedris* ecclesiarum." Bingham holds that baptisteries were included under *exedrae*. The apse of a basilica was also sometimes termed *exedra* from its similarity in shape to those of the baths.

(Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. viii. c. 7, § 1; Augustin *Christ. Archæol.* i. 387; Valesius ad Euseb. *Vit. Const.* lib. iii. c. 50.) [E. V.]

**EXEMPTION OF MONASTERIES.** In the earlier stage of their existence, monasteries generally availed themselves gladly of the patronage of the bishop of the diocese [BISHOP, p. 231], but as they increased in wealth and power, struggled to emancipate themselves from his control. For instance, towards the close of the 6th century the abbess of Ste. Croix at Poitiers, after the death of Radegunde the foundress, who had become one of the nuns, requested the bishop to take the convent under his protection. After some hesitation, on account of the royal rank of the foundress, or because she had placed the convent under royal jurisdiction, he consented "to govern it as the rest of his parishes" (Mabill. *Ann. O. S. B.* VII. xxxix. xl.; Gregor. Turon. *Hist.* ix. 46). On the other hand, in the middle of the 7th century, or later, for the exact date of the deed is uncertain, a monastery at Vienna, apparently of monks and nuns under one constitution, obtained absolute exemption from the

bishop's authority. By this deed, no bishop had any claim to any property of the monastery; no bishop, unless by invitation of the abbot or abbess, could consecrate altars or admit nuns, nor was any fee to be required for performing these ceremonies; and the diocesan was not to hinder any appeal of the monastery to the see of Rome (Mabill. *Ann. O. S. B.* XIII. ii. cf. App. tom. 1). In another fragment cited by Mabillon in the same place no bishop even by invitation was allowed to enter the more private parts of the convent; nor was any bishop to be entertained in the convent, lest this should be an expense and a distraction to the inmates, nor to interfere with the abbess in the correction of the nuns, for she was to be responsible only to the apostolic see. Instances might easily be multiplied of the almost continual collision in Western Christendom between the bishops and the monasteries in their dioceses; in which the monasteries, almost invariably, had the support of the pope, and, frequently, of the royal authority (cf. Martene, *Regul. Comment.* Bened. ap. Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* lxxvi. pp. 839, 840). And the same struggle was going on at the same time in the East. Thus, in the 7th century, the emperor Maurice granted to the monasteries of Theodorus Sicota entire exemption from all episcopal authority, except that of Constantinople (Mabill. *Ann. O. S. B.* xiv. 33). Monasteries subject only to emperor or king, were called "imperialia" or "regalia" (Ducange, *Gloss. Lat. s. v.*). [For exemption of monasteries from taxes see MONASTERY.] [I. G. B.]

#### EXEMPTIONS. [IMMUNITIES OF CLERGY.]

**EXEQUIES.** [BURIAL OF THE DEAD: OMBUDSMAN.]

**EXERCISES, PENITENTIAL.** [PENITENCE.]

**EXHORTATION** (*Exhortatio*), is used in a special sense for the admonition on the duties of their office addressed by the ordinator to a person just ordained. See, for instance, the Coptic ritual of ordination, in Martene, *De Lit. Ant.* i. viii. 11, *Ordo* 23. [C.]

**EXILE** (*Exilium*, *Peregrinatio*). For certain offences a penitent was ordered to leave his country and pass some period of his penitence in distant lands. This mode of penance is found among the canons ascribed to some of the British councils of the 6th century; but there are strong grounds for believing that they are interpolations of a later period, and that the penance of exile cannot be traced to any earlier source than the 7th century. The *Penitential* of Theodore (l. ii. 16) appoints fifteen years of penance for incest, of which seven are to be passed in a foreign land (personal peregrinations). The *Penitential* of Egbert (iii.) declares seven years of exile to be part of the penance due to parricide; and (v. 9) orders a cleric who begets an illegitimate child to go into exile for either four, five, or seven years. Morinus, however, considers (*de Penit.* vii. 15) that these wanderings of penitents soon led to abuses, and were checked in a capitulary of Charles the Great (vi. 372).

The practice thus begun in submission to a judicial penalty was continued as a voluntary self-discipline, and in the 10th century it began to be considered a meritorious action to leave

\* In Mabill. (*Concil.* ix. 476) the reading is "extra ecclesiam."

home and country and make a pilgrimage to some spot consecrated by association with some holy man; the earliest of which places were Rome, Tours, and the supposed burial-place of St. James at Compostella. This tendency received a great impulse from the Crusades, and especially from the decree of the council of Clermont (Canc. Clermont, a. 3), which allowed a pilgrimage to Jerusalem to expiate all penance whatever. [G. M.]

**EXOCATACOELE.** Five great dignities of the patriarchal church of Constantinople, viz. the oecumenical or steward, the senior and junior keeper of the purse (οικονομῆται), and the senior and junior chartophylax, were anciently called ἐξοκατάκοιλοι. To these, in the 11th century, the defender of the church was added. The etymology of the word is uncertain. That of Duvoigne (Oikos. Græc.) that they received their name from having their seats of dignity on a raised platform, not in the lower portion of the floor (κατάκοιλος) where less distinguished persons sat, is perhaps as probable as any. (Thomassin, *Éccl. Discip.* l. ii. 99, § 10; Daniel, *Codex Liturg.* iv. 702.) [C.]

**EXODIASTICON** (Ἐξοδιастικόν). As the departure of a Christian was frequently spoken of as ἔξοδος, the service at the death-bed is called in Greek office-books Ἐξοδιастικόν (Daniel, *Codex Lit.* iv. 608, 634). [BURIAL OF THE DEAD; SICK, VISITATION OF] [C.]

**EXOMOLOGESIS** (Ἐξομολογῆσις, Confessio, ἑξομολόγησις, ἑξομολογῆσις). The verb in St. Matt. vi. 25 expresses acknowledging and praise, and in this sense was used by many Christian writers (Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v. ἑξομολ.). But more generally in the early fathers it signifies the whole course of penitential discipline, the outward act and performance of penance. From this it came to mean that public acknowledgment of sin which formed so important a part of penitence. Irenæus (c. *Hæres.* l. 13, § 5) speaks of an adulterous wife, having been converted, passed her whole life in a state of penitence (ἑξομολογούμενη, in exomologues); and (ib. lib. 4) of Cerdon often coming into the church and confessing his errors (ἑξομολογούμενος). Tertullian (de *Pœnit.* c. 9) considers the Greek word ἑξομολογῆσις more suitable than the Latin *confessio*, and proceeds to define the term as "the discipline of humbling and penetrating a man." At the end of the same treatise he speaks of the king of Babylon's humiliation as an exomologues, and of the king of Egypt's neglect of repentance and its attendant confession. The term occurs twice in Cyprian (de *Lapsis*, cc. 11, 18), and six times in his Epistles (Epist. 4, ad Pompon. c. 3; 15, ad Martyr. c. 1; 16, ad Cler. c. 2; 17, ad Luc. c. 35; ad Anton. c. 24; 39, ad Corneli. c. 18, Oxf. ed.) in the sense of the course of penitence and public humiliation; three times (Epist. 18, ad Cler. c. 19, ad Cler. c. 20, ad Rom. Cler. c. 2) referring to the confession of dying penitents; and once (de *Lapsis*, c. 19) as applied to Ananias and his companions, in the sense of confession of the lips generally. St. Basil, describing the morning service of his time (Epist. 207, ad Cler. Novacorum), says that after the antiphonal chant, at daybreak they all burst forth into the psalm of confession (ὡς τῆς ἑξομολογῆσις ψαλμοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀναφύροντες), meaning no doubt that which is emphatically a psalm of

confession, the fifty-first. This psalm is also mentioned by Chrysostom (de *Fastis*, Orom. iii. 6) as occurring at the close of matins. Pœnitence in one place (Paræm. ad Pœnit. p. 372, Oxf. ed.) following Tertullian, speaks of the degradation of Nebuchadnezzar as exomologues; in another (ibid. p. 373), in imitation of Cyprian, applies the term to the song of the "three children." At the council of Laodicea (can. 2) it is in the whole course of penitence: "As, to those who sin by diverse offences and persevere in prayer of confession (ἑξομολ.) and repentance." With Chrysostom it is in one place (Hom. 10 on St. Matt. c. 4) the course of penitence; elsewhere (Hom. 3, de incompt. lvi. mat. t. i. p. 490; Hom. 2, ad Aluac. Catech. t. i. p. 240, Bened. ed.) it is confession to God only. Isidore of Seville (Etymol. vi. 19) defines exomologues to be that by which we confess our sins to the Lord. But at the end of the same chapter he adduces an entirely different meaning of the word. "Between litanies and exomologues there is this difference, that exomologues stands for confession of sins only, litany for prayer to God, and imploring His pardon; but now each word has the same meaning, nor is there any difference between the use of litany and exomologues." The 17th council of Toledo, A.D. 694 (c. 8), orders litanies (exomologues) to be said for a whole year for the church, for the sovereign, &c. &c. And the council of Mayence, A.D. 813 (Canc. Mogunt. c. 32) quotes the exact words of Isidore on exomologues being equivalent with litany (Comp. Morin. de Pœnit. ii. 2; note L. on Tertull. de *Pœnit.*, in Oxford Library of the Fathers).

Of these meanings the first and last are quite foreign to the general ecclesiastical use of the word and need not be pursued any further; that which signifies the whole course of penitential discipline will be discussed under the article ΠΕΝΙΤΕΝΤΙΑ: this article will relate to exomologues only so far as it signifies oral confession.

**Public Confession.**—i. *Of public sin.*—This was the first stage in the restoration of a penitent. So long as discipline was in force, any one guilty of a notorious crime which had subjected him to censure [EXCOMMUNICATION] was required to make an open acknowledgment of his crime at the beginning of his course of penitence. The confession took place after the Missa Catechumenorum, and when they and the hearers had been warned to withdraw from the church by the deacon. Then if any one had been recently convicted of any open sin, he confessed and bewailed it before the church, and in accordance with the gravity of his offence, his penitential station was assigned him by the bishop; sometimes, however, the bishop, yielding to the requests of the clergy and people who had heard the confession, allotted a less remote station. The bishop then addressed the congregation on the nature of the offence, and they offered up their prayers for the offender's repentance. This public confession was addressed not merely to the bishop or the priest in the presence of the congregation, but in a loud voice to the congregation at large. It signified that as the church had been scandalized by an open sin in one of its members, reparation should be made to it by an equally open admission of sin. It also manifested the earnestness of the offender's repentance that he was willing to undergo this public humiliation. But the

chief object was that the offender might seek the prayers of the congregation to support and stimulate his conversion. If any one who was notoriously guilty failed or refused to confess, no one would communicate with him, in accordance with the apostle's precept (1 Cor. v. 11; Ephes. v. 11). Again, if he waited to be convicted, his censure was heavier than if he had made a spontaneous confession. The council of Elvira (*Conc. Elib. c. 16*) orders that if a deacon before his ordination had committed a mortal sin, and afterwards confessed, he should be restored after three years' penitence; but if detected, after five years, and only to lay communion. Basil (*ad Amphiloc. cc. 7, 61*) allows alleviation of punishment on three grounds, ignorance, confession, and lapse of time. This encouragement to confession reappears in the 8th century in the Rule of Chrodegand of Metz (c. 18), "he who voluntarily confesses his lighter sins shall be visited with lighter censures." And not only was an offender urged to confess for his own sake, but any who was privy to his crime was under a similar obligation to accuse him, for if he failed or even delayed to do so, he was himself exposed to censure (Basil, *ad Amphiloc. c. 71*).

ii. *Of secret sins.*—Such confession was at no time obligatory. Sometimes, however, under the direction of a priest who had been consulted, or moved by a sudden contrition and remorse, some would charge themselves with a secret sin before the congregation. Thus (Iren. c. *Hæres. i. 9*) the virgins seduced by the heretic Marcus, and the wife of the deacon Asianus made a public acknowledgment of guilt which was known only to themselves. One of the three men who had calumniated Narcissus of Jerusalem (Euseb. *H. E. vi. 9*) publicly acknowledged years afterwards, when his two associates had died from some painful disorder, that his charge against the bishop had been false. Some of the priests who had joined Novatian (*ibid. vi. 43*) spontaneously charged themselves before the church with heresy and other crimes; one of the bishops who had been induced to consecrate him publicly acknowledged his error, and Cornelius, in deference to the intercession of the people who witnessed the confession, admitted him to lay communion. But public confession of secret sins needed at a very early period to be checked and regulated; and the people were admonished to consult their priests before divulging their sins to the church [PENITENTIARY]. Anything which would create a scandal or endanger life or liberty was forbidden to be revealed. So Basil (*ad Amphiloc. c. 34*) would not permit a woman who had privately admitted the guilt of adultery to acknowledge it in the church or even to perform openly the penance generally demanded for such a sin, lest she should be murdered by her husband. Similar precautions are laid down by Origen, Augustine, and Caesarius of Arles (Morin. *de Poenit. ii. 13*). In the 6th century the practice arose of making confession of public sins to the bishop, of private to the priest.

iii. *Before the bishop and his presbytery.*—Tertullian (*de Poenit. c. 9*) says it is part of exomologesis for the penitent "to throw himself upon the ground before the presbytery, and to fall on his knees before the beloved of God." Cyprian (*de Lapsis, c. 18*) praises the faith of those who, having without any overt act meditated idola-

try, made a confession "apud sacerdotes Dei." Gregory Nyssen (*Ep. ad Letoium*, in Marshall p. 195) speaks of a certain evil which had been overlooked by the ancient fathers, from whence it had come to pass, that no person who was brought before the clergy to be examined as to his life and conversation was at all examined upon that point. Before the presbytery confessions were made which criminated others; and this frequently happened; for any one making a public confession named his confederates, unless by so doing he exposed them to legal penalties. No ecclesiastical censure, however, fell on any who denied a crime which his associate had admitted: on the principle that penitence was a privilege not a punishment. The deacon and virgin whose case is decided by St. Cyprian and his presbytery (*Epis. iv. ad Pompon.*) must have had an information laid against them by some associate, for their guilt had been secret. This mode of confession was affected in the East by the appointment of the Penitentiary; but in the West so long as public penitence for secret faults prevailed, so long did public confession to bishops and their assistant priests. Probably this was the origin of the custom introduced into the Benedictine Rule of confession to the abbot surrounded by his monks.

*Private Confession.*—i. *General account.*—The testimony of the fathers will be discussed in detail later; here it is sufficient to say that the early fathers Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, hardly allude to private confession at all; and among the writers generally of the first 500 years those who mention it do so with some reference more or less direct to public discipline. But it is certain that public penitence was not assigned to all sins which were secretly confessed, but only to such as in the discretion of the priest required it. It is easy to understand that offences of a trivial nature might be confided to a priest, or offences of such a character as would scandalise the church were they openly divulged; and until this spiritual direction had been given, the offender would be in doubt whether or not a public acknowledgment would be expected from him. But it is equally clear that no absolution was given after direction of this sort, or until penitence had been performed. Such at least for many centuries was the practice in the Latin church (see PENITENCE, under which the question of absolution will be discussed): in the Eastern church a practice arose of pronouncing some preliminary absolution immediately after the utterance of the confession, and a second absolution when the penance had been performed. The evidence of this practice is to be found in the early Greek Penitentials at the end of the 6th century; but Morinus would carry back its origin to the time of the abolition of the office of Penitentiary at the end of the 4th. To resort to a spiritual guide for comfort and counsel was one thing; to obtain through his ministry by confession penance and absolution, reconciliation with God and communion with the faithful was another: and there is no proof that the two were combined, and that private sacramental confession had any existence in the first 500 years of the Christian church. The term itself is not found in any of the documents of the first eight centuries: and if the definition of Thomas Aquinas (*Summa*, pt. iii. qu. 84-90) is to be

accepted as a theological definition of the term, its growth must be assigned to a much later period. There existed undoubtedly from a very early period private confession followed by no penitence, but also by no absolution; there was also private confession followed by public penitence, and generally by subsequent public confession, to which the private was a preliminary: and there was after the beginning of the 6th century private confession followed by private penitence, but the penance was always exacted, and differed only from public penance in solemnity; there is nowhere to be found in canons or sacramentaries or penitentials one punishment for private penitence and another for public. The sins thus privately confessed with a view to penitence were those only of a grievous character, sins which excluded from communion or public prayer, or even from the church itself, which required a long and painful course of penance before they were blotted out, and into which if the sinner relapsed, there was, certainly in the rigour of the primitive ages, no second door of reconciliation open to him. Sozomen indeed, writing at the end of the 5th century, says in reference to penitence that there is pardon for those who sin again and again, but this is not the language of antiquity. There was but one admission to solemn penance. Moreover, sins for which penance was to be performed were described by canons and in canonical epistles, and sins which did not fall within these canons were neither confessed nor made subject to penance. Sins of frailty incidental to mankind were to be healed by daily prayer and confession to God only. So, among numerous authorities that penitence, and confession as a part of penitence, was not exacted for venial sins, Augustine (*de Sym. ad Catech.* t. vi. p. 555, ed. Antv.), "those whom you see in a state of penitence have been guilty of adultery or some other enormity, for which they are put under it: if their sin had been venial, daily prayer would have been sufficient to atone for it." The Greek Penitentials of the end of the 6th century, and the Latin ones of a century later, give no hint of habitual confession of common infirmities, or of private confession being a matter of indispensable obligation, still less of the doctrine that one may daily confess and be daily and plenarily absolved.

ii. *In the Western Church.*—In the times of Tertullian and Cyprian public discipline was in full vigour, and as part of it a public acknowledgment of sins: the passages which have already been adduced from these fathers contain nothing to show that they regarded confession in any other light than as one stage of the act of penitence.

Ambrose (*de Poenit.* ii. 6) speaks of confession, but it is confession to God. "If thou wilt be justified confess thy sins; for humble confession looses the bonds of sin." Another passage, selected by Bellarmine to support secret confession, relates manifestly to the course of discipline; for having at the end of the previous section said that "very many, out of fear of future punishment, conscious of their sins, seek admission to penitence, and having obtained it are drawn back by the shame of public entreaty," Ambrose thus proceeds (*ib.* c. 10), "Will any one endure that thou shouldst be ashamed to ask of God, who art not ashamed to ask

men? that thou be ashamed to supplicate Him from whom thou art not hid, when thou art not ashamed to confess thy sins to man from whom thou art hid?" Another passage (*in Luc.* x. 22, p. 5, 1787) commenting on St. Peter's denial of Christ and subsequent repentance, is inconsistent with the existence of a custom of private confession in his time. "Let tears wash away the guilt which one is ashamed to confess with the voice. Tears express the fault without alarm; tears confess the sin without injuring bashfulness; tears obtain the pardon they ask not for. Peter wept most bitterly, that with tears he might wash out his offence. Do thou also, if thou wouldest obtain pardon, wash out thy fault with tears."

Augustine's own confessions contain no hint that he either practised or inculcated private confession. "What have I to do with men that they should hear my confession, as if they could heal all my infirmities" (x. 3). Bellarmine quotes from the same writer (on *P's.* 66, c. 7)—"Be downcast before thou hast confessed; having confessed, exult; now shalt thou be healed. While thou confessedst not, thy conscience collected foul matter; the imposthume swelled, distressed thee, gave thee no rest; the physician fomented it with words, sometimes cuts it, employs the healing knife, rebuking by tribulation. Acknowledge thou the hand of the physician; confess; let all the foul matter go forth in confession; now exult, now rejoice, what remains will readily be healed." But Augustine is commenting on the text, "Sing unto the Lord all the whole earth;" and confession can be confession to God only, as surely the physician who heals by tribulation can be none other than God. In *Serm.* 181 (fin.) he speaks of daily prayer as the sponge which is to wipe away sins of infirmity and contrasts them with death-bringing sins for which alone penitence is performed. Elsewhere (*de Sym. ad Catech.* tom. vi. p. 555, ed. Antv.) he again speaks of the "three methods of remitting sins in the church, in baptism, in the Lord's Prayer, in the humility of the greater penitence," and he limits penance and consequently confession to sins which deserve excommunication. And in many similar passages he is a witness that up to his time no confession was required of any sins but such as subjected a man to penitential discipline.

Leo in his Epistle to Theodorus gives plain testimony of the connection of confession with penance (*Ep.* 91, c. 2). But in a letter to the bishops of Campania he gives some directions which mark if they do not make an era in confession in the Latin church. The epistle is too important not to be quoted at length (*Ep.* 80, *ad Episc. Campan.*). "That presumption, contrary to the apostolic rule, which I have lately learned to be practised by some, taking unduly upon themselves, I direct should by all means be removed, and that a written statement of the nature of the crimes of each should not be publicly rehearsed, since it suffices that the guilt of the conscience be laid open to the priests alone in secret confession. For although that fulness of faith, which out of the fear of God fears not to take shame before men, seems to be praiseworthy, yet because the sins of all are not of such sort, that they who ask to do penitence fear not their being published, let so unadvisable a custom be done away, lest



many be kept from the remedies of penitence; either being ashamed, or fearing that actions for which they may be punished by the laws should be discovered to their enemies. For that confession suffices, which is made first to God, then to the priest also, who draweth near to pray for the sins of the penitents. For so at length may more be stirred up to penitence, if the sins confessed by the penitents be not published in the ears of the people." In the early ages public confession was only remitted in case of danger to the individual or scandal to the church: by this constitution of Leo secret confession to the priest was to take the place of open confession, and the priest's intercession of the intercession of the church. The door thus opened for escaping from the shame of public confession was never afterwards closed, and secret confession gradually became the rule of the church.

In the pontificate of Gregory the Great, a century and a half later, there is no evidence to be found of the existence of public confession: and even after private confession it was difficult to bring men to submit to public discipline (*Expos. in 1 Reg. t. iii. 15, p. 342*). "The sign of a true confession is not in the confession of the lips, but in the humiliation of penitence. . . . The confession of sin is required in order that the fruits of penitence may follow. . . . Saul, who confesses and is not willing to humble and afflict himself, is a type of those who make a sterile confession and bear no fruit of penance."

In the 7th century, the stern rule that solemn confession as a part of penitence was received only once, had become obsolete, but habitual confession had not yet taken its place. The first council of Châlons, A.D. 650 (1 *Cabil. c. 8*), declares that all agree that confession to the priest is a proof of penitence. The Penitential of Theodore (I. xii. 7) gives a rule which shows that auricular confession was not yet obligatory. "Confession if needful may be made to God only." [COMMUNION, HOLY, p. 417.] Bede (tom. v. *Exp. in S. Jac. v.*) reverting to the old practice draws a distinction between the confession of frailties and of heinous sins. "We ought to use this discretion, our daily light sins confess to one another, and hope that by our prayers they may be healed; but the pollution of the greater leprosy let us according to the law open to the priest, and in the manner and the time which he directs, purify ourselves." The second council of Châlons, A.D. 813 (2 *Conc. Cabil. c. 32*) complains that people coming to confess neglect to do so fully, and orders each one when he comes to examine himself and make confession of the eight capital sins which prevail in the world—which are then enumerated—and by implication, of no others. Theodulph's Capitulary (c. 30) draws a distinction between confession made to a priest and that to God only, and (c. 31) mentions the same eight principal sins as the council, and appoints that every one learning to confess should be examined on what occasions and in what manner he had been guilty of any of them, and consequently be subjected to no further examination. Chrodegand (c. 32) orders "confession to be made at each of the three fasts of the year, 'et qui plus fecerit melius facit,' and monks to confess on each Sunday to their bishop or prior." But there is no other document showing that confession had yet become periodical. That secret confession

was not yet a matter of obligation is clear from the canon of the council of Châlons (2 *Conc. Cabil. c. 33*). "Some say they ought to confess their sins to God only, and some think they are to be confessed unto the priests, both of which not without great fruit are practised in the Holy Church. . . . the confession which is made to God purgeth sins, that made to the priests teacheth in what way those sins should be purged." And so it remained an open question for the next 300 years, for Gratian (*de Poenit. Dist. i. 89*) summing up the opinions of different doctors on necessity of confession leaves it still undecided. "Upon what authorities or upon what strength of reasons both these opinions are grounded, I have briefly declared; which of them we should rather cleave to is left to the judgment of the reader; for both have for their favourers wise and religious men." And it was not determined till the famous decree of the Lateran council, A.D. 1215 (4 *Conc. Lateran. c. 21*) ordering all of each sex as soon as they arrived at years of discretion to confess at least once a year to their own priest.

iii. *In the Eastern Church.*—The duty of consulting a priest when the conscience is burdened is urged more strongly by the Greek than by the Latin fathers; there are consequently more distinct traces of secret confession to be found in the Eastern than in the Western church. Origen has one passage speaking directly of confession, not to God only but to the ministers of the church; the purpose of the confession however is not to obtain absolution, but spiritual guidance; after having spoken of evil thoughts which should be revealed in order that they might be destroyed by Him who died for us, he continues (*Hom. 17 in Luc. fin.*), "if we do this and confess our sins not only to God, but to those also who can heal our wounds and sins, our sins will be blotted out by Him," &c. In another passage, which is even more explicit, he speaks of the care required in choosing a discreet and learned minister to whom to open the grief, and the skill and tenderness required in him to whom it is confided (*Hom. 2 in Ps. 37, t. 11, p. 688, ed. Bened.*).

Athanasius (*Vit. Ant. Erem. p. 75, ed. Augs.*) narrates an injunction of Anthony to his fellow-recluses, that they should write down their thoughts and actions and exhibit the record to one another, which probably was the beginning of habitual confession among monastic orders, where there are many grounds for supposing it prevailed long before it became the custom of the church. Basil lays it down even more definitely than Origen, that in cases of doubt and difficulty resort should be had to a priest; and in his time such a priest was specially appointed in each diocese, whose office it was to receive such private confessions and decide whether they should be afterwards openly acknowledged. [PENITENTIARY.] Thus in Basil, *Reg. brev. tract. (Q. 229)* the question is proposed, "Whether forbidden actions ought to be laid open to all, or to whom, and of what sort?" And the answer is, that as with bodily disease, "so also the discovery of sins ought to be made to those able to cure them." Again (Q. 288) Basil asks, "he who wishes to confess his sins ought he to confess them to all, or to any chance person, or to whom?" and re-

plies, "it is necessary to confess to those entrusted with the oracles of God." There would have been no necessity for regulations like these had not private confession been in frequent practice. In *Serm. Ascet.* (t. ii. p. 323, ed. Bened.) monks are directed, by a rule similar to that of Anthony, to tell to the common body any "thought of things forbidden, or unsuitable words, or remissness in prayer, or lukewarmness in psalmody, or desire after ordinary life," that through the common prayers the evil may be cured. Like instructions are found in the *Reg. fus. tract.* (Q. 26) "On referring everything, even the secrets of the heart, to the superior."

Gregory Nyssen (*Ep. ad Letoium*, in Marshall, p. 100) in one place speaks of secret confession which is to be followed by penance: "he who of his own accord advances to the discovery of his sins, as by his voluntary accusation of himself he gives a specimen of the change that is in his mind towards that which is good, will deserve lighter correction," alluding to the well-established rule that voluntary confession was allowed to mitigate the subsequent penance: in another place he writes as if he commended the custom of confessing all transgression of positive law whether it involved penance or not, "if he who has transferred to himself the property of another by secret theft shall unfold his offence to the priest by secret confession, it will be sufficient to cure the guilt by a contrary disposition."

The abolition of the office of the Penitentiary made undoubtedly a great break in the practice of confession in the Eastern church. The account is given in Socrates (*H. E.* v. 19) and Sozomen (*H. E.* vii. 16). [PENITENTIARY.] It is difficult to believe that the scandal which had arisen in connection with the Penitentiary had not some influence on the teaching of St. Chrysostom, who immediately afterwards succeeded to the see of Constantinople. He both recommended and enforced penance, but any confession which had not immediate reference to discipline, he taught should be made to God alone. None of the fathers bear equally strong testimony against auricular confession (*Hom. 5 de incomp. Dei nat.* p. 490). "I do not bring you upon the stage before your fellow-servants, nor do I compel you to discover your sins in the presence of men, but to unfold your conscience to God, to show Him your ail and malady, and seek relief from Him." So (*Hom. 20 in Gen.* p. 175). "He who has done these things (grievous sins) if he would use the assistance of conscience for his need, and hasten to confess his sin, and show his sore to the physician who healeth and reproacheth not, and converse with Him alone, none knowing, and tell all exactly, he shall soon amend his folly. For confession of sins is the effacing of offences." For numerous other examples compare Daille (iii. 14, iv. 25), Hooker (vi. c. iv. 16), note on Tertull. *de Poenit.* in Oxford *Library of the Fathers*, p. 401.

From the time of Chrysostom to the time of the Greek Penitentials there is no material evidence. Joannes Climacus (cited by Daille) has a rule which points to the existence of confession in the eastern monasteries of the 6th century: a similar notice from Theodorus Studites, in his life of Plato, shows that the practice had a greater hold on the monks of the 9th century.

It appears from the Penitentials that some form of absolution was given in the east immediately after confession, a practice of which there is no trace for many centuries later in the Latin church. Joannes Jejulator orders that immediately after the confession is over and the priest has said the seven prayers of absolution, i.e., absolution in the precatory form, he is to raise the penitent from the ground and kiss him, and exhort him thus—"behold by the mercy of God who would have all men to be saved, you have fled for refuge to penitence, and made a confession, and been freed from all your former wicked works, do not therefore corrupt yourself a second time, &c. &c.;" after this the penitence is imposed. In the contemporary Penitential of Joannes Monachus the form of absolution directly after confession is still stronger. "May God who for our sake became man, and bore the sins of all the world, turn to your good all these things which you, my brother, have confessed to me, His unworthy minister, and free you from them all in this world, and receive you in the world to come, and bring all to be saved, who is blessed for ever." But this absolution did not entitle the penitent to Holy Communion, nor do away with the necessity of subsequent penitence, which often continued for years after this, and at the end of it another and more formal and perfect absolution was granted. (*Morin. de Poenit.* vi. 25.) On the practice of confession among the sects which broke away from the Orthodox church, see Daniel (*Codex Liturgicus*, iv. p. 590).

iv. *Confession before receiving Holy Communion* may have been an occasional practice, but the presumption is very strong against its having been a general one. Socrates (*H. E.* v. 19), in his account of the abolition of the office of the Penitentiary, states that Nectarius was advised to strike his name from the roll of ecclesiastical officers, and allow each one henceforward to communicate as his own conscience should direct; a notice which seems to imply that in the time of Nectarius, who was Chrysostom's predecessor at Constantinople, it had been the custom for the people to consult with the Penitentiary before presenting themselves to receive the eucharist. But the passage is an isolated one; it is supported by no other authority; and whatever value it may have, it is a two-edged testimony, for it proves that the custom prevailed at that time, it also proves that after that time it ceased. On the other hand there is this class of indirect evidence, that no such preparation was generally enforced. Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 43), relates that during the episcopate of Cornelius at Rome, 1050 widows and destitute people received alms from the church; the Roman church must therefore at that time have consisted of many thousands, to minister to whom were the bishop himself and forty-six presbyters; and when the frequency with which the faithful communicated even at the latter half of the 3rd century, is borne in mind, it would seem to be almost physically impossible that each one should make an individual confession before communicating. Similar evidence is furnished from the ancient liturgies, in which special directions are given to the deacon to warn to depart from the church the catechumens, penitents, and others who were not allowed to communicate, but no hint is

given that those who had failed to confess were to be excluded. Stronger evidence is supplied by the absence of any mention of confession among the preparations required for a worthy reception of the sacrament. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. 1, p. 318, Potter) seems to imply that some ministers judged who were or were not worthy [COMMUNION, HOLY, p. 413], though he himself thought the individual conscience the best guide. Chrysostom (*Hom.* 27 in *Gen.* p. 268, ed. Bened.) similarly leaves each one to judge of his fitness, "If we do this [reconcile ourselves with the brethren], we shall be able with a pure conscience to approach His holy and awful table, and to utter boldly those words joined to our prayers—the initiated know what I mean; wherefore I leave to everyone's conscience how, fulfilling that command, we may at that fearful moment utter these things with boldness." Augustine also tells his hearers that their own conscience, and that alone, must determine their fitness (*Serm.* 46 *de Verb. Dom.*), "considering your several degrees, and adhering to what you have professed, approach ye to the flesh of the Lord, approach ye to the blood of the Lord; whoso proveth himself not to be such, let him not approach." The second council of Châlons (2 *Conc. Cabil.* c. 46), gives detailed directions on the manner and order of receiving, but no word about confession—an omission which bears so much the more strongly upon the question, because private confession had undoubtedly begun to take the place of penitential confession in the 9th century.

v. *At the hour of death.*—The evidence on this head, still more than on the preceding, is negative. If confession immediately before death had been customary, some notice of it would have found a place in the narratives of the last hours of the saints and fathers of the early church. But no such records appear. Cyprian in three of his epistles (*Ep.* 18–20, Oxf. ed.), allows the confession of the lapsed to be received on their deathbed preparatory to imposition of hands; but this was only to meet the emergency of sudden illness overtaking penitents; it was no part of a systematic practice. Athanasius in his account of the death of Anthony (*in Vit. Ant. Eremit. fin.*), has no allusion to a previous confession. Equally silent is Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* 21), on the death of Athanasius; and (*Orat.* 19), on the death of his own father, Gregory bishop of Nazianzum; and (*Orat.* 20), in the eulogy which he delivered at the tomb of Basil. Gregory Nyssen (*de Vit. Greg. Thaum.*) has no account of the deathbed confession of Gregory Thaumaturgus: nor has Ambrose (*de Obit. Theod.*) of that of Theodosius. Augustine (*Confess.* ix. 10, 11), records the last hours of his mother, but he records no last confession; his own last hours which Possidius (*de Vit. Aug.* c. 31) has described, were spent in penitence, but the only confession made was to God, "He was wont to say to us that even proved Christians, whether clergy or laity, should not depart from life without a full and fitting penitence, and this he carried out in his last illness. For he had the penitential psalms copied out and arranged against the wall in sets of four, and read them as he lay in bed, all through his sickness, and freely and bitterly wept. And he begged that he might not be interrupted, and that we would not go into his room except when his physicians came, or he

needed food. And all that time we neither read nor spoke to him." Bede, narrating (*Eccl. Hist.* iv. 3), the death of bishop Ceadde, and (*ib.* iv. 2), the abbess Hilda, and (*Cuth. Vit.* c. 39) Cuthbert, states that each received the Holy Communion at the last, but not that it was preceded by confession. Similar is Eginhard's account (*Vit. Car. Mag.*), of the death of Charles the Great (see Daille iv. 3, where the evidence is drawn out in detail).

vi. *Time and Manner.*—The time of public confession was originally whenever the penitent felt moved to acknowledge his sin before the church; afterwards, in common with the whole course of discipline, the time was restricted to certain seasons [PENITENCE]. Private confession not being part of the recognized order of the church, had necessarily no time assigned to it. The capitulary of Theodulph (c. 36) indeed orders confessions to be made the week before Lent, but this is an exceptional instance. There is an example of a confession made in writing by Potamius, archbishop of Braga to the 10th council of Toledo, A.D. 656, charging himself with misdemeanours. The confession was entirely spontaneous, for the council having no suspicion of his guilt could not at first believe him; but on his reaffirming the fact, he was deposed and subjected to penitence for the remainder of his life; allowed, however, out of compassion to retain his title, his successor signing himself bishop and metropolitan. Robert, bishop of the Cenoman. (Le Mans), also made a written confession, but the council to which it was made absolved him (*Morin. de Poenit.* ii. 2; v. 10).

It appears from the Greek Penitentials that confession was made sitting; the penitent kneeling only twice while making his confession, at the beginning, when the priest asked the Holy Spirit's aid to move the man to disburden his soul completely, and at the end, when a prayer was offered that he might obtain grace to perform his sentence conscientiously. The origin of this custom was the great length to which the form and process of confessing extended. The practice has since continued in the Greek church, for both priest and penitent to sit (*Martene de Rit.* i. 3; *Daniel Codex Liturg.* iv. p. 588). The Penitential of Joannes Jejunator gives the following instructions on the order and manner of confessing; "he who comes to confess ought to make three inclinations of the body as he approaches the sacred altar, and say three times 'I confess to thee O Father, Lord God of heaven and earth, whatever is in the secret places of my heart.' And after he has said this he should raise himself and stand erect; and he who receives his confession should question him with a cheerful countenance, which he who confesses should also if possible present, and kiss his hand, especially if he sees the penitent to be depressed by the severity of his sorrow and shame, and after that he should say to him in a cheerful and gentle voice" . . . and then follow 95 questions, and the priest orders the penitent, if not a woman, to uncover his head even though he wear a crown: he then prays with him: after that he raises him and bids him recover his head, and sits with him, and asks him what penance he can bear. The Penitential of Joannes Monachus directs that the priest should invite the penitent into a church or some other retired spot, with a cheer-

ful countenance, as though he were inviting him to some magnificent feast, and exhort him to make a confession of his sins to him: the priest should then recite with him the 69th Psalm, and the Trisagion, and bid him uncover his head, and neither should sit down before the priest has minutely investigated all that is in his heart. The penitent should afterwards prostrate himself on the earth and lie there, while the priest prays for him: the priest is then to raise him and kiss him, and lay his hand upon his neck and comfort him, after that they are to sit together. Alcuin, or the author of *De Divinis officiis*, orders the penitent coming to confess to bow humbly to the priest, who is then on his own behalf to say "Lord be merciful to me a sinner," and afterwards to order the penitent to sit opposite to him, and speak to him about his sins; the penitent is then to rehearse the articles of his faith, and afterwards kneel and raise his hands, and implore the priest to intercede with God for all the sins which have been omitted in the confession; he is then to prostrate himself on the ground, and the priest is to suffer him to lie there awhile, and afterwards raise him and impose a penance upon him: afterwards the penitent is again to prostrate himself, and ask the priest to pray that he may have grace given him to persevere in performing his penance; the priest then offers a prayer, which is followed by six others, which are found in all the Western Penitentials; the penitent then rises from the ground and the priest from his seat, and they enter the church together, and there conclude the penitential service. Compare Morinus (*de Poenit.* iv. 18-19).

*Literature.*—Morinus (*de Poenit.* lib. ii. et *passim*) who is however hampered by the Roman doctrine of obligatory confession, and contains far fewer details on this than on the other stages of discipline. What is to be said on the distinctively Roman side of the controversy will be found in Bellarmine (*de Poenit.* lib. iii.); and on the Protestant side in Ussher (*Answer to a Challenge*, s.v. Confession, Lond. 1625). The subject is more thoroughly treated from the same side in Daille (*de Auric. Confess.* Genev. 1661), a very learned controversial work, and the source of most of the subsequent Protestant writings, which deal with confession. Also Bingham (*Aniq.* xviii. 3), Marshall (*Penitential Discipline*), and a long note on confession, founded on Daille, appended by the editor of the Oxf. Lib. of Fathers to Tertullian (*de Poenit.*). [G. M.]

**EXONARTHEX** (Ἐξωνάρθηξ). Monastic churches sometimes have (besides the ordinary NARTHEX at the west end) an outer narthex, where the monks may say those portions of their devotions which bear the character of penitence without being disturbed by the influx of the general congregation. Cedrenus says that the great church of St. Sophia at Constantinople had four nartheces, but other authorities attribute to it only two (Daniel, *Codex Lit.* iv. 202). [C.]

**EXORCISM** (ἄρκωσις, ἔξορκισμὸς, ἐπορκισμὸς, ἀφορκισμὸς. *adjuratio, incocatio*) is the employment of adjuration, and especially the naming the name of Jesus Christ, with a view to expel an evil spirit. "Exorcismus est sermo increpationis contra immundum spiritum in energumenis sive catechumenis factus, per quem

ad illis diaboli nequissima virtus et inveterata malitia vel excursio violenta fugetur" (Isidore, *De Div. Off.* ii. 20).

1. To the early Christians the heathen world presented itself as under the dominion of evil spirits; everywhere they recognized the need of driving these spirits from their ancient seats, whether in the bodies and souls of men, in the brute creation, or in inanimate objects. They saw themselves surrounded by squadrons and gross bands of daemonia, supernatural beings who worked for evil under their several captains (Origen, *contra Celsum*, bk. vii. p. 378, Spencer; viii. p. 399); daemonia were the great officers of the evil world, and might well have fasces and toga praetexta (Tertullian, *De Idolol.* 18); the gods of the nations were daemonia (*ib.* 20; Orig. c. *Cels.* p. 378, quoting Ps. xcvi. 5); daemonia were by some devilish magic compelled to inhabit the statues in an idol's temple (Minucius Felix, *Oct.* c. 27; Tert. u. s. 7 and 15; Orig. c. *Cels.* vii. p. 374); the theatre was the very special dominion of evil spirits (Tertul. *de Spectac.* 26). Demons ruled the flight of birds, the lots, the oracles; they troubled men's minds, disturbed their rest, crept with their subtle influence into bodies and caused disease, distorted limbs; they compelled men to worship them, in order that, fed with the savour of the offerings, they might release those whom they had bound (Minucius, *Oct.* c. 27). And the members of this great supernatural army were driven from their seats by the mere word of a simple Christian naming over them the name of Christ (Acts xix. 13; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii. c. 8; *Dial. w. Trypho*, c. 85; Tertul. *ad Scapulam*, cc. 2 and 4, *Apol.* c. 23; Orig. c. *Cels.* iii. p. 133) with no parade of incantations or magic formulae, by mere prayers and adjurations (ἀρκώσεις, Orig. c. *Cels.* vii. p. 334), or by sentences of Scripture (*ib.* p. 376); and that not only from the bodies and souls of men, but from haunted places and from the lower animals; for these too fell under the tyranny of demons (*l. c.*). From such expressions as these it is evident that exorcism was practised from a very early period in the church.

In one form, indeed, exorcism was practised by the Lord Himself and His disciples, namely, in the casting out of evil spirits from those who were in a special sense "possessed" or "demoniac," and such exorcism was continued for some generations in the church [DEMONIAC: EXORCIST]. But we are at present concerned with the more general form of exorcism, by which the inherent evil demon was to be expelled from some creature or substance not specially "possessed," but belonging to the "evil world."

2. It is not wonderful that when the minds of men were full of the conception of an all-pervading army of evil spirits in the world around them, they should endeavour to free from this influence those whom they received from heathenism into the holy ground of the church. Hence, at a comparatively early period, we find candidates for baptism not only renouncing for themselves all allegiance to Satan and his powers, but having pronounced over them a formula of exorcism.

It is probable that in the first instance the use of exorcism was confined to the case of those



who entered the church from heathenism; but in the 4th century, if not earlier, it was clearly applied to all, for it is constantly appealed to as a conclusive proof that the church recognized the presence of original sin even in infants. Thus Optatus (c. *Donatist*. iv. 6, p. 75) insists that no one, even though born of Christian parents, can be destitute of a foul spirit, which must be driven out of the man before he comes to the font of salvation; this is the work of exorcism, by which the foul spirit is driven forth into the wilderness. And pope Celestinus (*Ad Episcop. Gall.* c. 12) says that none came to baptism, whether infants or "juvenes," until the evil spirit had been driven out of them by the exorcisms and insufflations of the clerics. Compare Augustine, *Epist.* 194, *ad Sixtum*, § 46; *De Symbolo ad Catechumenos*, i. 5; *Contra Julianum*, i. 4.

Cyril of Jerusalem (*Procatechesis* c. 9, p. 7; *Catech.* i. c. 5, p. 18) begs his catechumens to be earnest in receiving their exorcisms (*ἐπορκισμοῦς*); whether they had been insufflated or exorcised (*κἂν ἐμδισηθῇς κἂν ἐπορκισθῇς*), he prays that they may be blessed. And again (c. 13) he says, "when ye have entered before the hour of the exorcisms, let every one speak things that conduce to piety," as if the exorcisms began the catechetical office on each occasion. These instructions are evidently for all the catechumens, and not for those only who had come over from heathenism. And Chrysostom (*Catech. I. ad Initian.* c. 2, p. 227) speaks of the catechumens, after instruction, proceeding to hear the words of those who exorcise (*τῶν ἐξορκιστῶν*); to this exorcism they went barefooted and stripped of their upper garments. There can of course be no doubt that the great body of those whom Chrysostom catechised were born of Christian families.

3. *Formulae of Exorcism.*—Celsus, who wrote against the Christians probably in the middle of the 2nd century, says that he had seen in the possession of certain presbyters "barbaric books containing names of daemons and gibberish (*ῥεπαρεῖας*)" (*Orig. c. Celsum*, vi. p. 302); and again the same opponent says that, "to name the demons in the barbarous tongue (*βαρβάρως*) is efficacious; to name them in Greek or Latin is useless" (*ib.* viii. p. 402). Origen, in answer to this, alleges that Latin, Greek, or other Christians in their prayers use the name of God in the tongue in which they were born; but he does not deny the superior efficacy of names or formulae in one language over those in another. On the contrary, he admits (*ib.* i. p. 19) the mystic power of Hebrew names, and declares that Egyptian, Persian, and other names have a peculiar efficacy over certain demons; and elsewhere (*In Matt.* ser. 110, p. 232, ed. Wirceb.) complains that those who practised exorcisms (*adjurationibus*) used improper books, as, for instance, books derived from Jewish sources. From all this it seems clear that formulae of exorcism which to a Roman seemed "barbaric" were in use in the 2nd century. That written forms of exorcism were used in the 4th is clear from the 7th of the *Statuta Antiqua* [*Conc. Carth. IV.*], which orders the bishop to deliver to an EXORCIST on ordination a book containing such forms.

With regard to the form of exorcism, we find in ancient authorities the following particulars.

We have already seen that to name the name of Christ was regarded as being of the utmost efficacy for the expulsion of evil spirits. The passage of Justin Martyr (*Dial.* c. 85; compare c. 30) which says that every spirit (*δαμόνιον*) is conquered and subjected on being adjured "by the Name of the Son of God and first-born of every creature, Who was born of the Virgin and became Man capable of suffering (*παθητοῦ*), was crucified under Pontius Pilate by your [the Jewish] people, and died, and rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven," renders it probable that a recitation of the redeeming acts of the Lord accompanied the naming of his name. And the same thing seems to be indicated by the words of Origen (c. *Cels.* i. p. 7), who says that demons were expelled by the name of Jesus, "together with the recitation of the acts related of Him" (*μετὰ τῆς ἀπαγγελίας τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν ἱστοριῶν*). See Probst, p. 49.

The words of Tertullian again (*Apol.* 23), that the power of Christians over evil spirits derives its force from naming Christ, "and from the making mention of those punishments which await them from God through Jesus Christ the judge," make it probable that the awful punishment which was to overtake the evil ones was spoken of in the formula of exorcism. So Tertullian: "*representatione ignis illius*" (*Apol.* 23). And if in another passage—"Satanas . . . quem nos dicimus malitiae angelum" . . . (*De Testim. Animae*, c. 3)—we are to take "*dicimus*" in a ritual sense, it would appear that the exorcists of Tertullian's time cursed and reviled Satan.

That prayer was added to the exorcism proper we know from the testimony of Minucius Felix (*Octav.* c. 27, § 5).

The actions which formed part of the rite of exorcism were touching and breathing on the afflicted, and signing them with the cross.

As to the first, Tertullian tells us (*Apol.* 23), that the evil spirits depart unwillingly from the bodies of men at the touch and on-breathing of Christians (*de contactu deque afflatu nostro*). Vincentius of Thibari (*Sententiae Episcoporum*, No. 37, in Cyprian's Works), contending that heretics require baptism at least as much as heathens, distinctly refers to the imposition of hands in exorcism, quoting (incorrectly) Mark xvi. 17, 18. So Origen (*on Jo hua*, *Hom.* 24, c. 1) speaks of the imposition of the hands of the exorcists which evil spirits could not resist. Similarly the Arabic canons of Hippolytus (*Can.* 19, § 6, and *Can.* 29, quoted by Probst, p. 50). The same canon enjoins the exorcist, after the adjurations, to "sign" (no doubt with the cross) the breast, forehead, ears, and mouth. And at an even earlier date, when Justin (*Dial.* c. 131) speaks of the outstretched arms of Moses as a type of Christ, and then immediately after of the power of Christ crucified over evil spirits, it is not improbable that he alludes to the use of the sign of the cross. So when we read (Origen *on Exodus*, *Hom.* 6, § 8) how the demons tremble before the cross which they see on Christians, we may well believe that the reference is to the use of the cross in exorcism. Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* iv. 27) distinctly mentions the use of the sign of the cross (*signum passionis*) for the expulsion of evil spirits. The first council of Constantinople (c. 7) describes the course of proceeding with those heretics who were to be


received as non-Christians (as ἑταῖροι) as follows: "the first day we make them Christians; the second, catechumens; then the third we exorcise them, after breathing thrice upon the face and ears, and so we catechise them, and cause them to stay in the church and hear the Scriptures; and then we baptize them."

The ceremony took place in the church. "Shameless is he," says Pseudo-Cyprian (*De Spectac.* c. 4), "who exorcises in a church demons whose delights he favours in a theatre." During the exorcism the patient lay prostrate on the ground (Origen on *Matt. Hom.* 13, § 7).

Most of the characteristics of the form of exorcism which we have traced in ancient times are found in existing rituals. For instance, in the ancient Roman form of receiving a heathen as a catechumen (Daniel, *Codes Lit.* i. 171), after the admonition to renounce the devil and believe in the Holy Trinity, the priest "exufflat ab eo aevam maligni spiritus potestatem dicens—'Exi, immunde spiritus, et da locum Spiritui Sancto Paraclito.'" Then he signs him with the cross on the forehead and breast. At the seventh scrutiny (SCRUTINIUM), which took place on Easter Eve, after the recitation of the Creed by the candidates for baptism, the priest lays his hand on the head of each severally, saying—"Nec te lateat, Satanas, imminere tibi tormenta, imminere tibi diem iudicii, diem sup-

plici, diem qui venturus est velut effluens ardens, in quo tibi atque universis angelis, sub aeternis veniet interitus. Proinde, damnata, da honorem Deo vivo et vero: da honorem Jesu Christo filio ejus et Spiritui Sancto, in cujus nomine atque virtute praecipio tibi ut exas et recedas ab hoc famulo Dei, quem hodie Dominus Deus noster Jesus Christus ad suam sanctam gratiam et benedictionem fontemque baptismatis vocare dignatus est, ut fiat ejus templum per aquam regenerationis in remissionem omnium peccatorum: in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos et saeculum per ignem" (Daniel, s. a. 177). Then follows the epheta [EARS, TOUCHING OF], and the anointing on the breast and between the shoulders with holy oil.

In the *Vetus Missale Gallicanum*, published by Thomasius and reprinted by Mabillon (*Lit. Gall.* bk. iii. p. 338) the essential part of the form of exorcism is as follows: "Aggredior te, immundissime damnate spiritus... Te, invocato Domini nostri Jesu Christi nomine, ... adjuramus per ejusdem majestatem adque virtutem, passionem ac resurrectionem, adventum adque judicium; ut in quacunque parte membrorum latitas propria te confessione manifestes, exagitatione spiritalibus flagris invisibilibusque tormentis vas quod occupasse aeternas fugias expiationemque post habitationem tuam Domine



derelinquas... Abscede, abscede quocunque es, et corpora Deo dicata ne repetas. Interdicta sunt tibi ista in perpetuum. In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, et in gloria dominicae passionis, cujus cruore salvantur, cujus adventum expectant, iudicium confitentur. Per Dominum."

The Gelasian *Sacramentary* (i. 33), in the *Exorcismi super Electos*,\* gives the following form. The acolytes, laying their hands on the candidate, after praying God to send forth His angel to keep them, proceeds: "Ergo, maledicte diabole, recognosce sententiam tuam, et da honorem Deo vivo et vero, et... Jesu Christo Filio ejus et Spiritui Sancto; et recede ab his famulis Dei; quia istos tibi Deus... vocare dignatus est; per hoc signum sanctae crucis, frontibus eorum quod nos damus, tu, maledicte diabole, nunquam audeas violare... Audi, maledicte Satanas, adjuratus per nomen aeterni Dei et Salvatoris nostri Filii Dei, cum tu victus avide, tremens gemensque discede."

And again, the foul spirit is adjured to depart, in the case of the males, in the name of

Him who walked the water and stretched out His right hand to Peter; in the case of the females, in the name of Him who gave sight to him that was born blind, and raised Lazarus from his four days' death.

The form given from the Roman ritual by Probat (p. 53) presents a remarkable parallelism with the passage of Tertullian (*Apol.* c. 23) before referred to.

Greek forms similar in character to those given above may be seen in Daniel's *Codes Liturg.* iv. 493 f.

4. *Representation of Exorcism.*—Paciardi (*De Christianorum Balnea*, pp. 136 ff., 143 ff.) describes an urn or water-vessel found near Pisanura, which he believes to be not of later date than the 7th century. One of the bas-reliefs on this vessel (see woodcut) evidently represents an exorcism. The contortions of the person on the ground seem to show that it was an exorcism of one possessed. Now, if the vessel was a font for holding the baptismal water, it would seem more appropriate to represent upon it the ordinary pre-baptismal exorcism. It seems therefore more probable that it was intended for the

\* i. e. the accepted candidates for baptism.

ATRICUM of a church, where it might be used to contain HOLY WATER.

5. Besides human beings, various inanimate objects were exorcised. Of these we may mention especially water [BAPTISM, §§ 30, 42; FONT, BENEDICTION OF: HOLY WATER], salt for use in sacred offices [SALT, BENEDICTION OF], and oil for various uses [CHRISM: OIL, HOLY].

(Martens, *De Ritibus Antiquis*; Probst, *Sakramente und Sakramentalien*, Tübingen, 1872; F. C. Bear, *Kirchengeschichte der Drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, c. 6.) [C.]

**EXORCISTS.** Exorcists are only once mentioned in the New Testament (Acts xix. 13), and then without any reference to the power given to Christians to cast out devils. [See DICT. OF BIBLE.] In the early days of the church, it appears to have been considered that the power of exorcising evil spirits was a special gift of God to certain persons, who are therefore called exorcists. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. c. 26), it is said that an exorcist is not ordained, because the power of exorcising is a free gift of the grace of God, through Christ, and that whoever has received this gift will be made manifest in the exercise of it. It is added that if expedient an exorcist may be ordained bishop, priest, or deacon. Exorcists are not named among those who received ecclesiastical stipends, nor are they mentioned in the *Apostolic Canons*, though probably their office is alluded to in the direction that a Gentile convert who has an evil spirit may not be received into the church till he has been purified (*antipapists*, Can. 70). Thomassin (*Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* i. 2, c. 30, § 1, 8), thinks that exorcists were either priests or deacons. So Eusebius makes mention of one Romanus, as deacon and exorcist in the church of Caesarea in Palestine (*De Martyr. Palest.* c. 2).

Tertullian speaks as if all Christians were exorcists, driving away evil spirits by the exorcisms of their prayers. Thus (*Dr. Idol.* c. 11), he forbids Christians to have anything to do with the sale of things used for the purposes of idolatry, asking with what consistency they could exorcise their own inmates, to whom they had offered their houses as a shrine (*cellarium*); and in another place (*De Cor. Mil.* c. 11), uses as an argument against Christians entering the military service, that they might be called upon to guard the heathen temples, so as to defend those by night whom by their exorcisms they had put to flight during the day.

But it is evident that in later times they were reckoned among the minor orders of clergy. Cyprian (*Ep.* 69, *Mag. Fid.*), speaks of exorcists as casting out devils by man's word and God's power, and in his epistle to Firmilian (*Ep.* 75), says that one of the exorcists, inspired by the grace of God, cast out a certain evil spirit who had made pretensions to sanctity. Cornelius in his epistle (Euseb. *H. E.* i. c. 41) names forty-two exorcists among the clergy of the church of Rome. Epiphanius (*Expos. Fid.* c. 21), mentions them among the clergy, ranking them with the heremites, immediately after the deacons. Paulinus of Nola (*De S. Ecl. Natal. carn.* 4), speaks of St. Felix as having been promoted from the order of lector to the office of exorcist. The council of Laodicea (c. 24),

mentions them among the minor clergy, placing them between the singers and the doorkeepers, and, in another canon (c. 26), forbids any to exorcise either in church or in private houses, who had not been appointed to the office by the bishops. The council of Antioch (c. 10), places them after the subdeacons, among the clergy who might be appointed by the chorepiscopi. The 4th council of Carthage (c. 7), provides an office for the ordination of an exorcist. He was to receive from the hands of the bishop a book, in which were written forms of exorcism, with the bidding, "Take and commit to memory, and receive power to lay hands on energumens whether baptized or catechumens." The same council also provided that exorcists might lay hands on an energumen at any time (c. 90), and (c. 92) gave it into their charge to provide the energumens with their daily food while remaining in the church. [DEMONIACA.]

The names of four exorcists, designating themselves by no other titles, are found among the signatories of the first council of Arles (Routh's *Reliq. Sac.* iv. p. 312).

There seems little reason for connecting the exorcists with the form of exorcism that was used in the case of all catechumens. Their work, as expressly allotted to them by the 4th council of Carthage (c. 7), lay among all energumens, whether baptized or not. [P. O.]

**EXPECTATION WEEK** (*Heldmann's Expectationis*), the week preceding Whitsunday, because in that week the apostles waited for the Comforter from on high, which the Lord had promised at His Ascension. (Ducange, s. v. *Heldmann's*.) [C.]

**EXPEDITUS**, martyr in Armenia with five others; commemorated April 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EXPOSING OF INFANTS** [compare FOUNDLINGS]. The frequency of the exposition of infants among the ancient heathens is a fact to which both the mythology and the history of Greece and Rome bear frequent witness. Among the early Christian writers we find exposition, together with actual infanticide, constantly cast in the teeth of their Pagan opponents. "I see you," writes Minucius Felix, "now casting forth the sons whom ye have begotten to the wild beasts and to the fowls of the air" (*Octavius*, c. 30, § 2; 31, § 4). Lactantius (bk. vi. c. 20) inveighs against the false pity of those who expose infants. Justin, Tertullian, Augustine and others might be quoted to much the same effect.

A law of Alexander Severus, which has been retained in Justinian's Code (bk. viii. t. lli., l. l.; A.D. 225), allowed the recovering of an infant exposed against the will or without the knowledge of the owner or person entitled to the services of its mother, whether slave or *adscriptive*, but only on condition of repaying the fair cost of its maintenance and training to a trade, unless theft could be established—an enactment obviously framed only to secure the rights of slave-owners, and not inspired by any consideration of humanity for the infants themselves. There is something of a higher spirit in a law of Diocletian and Maximian, A.D. 285 (Code, bk. v., t. iv., l. 16), enacting that where a female infant had been cast forth by her father and brought

up by another person, who sought to marry her to his own son, the father was bound to consent to the marriage, or in case of refusal (if we construe the text aright), to pay for his daughter's maintenance. Constantine (A.D. 331), by a law contained in the Theodosian Code (bk. v., t. vii., l. 1), but not reproduced by Justinian, enacted that whoever took up an infant cast forth from its house by the will of a father or master, and nourished it till it became strong, might retain it in whatever condition he pleased, either as a child or as a slave, without any fear of recovery by those who have voluntarily cast out their new-born slaves or children. The growth of Christian humanity is shown in a constitution of Valentinian, Valens and Gratian, adopted by Justinian (Code, bk. viii., t. lii., l. 2; A.D. 374), which absolutely forbade masters or patrons to recover infants exposed by themselves, if charitably saved by others, and laid down as a duty that every one must nourish his own offspring. A constitution of Honorius and Theodosius, in the Theodosian Code (A.D. 412), repeated the prohibition, observing that "none can call one his own whom he condemned while perishing," but required a bishop's signature by way of attestation of the facts (bk. v., t. vii., l. 2).

The law last referred to may seem in some degree to explain a canon of the council or synod of Vaison, A.D. 442. There is a universal complaint, it says, on the subject of the exposition of infants, who are cast forth not to the mercy of others, but to the dogs, whilst the fear of lawsuits deters others from saving them. This therefore is to be observed, that according to the statutes of the princes the church be taken to witness; from the altar on the Lord's day the minister is to announce that the church knows an exposed infant to have been taken up, in order that within ten days any person may acknowledge and receive it back; and any who after the ten days may bring any claim or accusation is to be dealt with by the church as a manslayer (cc. 9, 10). A canon almost to the same effect, but in clearer language, was enacted by the slightly later 2nd council of Arles, A.D. 452, indicating that which serves to explain both the law of Honorius and the two canons just referred to, viz., that it was the practice to expose infants "before the church" (c. 51). The council of Agde, in 506, simply confirmed former enactments.

In the East, the full claims of Christian humanity were at last admitted by Justinian, as towards foundlings themselves, though without sufficient consideration for parental duties. He not only absolutely forbade the re-vindication of exposed infants under any circumstances, but also the treating of them, by those who have taken charge of them, either as slaves, freedmen, *coloni* or *adscriptitii*, declaring such children to be absolutely free (Code, bk. viii., t. lii., l. 3; A.D. 529; see also bk. i., t. iv., l. 24; A.D. 530). This applied to infants cast away either in churches, streets or any other place, even though a plaintiff should give some evidence of a right of ownership over them (bk. viii., t. lii., l. 4). The 153rd Novel, however, shows that it was still the practice in certain districts (Thessalonica is specified) to expose new-born infants in the churches, and after they had been brought up to reclaim them as slaves

and it again expressly enacts the freedom of exposed infants.

The Wisigothic law contains some rather remarkable provisions as to the exposition of infants (bk. iv., t. iv., cc. 1, 2). Where a person has out of compassion taken up a foundling of either sex, wherever exposed, and when it is nourished up the parents acknowledge it, if it be the child of a free person, let them either give back a slave in its place or pay the price of one; otherwise, let the foundling be redeemed by the judge of the territory from the ownership of the parents, and let these be subject to perpetual exile. If they have not wherewithal to pay, let him serve for the infant who cast it forth, and let the latter remain in freedom, whom the pity of strangers has preserved. If indeed slaves of either sex have cast forth an infant in fraud of its masters, when he has been nourished up, let the nourisher receive one-third of its value, the master swearing to or proving his ignorance of the exposing. But if he knew of it, let the foundling remain in the power of him who nourished it.

In a collection of Irish canons, ascribed to the end of the 7th century, is one "on infants cast forth in the church," which enacts, in very uncouth and obscure Latin, that such an infant shall be a slave to the church unless sent away; and that seven years' penance is to be borne by those who cast infants forth (bk. xli., c. 22).

A capitulary of uncertain date (supposed about 744) enacts, in accordance with the canon of the synod of Vaison before referred to, that if an infant exposed before the church has been taken up by the compassion of any one, such person shall affix—probably on the church door—a letter of notice (*contestacionis ponat . . . epistolam*). If the infant be not acknowledged within ten days, let the person who has taken it up securely retain it (c. 1).

The "Lex Romana," supposed to represent the law of the Roman population of Italy in Lombard times, contains a less liberal provision on this subject, founded on the earlier imperial law. If a new-born infant has been cast out by its parents either in the church or in the precincts (*platea*), and any one with the knowledge of the father or mother and of the master has taken it up and nourished it by his labour, it shall remain in his power who took it up. And if a person knew not its father or mother or master, and wished nevertheless to take it up, let him present the infant before the bishop (*pontificem*) or the clerics who serve that church, and receive from the hand of that bishop and those clerks an *epistola collectionis*, and thenceforth, let him have power either to give such infant liberty, or to retain it in perpetual slavery (bk. v., t. vii.). [J. M. L.]

#### EXPULSION FROM A MONASTERY.

So soon as there began to be any sort of discipline among the ascetics who dwelt together in a community, expulsion inevitably became a necessary part of it. In the so-called "Rule of Pachomius," expulsion (or a flogging) was the penalty for insubordination, licentiousness, quarrelling, covetousness, gluttony (cf. Cass. *Inst.* iv. 16). Menard, however, thinks that this was only expulsion for a stated time (Bened. Anian. *Concord. Regg.* xxxi. 5). By the *Regula Orientalis*



(c. 35) obstinate offenders are to be expelled. Benedict, with characteristic prudence, prescribed expulsion for contumacy (*Reg. c. 71*), on the principle that the gangrened limb must be lopped off, lest the rest of the body should be infected with the poison (*ib. c. 28*), while with characteristic gentleness he allowed such offenders to be re-admitted, if penitent, so often as thrice, on condition of their taking the lowest place among the brethren (*ib. c. 29*). Some commentators, however, take this permission as not extending to the case of a monk expelled for such vices as could hardly fail to corrupt the community (*Mart. Reg. Comm. loc. cit.*). The Benedictine reformers generally made expulsion more common and readmission more difficult. Fructuosus orders all incorrigible offenders to be expelled (*Reg. cc. 8, 16*); and the *Regula Cujusdam*, still more severe, enacts expulsion for lying, fornication, persistent murmuring, and even abusive language (*cc. 6, 8, 16, 18*). At a later period, under the stern discipline of Cîteaux, a monk was to be unfrocked and expelled, even for theft above a certain value (*Mart. Reg. Comm. c. 33*). Obviously the frequency or infrequency of such a penalty as expulsion depended on the monastery being regarded rather as a reformatory or as a place of ideal perfection. [I. G. S.]

**EXSECRATIO.** [ANATHEMA: DESECRATION.]

**EXSUPERANTIUS**, deacon and martyr at Spoleto, with Sabinus the bishop, and others, under Maximian; commemorated Dec. 30 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EXSUPERIA**, martyr at Rome with Simpronius and others; commemorated July 26 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EXSUPERIUS.** (1) One of the Theban legion, martyr at Sedunum in Belgic Gaul (the Valais), under Maximian; commemorated Sept. 22 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Bishop and confessor at Toulouse; commemorated Sept. 28 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr at Vienna with Severus and Felicianus; commemorated Nov. 19 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**EXT. EME UNCTION.** [SICK, VISITATION OF THE: UNCTION.]

**EX VOTO.** [VOTIVE OFFERINGS.]

**EYES, TOUCHING OF.** 1. The first council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) laid it down (c. 7) that Arians and certain other heretics were to be received into the church, without rebaptism, on renouncing their heresy and being crossed or anointed with holy unguent (μύρον) on the forehead, eyes, &c. So in the form of baptism given by Daniel (*Codex Lit. iv. 507*) from the Greek *Euchologion*, the priest after baptism anoints the neophyte with holy unguent, making the sign of the cross on forehead, eyes, nostrils, mouth, ears, breast, hands, and feet, saying, "the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Amen." Compare Martene, *De Rit. Ant. I. i. 17*, Ord. 24, 25.

2. In extreme unction, the eyes are anointed with holy oil. Thus, in the Ratold MS. of the Gregorian *Sacramentary* (p. 549, ed. Ménard), the priest is directed to anoint the eyes, with the words: "Ungo oculos tuos de oleo sanctificato,

ut quicquid illicito visu deliquisti per hujus olei unctionem expietur."

3. It seems to have been the custom to touch the eyes, as well as the other organs of sense, with the moisture remaining on the lips after communicating (Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. Myst. v. 22*; see COMMUNION, HOLY, p. 413; EARS, TOUCHING OF). [C.]

**EZEKIEL**, the prophet; commemorated April 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*); Miaziah 5 = March 31, and Hamle 27 = July 21 (*Cal. Ethiop.*); Sept. 3 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

**EZRA**, the prophet; commemorated Jakatit 10 = Feb. 4, and Hamle 6 = June 30 (*Cal. Ethiop.*), July 13 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

## F

**FABARIUS.** The Cantores anciently fasted the day before they were to sing divine offices, but ate beans, as being supposed to benefit the voice (Pliny, *Nat. Hist. xx. 6*); whence they were called by the heathen *Fabarii* (Isidore, *De Div. Off. ii. 12*). [C.]

**FABIANUS**, the pope, martyr at Rome in the time of Decius; commemorated Jan. 20 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FABIUS**, martyr at Caesarea; "Passio" July 31 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FABRICA ECCLESIAE.** [CHURCHES, MAINTENANCE OF, p. 388.]

**FACE, BRANDING IN THE.** It was enacted under Constantine (*Code, lib. ix. tit. 47, l. 17*), that branding should not be in the face, as disfiguring the heavenly beauty [CORPORAL PUNISHMENTS, p. 470]. [C.]

**FACITERGIUM** (also *facietergium, facistergium, faciterygula; facialis, faciale*). This, as its name indicates, is a handkerchief for wiping the face ("facitergium et manitergium, a tergendo faciem vel manus vocatur." Isidore, *Etym. xix. 26*). Mention of this is occasionally found in various monastic rules. It is appointed as part of the furniture of a monk's couch in the Rule of St. Isidore (c. 14; p. 127, part 2, in Holstenius, *Codex Regularum*: ed. Paris, 1663). See also Magistri *Regula*, cc. 17, 19, 81 (*op. cit.* pp. 214, 216, 257). The last passage ordains that there shall be dealt out "singula facitergia per decadam." Gregory of Tours (*Vitae Patrum*, viii. 8; p. 1191, ed. Ruinart) speaks of the value set upon the "facitergium dependentibus villis intextum, quod Sanctus [i.e. Nicetius Lugdunensis] super caput in die obitus sui habuit." The *facitergia* used by nuns were at times embroidered (Caesarii *Regula ad Virgines*, c. 42; Holstenius, part 3, p. 22). Again, Venantius Fortunatus, in his life of St. Radegundis of France, describes her on one occasion as "circa altare cum facistergio jacentem pulverem colligens" (c. 2; *Patrol. lxxii. 653*). One more example may suffice, where the word, perhaps, appears in the transitional state of its meaning: "donata etiam particula sancti orarii, id est

facialis" (*Hypomnesticon de Anastasio Apocri-  
sario, etc.*, in *Anast. Biblioth. Collectanea: Pa-  
trol.* cxxix. 685). For further examples, see  
Ducange's *Glossarium*, s. vv. [R. S.]

### FAITH. [SOPHIA.]

**FAITHFUL.** The present article is in-  
tended to give an account of the principal names  
applied to Christians in early times, whether by  
themselves or by others.

The names most common among Christians in  
the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages seem to have  
been Saints (ἅγιοι), Elect (ἐκλεκτοί), Brethren  
(ἀδελφοί), and Faithful (πιστοί), often followed  
by the words, ἐν ᾿Ιησοῦ Χριστῷ.

The words πιστός and *Fidelis* were also used  
in a special sense to distinguish the baptized  
Christian from the catechumen. Thus Augustine  
(*Tract. in Joan.* 44, c. 9) says that if a man tells  
us that he is a Christian, we have to ask further,  
whether he is catechumen or "fidelis." Hence  
such an inscription as CHRISTIANA FIDELIS (Le  
Blant, *Inscript. de la Gaule*, i. 373) is not a mere  
pleonasm. So the council of Elvira (*C. Elib.*  
c. 67) seems to distinguish between "fidelis"  
and "catechumena." In the liturgies, the portion  
of the office at which catechumens were not  
allowed to be present was called *Missæ Fidelium*,  
and the Lord's Prayer *Fidelium Oratio*. See  
Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s.v. Πιστός. Eusebius (*Præp.*  
*Evangel.* i. 1) repudiates the charge that Chris-  
tians were called πιστοί from their credulity.

*Fidelis* is a frequent epithet in inscriptions,  
particularly in the case of young children, who  
might otherwise be supposed to have died un-  
baptized. Thus an inscription given by Maran-  
goni (*Acta S. Victorini*, 103) runs thus: HIC  
REQVIESCIT IN PACE FILIPPUS || INFAS FIDELIS.  
Similar inscriptions are given in the case of a  
child who died at the age of a year and nine  
months (*Ib.* p. 109), and of another who died at  
the age of five years and five months (*Ib.* p. 96).  
Another may be seen in Cavedoni (*Ant. Cimit. di  
Chiusi*, p. 33). On a marble at Florence (Gori,  
*Inscr. Ant. Etrur.* iii. 314) it is said of a child of  
three years and three months, ΠΙCΤΗ ΕΤΕΛΕΤ-  
ΗCΕΝ. In one case given by Marini (*Frat.*  
*Arval.* p. 171), the inscription describes an  
ancestress (major) begging baptism for a child at  
the point of death: PETIVIT AB ECCLESIA UT  
FIDELIS DE SECVLO RECECISSET (i. e. recederet).  
In another case (Oderico, *Inscr. Vet.* p. 267), one  
of two brothers, who died at eight years old,  
is described as NEOFITVS, while the brother, who  
died at seven, is described as FIDELIS. And  
again a guardian described as FIDELIS, erects a  
monument to a nursling who was yet among  
the "audientes" or catechumens: ALVMNAE  
AVDIENTI (Gori, *u. s.* i. 228).

Such inscriptions as VIXIT IN PACE FIDELIS,  
or REQVIESCIT FIDELIS IN PACE, are too common  
to need particularizing (Martigny, *Dict. des  
Antiq. Chrét.* s. v. *Fidelis*).

Other names given to Christians were perhaps  
either (1) Designations of some peculiarity of their  
practice or profession, rather than recognized  
titles; more epithets than names; or (2) names  
given them by the outside world, either in deri-  
sion or by mistake.

I. Under the first head may be classed (a) Ἰεσ-  
σαῖοι, Jessaeans, a name which Epiphanius (*Haer.*  
29, n. 4) says may be derived from Jesus, or (as

seems far-fetched and improbable) from Jesse,  
the father of David. Epiphanius (*u. s.*) considers  
this name earlier than that of "Christian."

Another such name was (b) γνωστικοί, applied  
to Christians by Clement of Alexandria (*Ström.*  
i. p. 294; ii. p. 383; vi. p. 665; vii. p. 748) as  
having the true knowledge. Later we find  
Athanasius (ap. Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 23) using  
the term of the Ascetics of Egypt, and Socrates  
(*ibid.*) tells us that Evagrius Ponticus wrote a  
book for the use of these Ascetics, called "The  
Gnostic, or Rules for the Contemplative Life."

(c) Θεοφόροι, a name claimed by Ignatius in  
his interview with Trajan (*Acta Ignat.* ap. Grabe,  
*Spiril.* t. ii. p. 10), because he "carried Christ in  
his heart," and seemingly conceded especially to  
him, was commonly used of all Christians, as  
Pearson (*Vind. Ignat.* par. ii. c. 12, p. 397)  
shows by quotations from many writers of the  
2nd century.

Clement of Alexandria, agreeing about the  
meaning of the name, gives the varieties of it  
Θεοφορῶν and Θεοφορούμενος, and Eusebius (viii.  
10) quotes a letter of Phileas, bishop of Thmuis,  
to his flock, in which he calls the martyrs Χρισ-  
τοφόροι.

(d) St. Ambrose (*de obit. Valentin.* t. iii. p. 12)  
speaks of Christians as *Christi*, i. e. "anointed,"  
and justifies his use of the title by reference to  
Ps. cv. 15, "nolite tangere Christos meos," all  
Christians receiving the unction of the Holy  
Spirit, and Jerome commenting on the passage  
(Ps. civ. [cv.]), justifies it by the same refer-  
ence.

(e) The name *Ecclesiastici* was used within  
the Christian body (Bingham, i. 1, § 8) to dis-  
tinguish the clergy from the laity, and with a  
modification of this meaning of the word Eusebius  
(iv. 7) speaks of "ecclesiastical writers;" and it  
was also used of Christians generally in contrast  
to those who did not belong to the ἐκκλησία, as  
Jews, infidels, and heretics. Bingham quotes  
Eusebius (iv. 7, v. 27), and Cyril of Jerusalem  
(*Catech.* 15, n. 4), as employing the word in this  
sense, and Valesius (not. in Euseb. i. ii. c. 25)  
finds the same use of it in "Origen, Epiphanius,  
Jerome, and others" [ECCLESIASTICUS].

(f) Bingham asserts that Christians were  
called οἱ τοῦ δόγματος, "They of the Faith,"  
giving as his authority for this statement the  
rescript of Aurelian against Paul of Samosata,  
quoted by Eusebius (vii. 30), in which the  
bishops of Rome and of Italy are called ἐπί-  
σκοποι τοῦ δόγματος.

(g) Christians also called themselves CATHOLIC  
[see the word]; and (h) *Pisciculi*, alluding to the  
mystic Fish [BAPTISM, p. 171; FISH].

It is to be observed, says Bingham (i. 1, § 6)  
that all these names express some relation to  
God or to Christ, and that none of them were  
taken from the names of men, as was the case  
with the heresies and sects. He quotes Chry-  
sostom (*Hom.* 33 in *Act.*), Epiphanius (*Haer.* 42.  
Marcionit., also *Haer.* 10.), Gregory Nazianzen  
(*Orat.* 31, p. 506) and others as noticing these  
opposite tendencies. The name of Christian was  
neglected by the heretics for the names of their  
leaders, while the Christians thought it enough  
without any other title derived from parents,  
country, city, quality, or occupation; see the  
case of the deacon Sanctus martyred in the  
reign of Antoninus, related by Eusebius (v. 1).

II. Among the names given to Christians from without their body are probably to be reckoned

(1) *Χρηστοί*, a name which would easily arise from a misunderstanding or mispronunciation of the name *Χριστοί*, and was naturally not refused by Christians; referred to by Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 4), Lactantius (*Inst.* iv. 7), Tertullian (*Apol.* c. 3), and others.

(2) It was quite to be expected that they would be called *Jews* by the heathen world, and there is evidence of this. Bingham (i. 1, § 10) refers to a passage in Dio's *Life of Domitian*, in which he speaks of the Christian martyr Ocilius Glabrio (Baronius, an. 94, § 1), being put to death for turning to the *Jews'* religion.

Again, Suetonius says (*Claud.* c. 26) that Claudius "expelled the *Jews* from Rome because they made disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus;" and Spartianus (in *Caracal.* c. i.) says that Caracalla's playfellow was a Jew, Caracalla, according to Tertullian (*ad Scapul.* c. 4), having been "lacte Christiano educatus."

(3) There remains to be considered the word *Christian*, a name which differs from those already spoken of in being traceable to a particular locality, and with great probability to a particular year. The reason why the name arose when and where it did, is probably to be found in the long stay—"a whole year"—(*Acts* xi. 26) made in Antioch by Paul and Barnabas after their return from Tarsus, in the assembly of the church there for the same time, and in the publicity given to the teaching of Christ by frequent addresses to the people.

The question whether the Christians assumed the name themselves or received it from the Jews, or from the Gentiles, can only be determined with an approach to certainty.

(a) The only reason for thinking that the Christians assumed this name is the language of *Acts* xi. 26, *χρηματίσαι τε πρῶτον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς*, because *χρηματίζω*, when used of acquiring a name generally means to assume one; but on the other hand, both in the *Acts* and in the *Epistles*, Christians speak of themselves as "brethren," "believers," "disciples," "saints," and only in three places in the N.T. is the word *Christian* used (*Acts* xi. 26, xvi. 28; 1 Peter iv. 16), in only one of which, and there doubtfully, is the word used by Christians of themselves.

(b) Nor is it likely that the Jews would give them a name which would virtually concede the claim made by Christians, and so strenuously denied by Jews. For "Christ" being the Greek equivalent of "Messiah," to call the followers of Christ "Christians" would be to acknowledge Christ as the Messiah; nor would they have used so sacred a name in derision even for the sake of insulting a despised and hated sect. When they wanted to designate them, they used a name derived from a place they held in contempt (*John* i. 46, vii. 41; *Luke* xiii. 2), and called St. Paul "a ringleader of the sect of the 'Nazarenes'" (*Acts* xxiv. 5).

(c) But it is not unlikely that the Gentiles, seeing the wide aim of this new community, its readiness to admit all sorts of people, and even to dispense with the rite of circumcision in its converts, should have early come to distinguish it from the sects of the Jews, with which they very naturally at first confounded it, and so

should have attached to it a new name. And this probability is increased when we remember that "Christ" was the title of the head of the new sect, represented his peculiar office to them, and was the name by which he was generally known in their letters and conversation. It would be adopted, of course, by the Gentiles from them, as we know it was (*Tacit. Ann.* xv. 44), and in a city like Antioch, "notorious for inventing names of derision, and for turning its wit into channels of ridicule" (cf. *Procopius, Bell. Pers.* ii. 8, quoted by Conybeare and Howson, vol. i. p. 130), the new society would soon get its name. The form of the word indicates its Roman origin (cf. *Sullani*, *Pompeiani*, and later *Othoniani* and *Vitelliani*), and that it was first used as a term of reproach may be gathered from the use made of it by Tacitus in the passage referred to above, "quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat." The great increase in the number of Gentile converts would soon turn what was at first a nickname into a title of honour, and the predominance of Rome in the world naturally made the Roman name what it has become, the universal one. It is interesting to contrast with "Christian" the name "Jesuit," as unlike the other in its comparatively modern date and Greek form as in its history and significance.

See Conybeare and Howson (vol. i. p. 129 ff.), from whom this note on the word *Christian* is derived.

[E. C. H.]

III. The following names were appellations of scorn, or "nick-names," given to Christians by their enemies.

1. That they should be called *Atheists* was inevitable in an empire in which the vulgar at least knew of no gods that could not be represented by art and man's device. And Atheism was in fact a common charge against them. See Athenagoras (*Leg. pro Christ.* c. 3) and Justin Martyr (*Apol.* I. c. 6). "Down with the Atheists" (*αἶπε τοὺς ἀθέους*) was a mob-cry against the Christians (*Euseb. H. E.* iv. 15, § 6).

2. From the time that Christians were first recognised as a sect, they were contemptuously called *Nazarenes* (*Acts* xxiv. 5; Epiphanius, *Haeres.* 29, c. 1; Jerome on *Isaiah XLIX.*; Prudentius, *Peristeph.* ii. 25). This no doubt at first designated the supposed origin of the Lord and the disciples from Nazareth; but the variety of ways in which the word is written (*Ναζαρηνοί*, *Ναζαραῖοι*, *Ναζωραῖοι*, *Ναζηραῖοι*, *Ναζιραῖοι*) seems to show that in later times various senses were attached to it. It was also, perhaps, sometimes used to designate a sect of Judaizing Christians, rather than the whole body of the church.

3. The name *Galilaei* was one which the philosophic emperor Julian (*Epist.* 7) endeavoured to fix upon the Christians (see Gregory Nazianz., *Orat.* iii. p. 8. Socrates, *H. E.* iii. 12), meaning, no doubt, to express the contempt of a cultivated man for a sect which arose in a despised district of Palestine, among shepherds and fishermen. His last words were, according to Theodoret (*H. E.* iii. 21), *νενίκηκας, Γαλιλαῖε*, "Thou hast conquered, O Galilaean!" Cyril of Alexandria (c. *Julian.* iii. p. 39) sets himself to show that the name "Galilaean," if it implied roughness and want of culture, was no more applicable to Christians than to Jews.

and his friends (Gibbon's *Rome*, ch. 23; iii. 162, ed. Smith).

4. *Graecus, Graeculus*. It was probably with reference to the falseness and want of principle attributed to the Greeks, in the days of the empire, that Christians came to be called "Greeks," that is, impostors. The Christian in the streets was saluted with the cry, *ὁ Γραικὸς ἐπιθέρης* (Jerome, *Epist.* 10, *ad Furan.*). If his tunic was not white, he was "impostor et Graecus" (*Ib. Epist.* 19, *ad Marcell.*). The recognising a Christian by the want of the "tunica alba," perhaps indicates a time when the ALB had become with them almost wholly a ministerial dress.

5. *Sybillists* was an appellation given to Christians by Celsus (Origen c. *Cels.* bk. v. p. 272, Spencer). The early Christians did in fact pay great respect to the Sibylline books (Tertullian, *ad Nationes*, ii. 12), and discovered in them clear prophecies of Christ. Celsus accused them of having interpolated these books.

6. From peculiarities, or supposed peculiarities, of their worship, they were called cross-worshippers, *σταυρόλατραι*, or *Crucicolae*, a reproach as old as the days of St. Paul, often repeated (Tertul. *Apol.* 16 and *Ad Nat.* i. 7, 12), and from which they were not slow to vindicate themselves (Minucius Fel. *Oct.* 29). Whether Christians in general, or a sect of them, were called *οὐρανολάτραι*, *Coelicolae*, sky-worshippers, seems somewhat doubtful; and the same may be said of *Hypsistarii*. That they were called *Sun-worshippers* and *Ass-worshippers* is certain. [ASINARII; CALUMNIES AGAINST CHRISTIANS.]

7. The miracles of the early church procured Christians the reputation of being *Magicians*. [MAGIC.] Hence Suetonius (*Nero*, c. 16) calls Christians "gens hominum superstitionis maleficae," a set devoted to the black art. The steadfast endurance of torture was often thought the effect of some charm. Asclepiades (Prudentius, *Peristeph.* xii. 868), ascribed to magic the endurance of Romanus the martyr; and St. Ambrose (*Serm.* 90, in *Agnen*) mentions that the crowd shrieked against her, "Tolle magam! tolle maleficam!"

8. Several nick-names were given by the heathen to the Christians in consequence of their inexplicable endurance of martyrdom. They were *βιοθάνατοι*, as dying violent deaths, often, as it seemed, little better than suicides. They were *Parabolani* (*παράβολανοί*) and *Desperati*, as freely risking their lives. They were *Sarmentitii*, from the faggots (*sarmenta*) which consumed them; and *Semixarii*, from the stake (*semiaxis*) to which they were bound. (Tertull. *Apol.* 50). They were *Cinerarii*, from the respect which they paid to the ashes of their martyrs.

(Bingham's *Antiq.* i. ii.; Augusti's *Handbuch der Christl. Archäol.* II. i.) [C.]

**FALDESTOLIUM, or FALDISTORIUM.** The first form of this word points to its true etymology and signification. It is connected with the German *falden*, "to fold," and *stuhl*, "a chair," and indicates a folding-chair, "*sella plicatilis*," answering to our modern "camp-stool" (Muratori, tom. iii. p. 646, not. 18). A false etymology, often given, "*fandistolium quasi fandi locus*" is at variance with its use,

and would better apply to a pulpit. *Faldistorium* originally employed for any portable seat, became limited in ecclesiastical use to a low armless folding-chair, in which a bishop or mitred abbot sat at the altar after his enthronisation, or on other solemn occasions, offered himself to the gaze of the people in his full official attire. According to Macri (s. v.) it was also placed at the epistle corner of the altar for the bishop, when celebrating in a church in which he had no jurisdiction, or if a superior dignitary was present (Macri, *Hierolex.* s. v.; Ducange, s. v.; Augusti, *Hdbch. der Christ. Arch.* iii. 556). [E. V.]

#### FALSE WITNESS. [PERJURY.]

**FAMILY.** The influence of the Christian religion upon the customs and habits of family life was very considerable, even from the first; although it did not aim at making any abrupt or sudden changes, except in those things which were necessarily sinful.

The great Christian doctrines which so powerfully affect the feelings, hopes, and whole inner life of those who heartily receive them, led at once to the renunciation of idolatry in all its forms, and of the excesses and licentiousnesses then so common and so little thought of; and inculcated new principles of thought and action, which operated more or less powerfully in every direction. But the ordinary usages of domestic life, which were not directly connected with the religious and moral obliquities of the old polytheism, were apparently left untouched by any positive interference or command. Christianity proved itself the salt of the earth by gradually interpenetrating the surrounding mass of pagan civilisation, and not by shrinking from all contact with it.

The elevation of the female sex was one of the most conspicuous of the indirect results which rapidly followed the reception of the new religion. The position of women among the Jews, and the manner in which Jesus had received them as his disciples and friends, must have taught the apostles, if they needed any such teaching, what place women were entitled to hold in the social economy of the church. And accordingly, wherever Christ was proclaimed, women were invited and welcomed into the Christian communities, and were admitted equally with men to all Christian privileges. Hence in a Christian family the wife and mother held an honourable place; and the conjugal union, the source of all other family relationships, being thus honoured, communicated a happy influence throughout the household.

Another result, only less important than the former, was the amelioration, and, in the course of time, the abolition of slavery. Apostolic Christianity did not endeavour to remove this nefarious but inveterate evil by any direct or violent denunciation, which, if successful, would have rudely upset the existing framework of society, and would have proved as ruinous to the slave, as it would have seemed to be unjust to the master; but it distinctly taught the equality of all men in Christian privilege and religious position;—it taught most emphatically the duty of caring for others;—it taught the master that he had a Lord over him who was no respecter of persons, and the slave that he was Christ's freedman. And thus slavery in a Christian



family was relieved from some of its most galling burdens. This happy change, however, it must be remembered, depended entirely upon the personal feeling and will of the master; for slavery was not legally and publicly alleviated to any great extent, until the time of Justinian, who did much to promote its extinction, after which it was gradually discontinued or changed to serfdom (Milman, *Hist. Christ.* iii. 343, and *Latin Christ.* i. 391; and SLAVERY in this work). In the mean time Christians in general did not think it wrong to have bondmen in their service (Clem. Alex. *Paedag.* iii. 12).

But besides particular results of this nature, Christianity to some extent changed the general habits of men, and tended to make them more domestic and less public in their feelings and pursuits. More especially, while Christians were small communities separate and distinct from the general mass of the population, they felt it necessary to withdraw themselves in some degree from public affairs; they were less frequent in their attendance on courts of law; they could not, without scruples and repugnance, be present at many of the ordinary amusements and popular festivities, mixed up as they were with the idolatry and some of the worst moral abominations of paganism. Thus they were thrown back more upon the society of each other, and upon their own family life. And although afterwards, when the new religion became dominant, and was at length the religion of the people, the objections to public life greatly disappeared, the family life with its attractions and its virtues continued to maintain a wholesome influence, which has indeed never since been lost. (See Milman, *Hist. Christ.* iii. 134.)

But to look more closely at the family life of Christianity, it must be observed that the abnegation of idolatry caused a displacement of the household and hearth gods—the *Penates* and *Lares* of the Romans,—together with all family rites which savoured of idol worship, and a substitution of Christian observances in their stead. And as it seems to have been the custom of religious Romans to offer their prayers the first thing in the morning, in the *Lararium*, or household shrine (Lampridius, *Alex. Sever.* 29. 31); so family prayer, in which the different members of a Christian household joined, appears to have had its place from the beginning of the new religion. Such united prayer seems to be alluded to in the remark, "that your prayers be not hindered" (1 Pet. iii. 7). And Clement of Alexandria, at the end of the second century, testifies to the same thing when, commenting on the words, "where two or three are gathered together in my name," he says that the three mean a husband, a wife, and a child (*ἄνδρα, καὶ γυναῖκα, καὶ τέκνον τοὺς τρεῖς λέγει*, *Stromat.* iii. 10). And the same author speaks expressly of "prayer and reading of the Scriptures (*εὐχὴ καὶ ἀνάγνωσις*) in Christian families (*Paedag.* ii. 194).

It is evident from the words of Tertullian (*ad Uxorem*, ii. 4) and subsequently of Cyprian (*De Lapsis*, c. 26) that Christians were in the habit of taking home portions of the eucharistic bread, and eating a small piece of it every morning, as an act of devotion [EULOGIAE, p. 629].

The practice also of making the sign of the cross upon the forehead, to which at a later

period so much efficacy was superstitiously ascribed, had become before the beginning of the third century a perpetually repeated ceremony in Christian families, being used "on getting up and going to bed, on putting on their clothes or their shoes, on walking out or sitting down, at table or at the bath;" in short in every act or movement of the day (see Tertullian *de Cor. Mil.* § 3). This little symbolical action may in the early times have been a useful memento to Christians in the midst of so many things of a contrary tendency, however much, like some other practices once innocent and salutary, it was subsequently used in the service of formalism and error. And the same desire of being constantly reminded of their Christian position led them to adorn their goblets with the figure of a shepherd carrying a lamb, and their seal-rings with a dove, an anchor, and other similar devices. (Neander, *Hist. Christ.* p. 399.)

Besides these there were other domestic observances which from time to time interested the piety as well as the natural affections of Christian households, especially those which were connected with the baptism of children, marriages, and funerals, more particularly noticed in separate articles [BAPTISM, CHILDREN, MARRIAGE, BURIAL]. Christians cherished the memory of departed relatives as those with whom they trusted to be reunited in rest and glory, and not unfrequently held family banquets over their remains in a room provided for that purpose [CELLA MEMORIAE].

But besides those festivals which were exclusively Christian, there were some celebrations of an older date, in which, as they were not mixed up with any idolatrous rites, Christian families might unite with their pagan neighbours, and which they might retain for their own use. Even Tertullian, who was so strict in forbidding all semblance of participation in idol worship, saw no objection to Christians joining in the domestic ceremony of "putting on the toga virilis," which corresponded with our "coming of age," or to their being present at weddings, or the "naming of children" (*Nominalia* or *Dies lustrici*; Tertul. *de Idolol.* 16).

As the facility of divorce was a primary principle of corruption in Roman social and family life; so Christianity, having invested marriage with a religious sanctity, and not allowing divorcement under any circumstances, except those mentioned by Christ himself, drew more closely together not only the husband and wife, but all other members of the family.

The relationship between parents and children was greatly influenced for good. The barbarous practice of infanticide, which prevailed among the Greeks and Romans, was immediately discontinued. Under the old Roman law parents might at any time put their children to death, or sell them as slaves; but this severity was at once voluntarily softened in Christian families; and the power was afterwards taken away by Christian emperors; who further directed that in cases of great poverty, when parents might be tempted to sell their children, relief might be given them out of the public revenues, thus affording an example of an incipient poor-law (*Cod. Theod.* vi. 27, in Bingham, xvi. ix. 1).

Parental authority, however, and family ties were strongly upheld. Children were not at

lowed to marry without the consent of their parents (Tertul. *ad Uxor.* ii. 9), and, under the Christian emperors, in the case of daughters thus marrying, the most dreadful punishments were ordered to be inflicted on all who were consenting parties to the marriage (*Cod. Theod.* ix. 24).

The education of their children assumed a new interest with Christian parents, but at the same time caused them new anxieties and cares; since in "bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," it was needful, more especially in the earlier times, to guard them from the evil influences in the midst of which they lived,—from the contact of idolatry all around them,—from the contagion of companions on every side. Further difficulties too presented themselves in connection with the future occupation of their children, inasmuch as many employments open to others were closed against them. For a Christian had to avoid all the numerous trades and arts which were connected with idols and idol-worship, together with some offices of civil and military life.

While children were young their superintendence and education engaged especially the mother's care and vigilance; but besides this and other strictly domestic duties, it was usual for Christian women to devote a portion of their time to doing good beyond their own homes; and Tertullian shows that in his days it was expected, as a matter of course, that they would attend on the sick, go round to the houses of the poor, relieve the needy, and visit imprisoned martyrs (Tertul. *ad Uxor.* ii. 4).

One source of uneasiness was, it must be confessed, introduced into the household in Christian times, which had not existed previously. After the institution of monastic orders, a husband, a wife, or a child might desire to adopt the "religious" life, even without the consent of those who had a claim upon their services and society. Where the persons interested consented, as in the cases of Ammon and his wife (Socrates, *H. E.* iv. 23; Palladius, *Hist. Lausiaca*. c. 8), and of Martianus and Maxima (Victor Uticensis [or Vitensis], *De Persec. Vandul.* i. 5), no harm was done; but in many cases monastic fanaticism disturbed the peace of households and sundered their members. It is evident from the references to the matter (for instance) by Paulinus (*Epist.* 14, *ad Celant.*) and Augustine (*Epist.* 45 [al. 127], *Armentario et Paulinas*; *Epist.* 199 [al. 262], *ad Ecdiciam*), that in the 4th century the question of the relative claims of domestic duty and ascetic life was felt to be a pressing one. Basil the Great in the Larger Rule (Qu. 12) directs that a married person offering to enter a monastery should be questioned as to the consent of the other party; yet he thinks that the precept about hating father, mother, wife, or children to be Christ's disciple (Luke xiv. 26) applies to this case; and in another place (*Epist.* 45, *ad Monachum Lapsam*) he certainly mentions a man's declining domestic cares and the society of his yoke-fellow, for an ascetic life, without the smallest censure. Jerome (*Epist.* 14, *ad Heliod.*) expresses similar views. The feeling of the church on this subject was distinctly pronounced in the 6th century, for the legislation of Justinian (*Codex*, lib. i. tit. 3, *De Episc. et Cler.* leg. 53) allowed married persons to desert their yoke-fellows for "religion" with impunity,

and to reclaim their own fortunes. So in the case of children. The council of Gangra in the 4th century (c. 16) anathematized children—especially children of Christians—who should withdraw from their parents on pretence of religion (*Θεοσεβείας*) and refuse them due honour. So Basil (*Reg. Maj.* q. 15) enjoined that children should not be received into monasteries unless offered by their parents, if the parents were alive. But here again the legislation of Justinian (u. s. leg. 55) betrays the presence of a feeling that "religion" might override domestic obligations, in that it forbids parents to restrain their children from becoming monks or clerics, or to disinherit them for that cause alone. And this feeling, in spite of the not unfrequent protests of jurists, was very prevalent from that time onward. On the other hand, the power of parents to devote their children to "religion" became in time almost absolute; they who had been devoted by their parents were as much bound as those who had entered of their own accord in mature age (*Conc. Tolet.* IV. c. 49, A.D. 633; see OBLATI).

In our view of the family life of Christians, their use of music and singing must not be unnoticed. Among the Greeks especially, and to some extent among the Romans also, their songs occupied a conspicuous place in their social life. These, however, from their generally expressing and encouraging some of the worst evils of the old religions, could not be used in the Christian family circle. But the want was rapidly supplied. Christian songs and hymns were soon composed and extensively multiplied; and these became an abundant source of recreation to all the members of the household, while at meal times, and in all family or friendly unions, they thus expressed their habitual faith, and hope, and joy.

Before Christianity became the prevailing and established religion, families were in continual danger of being molested by popular violence, and of being utterly broken up in times of legalised persecution. But besides these dangers and troubles there were sometimes others hardly less painful within the family itself, when only a part of the household had become Christians. The antagonism and consequent discomfort, if not positive misery, must then have been almost perpetual; and the difficulty of maintaining religious faithfulness, without losing family affection or breaking family ties, must have been very great. Jesus himself had warned his disciples beforehand that "a man's foes might be those of his own household;" and that his religion, in such cases, might bring "not peace but a sword." St. Paul, while desirous that this difference of religion should not actually separate a husband and wife, admitted that it would and must sometimes have this effect. Tertullian (*ad Uxor.* ii. 4) describes in detail the sort of hindrances, opposition, and ridicule, which a Christian woman must expect if she married a husband who was an unbeliever; and how impossible she would find it to fulfil in peace, if she could fulfil at all, her Christian duties,—even if nothing worse occurred. But in times of persecution, or of any strong excitement of antichristian feeling, it was not merely difficulties and discomforts that had to be encountered. The strongest words of Christ were then often liter-

ally realised, when the most powerful natural affections were shattered, and Christians were betrayed and denounced by their nearest relatives and given up to the persecutor's sword. See an early instance of this in Justin Martyr, *Apol.* ii. 2. [G. A. J.]

**FAMILY—THE HOLY.** The subject which bears this title in modern art is generally a group consisting of the Virgin Mother bearing the Sacred Infant, of St. Joseph, and frequently of the younger St. John Baptist, and occasionally of St. Elizabeth. It is frequently treated in an academic or purely artistic spirit, and chosen mainly for the sake of opposing the age of St. Elizabeth or maturity of St. Joseph, to the high ideal of feminine, infantine, or youthful beauty in the Blessed Virgin, the infant or St. John. As a complete and isolated group of this kind the subject is hardly ever treated in art of the earliest Christian age, unless the three Orants



Supposed Holy Family, from Martigny.

given by Martigny (from Bosio *Roma Sott.* p. 279, see woodcut) are to be considered as representing it. He is inclined to think so, though Bosio, Ariaghi, and Bottari consider the group as an ordinary Christian family in the attitude of prayer, and though the boy is more decidedly in that attitude than either the father or the mother. He mentions another lately discovered, but also somewhat conjectural monument, in the cemetery of St. Priscilla, and says that the subject occurs on sarcophagi of the South of France, naming one in the museum of Arles, No. 26, where St. Joseph leads the Saviour by the hand to the Virgin Mother, probably representing Luke ii. 48, "Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us?" [R. St. J. T.]

**FAMILY TOMBS.** [CATACOMBS, p. 300; CELLA MEMORIAE; CEMETERY.]

**FAN.** [FLABELLUM.]

**FANATICI.** From their frequenting *Fana*, shrines of heathen deities, all heathen were sometimes called "fanatici"; thus Clovis before his conversion, "a said (*Gesta Reg. Franc.* c. 1), to have been "fancticus et paganus." In a special sense, priests of idol-temples were "fanatici" (Iso Magister on Prudentius, quoted by DuCange, s.v.); and those who professed to prophesy by the aid of the demon attached to the place [EXORCISM; and see Jerome on Isaiah,

c. 6, and Augustine on Psalm 40]; these were condemned with others who practised such evil arts (*Code*, lib. ix. tit. 18, l. 4; *Macri*, *Hierol.* s.v.; Bingham's *Ant.* xvi. v. 4). [C.]

**FANDILA**, presbyter, martyr at Cordora; commemorated June 13 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

[W. F. G.]

**FANON.** (1.) A head-dress worn by the pope when he celebrated mass pontifically. It is described by Ciampini (*Vet. Mon.* i. 239) and *Macri* (*Hierol.* s.v.) as a veil variegated, like the Mosaic ephod, with four colours, symbolising the four elements, put over the head after the pope was vested with the alb, and tied round the neck, forming a kind of hood, the tiara or other head-dress being put on above it. The lower part was concealed by the *planeta* (Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* i. 24. 15). Ciampini gives the annexed figure from a small brass statue on the doors of the oratory of St. John Baptist at the Lateran. At the *Pedicularium* the "*Cærimoniale Romanum*" directs that the pope should wear the *fanon* alone without the mitre.



(2.) The napkin or handkerchief, *mappa*, *sudarium*, used by the priest during the celebration of the mass to wipe away perspiration from the face, &c. (Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* i. 24. 5; Rab. Maur. *de Inst. Cler.* i. 18; Augusti, *Hierol.* *der Christ. Arch.* iii. 504). [FACERETORUM.]

(3.) In later times the white linen cloth in which the laity made their oblations at the altar. "*Populus dat oblationes suas, id est panem et vinum, et offerunt cum fanonibus candidis.*" *Ordo Romanus*; "*cum fanonibus offerunt.*" *Amalar. de offic. Miss.*; Martens, *de Eccl. rit.* lib. i. c. 4, § 6; Augusti, u. s. ii. 649. The word is sometimes erroneously spelt "*fanones*."

(4.) A still later use of the word is for the church banners, "*vexilla Ecclesiastica*," employed in processions. This is perhaps not earlier than the French and German writers of the 11th century (Augusti, u. s. iii. 348, 355).

(5.) The strings or lappets of the mitre (Willem, *Monuments inédits*, pl. 68, 76, 90) [E. V.]

**FARA**, virgin, of Meaux; "Natalis" Dec. 7 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FABO**, bishop, and confessor at Meaux; commemorated Oct. 28 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FAST OF CHRIST IN THE DESERT.** **THE**, is commemorated in the Aethiopic Calendar on Feb. 4 (*Daniel's Codes*, iv. 252). [C.]

**FASTING** (*nyctelia, jejuniu, abstinentia*). Fasting was total or partial abstinence from food for a certain period; it also signified abstinence from pleasure, or from the celebration of birthdays or marriages or church festivals; and it had the further spiritual signification of abstinence from

sin. See the passages collected in Gunning (*Lent Fast*, pp. 130-150) on the spiritual meaning of fasting.

1. The stated fasts of the Western church were these:

(i.) The great ante-paschal Fast of LENT (*Quadragesima*).

(ii.) The fasts of the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth months, called also EMBER FASTS, or the fasts of the four seasons (*jejunia quatuor temporum*).

(iii.) The weekly fasts of the STATIONS, Wednesday and Friday (*feria quarta et sexta, stationes, semijejunia, τερπὰς καὶ παρασκευή*).

(iv.) The ROGATIONS (*rogationes litaniae*).

(v.) The Vigils or Eves of holy days (*pernoctationes, pervigilia*).

2. The Greek church kept in addition to Lent three fasts of a week each: 1st the Fast of the Holy Apostles, immediately after Pentecost [APOSTLES' FESTIVALS AND FASTS]; 2nd the Fast of the Holy Mother of God (*Sanctae Deiparae*) in August; 3rd the Fast of the Nativity (Suicer *Thesaurus* s. v. *νηστεία*; Neale *Introduction to Eastern Church*, p. 731). Some have supposed (Morinus *de Penit.*, Appendix, p. 124) that the Fast *Sanctae Deiparae* at one period lasted forty days, and began originally on 6th of July and afterwards on 1st of August, and that the Fast of the Nativity was also one of forty days, and began on 15th of November.

3. Other fasts had only a local or partial observance. The council of Eliberis (c. 23) introduced into Spain fasts of superposition (*jejuniorum superpositiones*) for every month in the year except July and August. It does not appear on what days of the month they were kept, but their name implies that they were something over and above the usual fasting days. Bingham (*Antiq.* xxi. 11 § 5) quotes from Philastrius the mention of a fast of three days before Epiphany. In the Dialogue of Egbert of York (Haddan and Stubbs' *Councils and Eccl. Documents*, vol. iii. p. 413) there is the appointment, in addition to the Ember fasts, of a period of twelve days before the Nativity to be spent in fastings, watchings, prayers, and alms; on which twelve days not only were the clergy but laity also, with their wives and households, exhorted to resort to their confessors. The seventeenth council of Toledo A.D. 694 (c. 6) orders litany-fasts (*exomologeses*) to be kept every month in the Spanish and Gallic churches to supplicate "for the safety of the sovereign, for the preservation of the people, and the pardon of their sins, and the expulsion of the devil from the hearts of the faithful." The fasts to be observed throughout the year in the western monasteries are given in detail by the second council of Tours (A.D. 567, c. 17): "From Easter to Pentecost let dinner be served to the brothers every day except on Rogation-days; after Pentecost let them fast an entire week; thence till the 1st of August let all, except those who are suffering from illness, fast three days a week, second, fourth, and sixth days. In August because the *Missa Sanctorum* is daily celebrated, let them eat their dinner; through the whole of September, October, and November, fast three days a week, and in December every day till the Nativity. And because between the Nativity and the Epiphany all days are festivals, with the exception of the

three when private litanies are to be said, they shall eat their dinner; and from Epiphany to Lent fast three days a week."

4. Special fasting was occasionally ordered or advised in a diocese by the bishop, as Tertullian (*de Jejun.* c. 13), after he became a Montanist unwillingly bears witness. It was also one of the means used for preparing for the reception of a sacred ordinance. Fasting before Holy Communion, if not invariable, had become a common practice in the 4th century [COMMUNION]. Fasting before baptism can be traced to a much earlier date. Justin Martyr (*Apolog.* i. 61) mentions among the customs of the Christian church that candidates "are taught to pray fasting, we fasting and praying with them." Tertullian (*de Bapt.* c. 20) exhorts those who are about to receive baptism to pray with frequent prayers and fastings. And the fourth council of Carthage. A.D. 398 (c. 85), appoints abstinence from wine and meat among the preparations for baptism (*Apost. Constt.* vii. 22). The only authority which Martene (*de Rit.* viii. 4) discovers for the practice of fasting before ordination is from Leo, who (*Ep. ad Diosc.*) with reference to ordinations taking place on Sunday, speaks of the Saturday's fast continuing both for candidates and bishop till the ordination was over. No notice of fasting before confirmation is to be found before the 13th century (Martene *de Rit.* iv. 1).

5. *Penitential Fasting*.—For the first 500 years fasting does not appear to have been imposed as a special penance, or to have taken place of other penitential exercises; but in all ages, so long as penitential discipline was in force, a penitent was required to abstain from delicacies of food as from all other bodily gratifications during his period of punishment. Tertullian (*de Penit.* c. 9) defines a true exomologesis to consist, among other duties, in "the use of simple things for meat and drink, and in cherishing prayer by fasts." Pacian (*Paraen. ad Penit.* c. 19) makes his penitent, when invited to a feast, reply, "These things belong to the happy, but as for me I have sinned against the Lord." In the 6th century fasting began to be inflicted as a special and separate mode of penance. One of the canons of the council of Agde, A.D. 506 (c. 60), appoints to those who lapse into heresy, in place of the longer term of penitence allotted by the early church, a fast of two years, to be kept on the third day of the week without any break; if at least that is the meaning of the rather obscure language of the canon (*ut biennio tertio sine relaxatione jejunent*). The penance of fasting is found in the early British penitential canons attributed to Gildas; and in the Penitential of Theodore sentences of a fast of so many days or weeks, or even years, are very common (*Penitential* I. viii. 3, 4, 8, 9; xii. 8; xiv. 9), and no less so in the Penitential of Bede (iii. 5; vii. 11), and in that of Egbert (iv. 6; v. 3; xiii. 4). The crimes for which these sentences were inflicted in these early English penitential books are such as could exist only among a people just emerging from heathenism. In the Penitential of Theodore (II. xiv. i.) is found the first notice of the appointment of three regular fasts of forty days in the year (*tria legitima quadragesima*), forty days before Easter, forty days before the Nativity, and forty days after Pentecost. The



Rule of Chrodegang (c. 32) with reference to the same observance, orders confessions to be made at each of these three annual quadragesimal fasts. And the Capitularies of Charles the Great (vi. 184) repeat in identical words the injunction of Theodore on the three quadragesimal fasts, and add that "although some of them lack canonical authority, yet it is well for all of us together to observe this custom in accordance with the practice of the people and of our forefathers." These fasts were probably first appointed as appropriate penitential seasons for the performance of long periods of penance; afterwards, as may be inferred from the canon in the Capitularies, they came into partial use with the people at large. There is no evidence that they existed earlier than the 7th century, for the councils prior to Theodore which are strict in ordering the people to keep Lent (e.g. *Conc. Agath.* c. 12; 4 *Conc. Aurelian.* c. 2), contain no hint of there being more than one such season in the year; and the canon of the second council of Tours which enumerates the fasts of the monks, and approaches nearer the time of Theodore, evidently recognises no Pentecostal Quadragesima, for it orders monks, whose self-denial would be more severe than that of the rest of the church, to fast only three days a week from Pentecost till August. Hence it is probable that Theodore introduced these as penitential fasts into the Western church from the East, for in the Greek Penitential of Joannes Jejunator two fasts of forty days in addition to Lent are imposed upon penitents, the former of which was called the Quadragesima of St. Peter and St. Paul, and the latter the Quadragesima of St. Philip. One of the councils of the Carolingian kings, about A.D. 821 (*Conc. apud villam Theodonis* cc. 2-5) held for the purpose of devising means for the protection of the clergy, inflicts five quadragesimal fasts on any one slandering or wounding a sub-deacon, six on the slanderer of a deacon, twelve of a priest, and a lifelong fast on the slanderer of a bishop. Even after absolution, a penitent was sometimes ordered to fast one day a week for the remainder of his life—a sentence opposed to the earlier practice, by which admission to communion was a sign of the forgiveness of all past offences.

The penitential fasts were observed with various degrees of severity. In the East the Penitential of Joannes Jejunator allows penitents on the second, fourth, and sixth days of the week to eat oil and beans with oil, but orders them to abstain from cheese, eggs, flesh, and fish; on the third and fifth days eat everything freely except flesh; and on the first and seventh days use wine and flesh as if under no punishment. In the Anglo-Saxon church Egbert (*Penitential* iv. 15) directs penitents to fast three days each week, without specifying the days, from wine, mead (medo), and flesh, till the evening, and eat only dry food; and also keep three quadragesimal fasts in the year on dry food, two days a week till the evening, and three days till three o'clock. Burchard (*Decret.* xix. 9, 10) referring to this direction from the Penitential, states the following to have been the manner in which a fast of two years on bread and water was kept. "For first year fast three days in each week, second, fourth, and sixth, on bread and water; and three days, third, fifth, and seventh, abstain

from wine, mead (medo), beer flavoured with honey (mellita cervisia) flesh and blood, cheese, eggs, and rich fish of various sorts, and eat only small fish if they are to be got, but if not, fish of one kind only, and beans, and herbs, and apples, and drink beer." This list makes no mention of Lent, because it is assumed to be spent entirely on bread and water. "The next year the penitent should fast two days, second and fourth, till the evening, and then refresh himself with dry food, i.e. bread and dry cooked beans, or apples, or raw herbs; let him select one of these three, and drink beer sparingly; on the sixth day let him fast on bread and water." In some cases no additional time of abstinence was imposed, but only a greater rigour during the ordinary ecclesiastical fasts. A very old sacramentary, assigned by Morinus to the 8th century, directs the actual incarceration of a penitent through Lent; "Take him in the morning of the first day of Lent and cover him with ashes, and pray for him, and shut him up till the Thursday of Holy Week (feria quinta in coena Domini), and on the Thursday of Holy Week he may come forth from the place in which he has performed his penance." A Gothic codex from the monastery of Remigius of Rheims, dating probably from the next century, also orders imprisonment through Lent, but instead of the whole body of the penitent being covered with ashes, directs that a few should be sprinkled on his head, and that they should be blessed. This severity was relaxed before the 10th century, and penitents were assigned a parish or district in which to confine themselves through Lent. But both incarceration and confinement within bounds were deviations from an older practice of shutting up a penitent in a monastery (1 *Conc. Matiscon.* cc. 5, 8).

6. *Exemptions from Fasting.*—A superstitious abstinence from flesh and wine on pretence of keeping a stricter fast was forbidden. The *Apistolical Canons* (cc. 52, 53) direct that if any of the clergy abstain from marriage, flesh, or wine, not for exercise, but abhorrence, forgetting that God made all things very good, they shall be deposed (*Conc. Ancy.* c. 14; *Conc. Gangr.* c. 2). The first council of Braga, A.D. 563 (c. 14), orders, under pain of excommunication, clergy who have been in the habit of abstaining from meat, to eat vegetables boiled with meat, in order to avoid the suspicion of being infected with the Priscillian heresy.

Fasting was strictly forbidden on all Sundays throughout the year in every part of the church. The reason of this prohibition was that fasting was held inconsistent with the observance of so high a festival. [LORD'S DAY.]

The observance of Saturday was, as is well known, one of the points in dispute between the Eastern and Western churches. In the East it was always observed as a festival, with the exception of the Paschal Vigil, the *Great Sabbath*, in which Christ lay in the grave, which was kept as a fast both in East and West (*Apost. Constt.* ii. 59; v. 15, 20; vii. 23; viii. 33; *Conc. Laod.* cc. 49, 51; *Conc. in Trull.* c. 55). [SABBATH.]

It was not customary to fast on any festivals, nor consequently to hold festivals during seasons of fasting. The council of Laodicea, A.D. 320 (c. 51), forbids the celebration of festivals of

martyrs in Lent, but orders them to be kept on Saturdays and Sundays. Another canon (c. 52) forbids the celebration of marriages or birthdays in Lent. The Greek church held no festival through Lent except the Annunciation, a festival which the tenth council of Toledo, A.D. 656 (c. 1), ordered to be held eight days before Christmas. [MARY THE VIRGIN, FESTIVALS OF.] The church at Milan held no *missa sanctorum* whatever throughout Lent.

The non-observance of a fast was permitted in the case of weakness or sickness (*Apost. Can.* 68, 2 *Conc. Turon.* c. 17). To these grounds of excuse the eighth council of Toledo, A.D. 653 (c. 9), adds old age or strong necessity. The council of Eliberis (c. 23) had allowed the Spanish churches to omit the monthly fasts in the sultry heat of July and August.

7. *Manner of Fasting*.—A fast day in the early church was kept by a literal abstinence from food till the evening, and then a simple meal was eaten. Ambrose (*de Elia et Jejun.* c. 10) speaks of the fast during Lent continuing through the whole day; and Chrysostom (*Hom.* 6 in *Gen.* p. 60; *Hom.* 8 in *Gen.* p. 79) rebukes the folly of those who abstain all day from food and do not abstain from sin. There was no restriction upon the kind of food eaten at the evening meal, provided only it was partaken of sparingly. Many, no doubt, refused meat or wine during the greater fasts, and contented themselves with bread and water, *Xerophagia* (Tertullian *de Jejun.* c. 11); but that there was no settled rule, and that the choice of diet was left very much to individual discretion is evident from the account given by Socrates (*H. E.* v. 22) of the variety of the observances of the Western church; "some abstain from every sort of creature that has life; others eat fish only of living creatures; others eat birds as well as fish, because, according to the Mosaic account of the creation, they too sprung from the water; others abstain from fruit covered with a hard shell, and from eggs; some eat dry bread only, others not even that; others again when they have fasted till three o'clock eat varieties of food." The Greek church kept Lent very strictly, eating neither fish, nor eggs, nor milk, nor oil; but on the other fasts, except on the fourth and sixth days, these were allowed. The great Sabbath fast of the Paschal Vigil was sustained not only till the evening, but till cockcrowing on Easter morning (*Apost. Const.* v. 18). But the other appointed seasons were kept with less rigour than that of Lent, and the fast, instead of continuing till the evening meal, was broken at the ninth hour (three o'clock), the hour on which our Lord expired on the cross. This was the hour at which the fast of the Stations ceased (Epiphanius *Expos. Fid.* c. 22). And the English council of Clovesho, A.D. 747 (c. 16), orders the Rogations to be kept till three o'clock. The food which was thus saved by abridging the number of meals it was considered a pious act to bestow upon the poor (Origen, *Hom.* 10. in *Levit.*; Leo, *Serm.* 3 *de Jejun. Pentecost.*; Chrysostom, *Serm.* 8 *de Jejun.*). Another practice mentioned by Tertullian (*de Orat.* c. 18) was refraining from the kiss of peace while a fast lasted. A change of dress during fasting was confined chiefly to penitents [PENITENCE], although Tertullian (*Apolog.* c. 40), if his language is not merely

rhetorical, speaks of pious Christians in contrast with heathen self-indulgence, "being dried up with fasting and prostrating themselves in sackcloth and ashes." And at a much later date the council of Mayence, A.D. 813 (c. 33), orders the greater Litany to be observed for three days by all Christians, "not riding nor clothed in rich garments, but barefoot and clothed in sackcloth and ashes." [G. M.]

8. *Fast after Communion*.—St. Chrysostom, on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, speaks as follows: "Before receiving thou fastest, that thou mayest by any means appear worthy of the communion. But when thou hast received, it being thy duty to persevere in self-control, thou undoest all. Not that sobriety before this and afterwards are of equal importance. For it is our duty, indeed, to exercise self-control at both times, but especially after receiving the Bridegroom; before this indeed that thou mayest be worthy to partake; but afterwards that thou mayest not be found unworthy of that of which thou hast partaken. What! Ought we to fast after partaking? I do not say so, nor do I use constraint. For indeed this also is good, but I am not enforcing it, only advising you not to be self-indulgent to excess" (*Hom.* xxvii. ad c. xi. v. 27.) We should infer from this passage that the hearers of St. Chrysostom neither had themselves, nor knew of, any custom of abstaining from ordinary food, for however short a time, after receiving the Holy Communion. Nor have we any evidence that his advice led to the formation of such a habit in the members of the Greek or Oriental churches. In the West, on the other hand, we meet with occasional notices of the practice from the 6th century downwards; and it is probable that it survived, as the pious custom of a few, to the 14th, or even later. A canon of the council of Mâcon held in 585 contains the earliest reference, if the writer mistake not, to this post-communion fast. We give the decree in full: "Whatever relics of the sacrifices shall be left over in the sacarium after the mass is finished, let innocent children be brought to the church on Wednesday or Friday by him whose business it is, and, let them, being enjoined a fast, receive the said relics sprinkled with wine" (*Can.* 6; *Labb. Conc.* tom. v. col. 982). Among the Forged Decretals is an epistle purporting to be written by Clement of Rome to St. James the Lord's brother. The greater part of this epistle appears to have been composed in the 8th century, and in that earlier portion we find a direction to this effect, viz. that the remainder of the consecrated elements "is not to be kept till the morning, but is by the care of the clerks to be consumed with fear and trembling. But they who consume the remainder of the Lord's body, which has been left in the sacarium, are not to assemble forthwith to partake of common food, nor to presume to mix food with the holy portion . . . If therefore the Lord's portion be given to them at an early hour, let the ministers who have consumed it fast till the sixth; and if they have received it at the third or the fourth, let them fast till evening" (*Præcepta S. Petri, inter Opp. S. Leonis*, ed. Baller. tom. iii. p. 674). There is a law of Charlemagne, A.D. 809, with this heading, "Touching those who have communicated, that they wait three hours, on account of the mixing

of the food." The decree itself says "two or three hours" (*Capitularia Regum Franconum*, tom. i. col. 1213. Similarly col. 1224). Regino (*De Eccl. Discipl.* lib. 1. c. cxcv.) at the beginning of the 10th century, and Gratian (*Decr. P.* iii. Dist. ii. c. xxiii.) in the 12th give the passage from pseudo-Clement as above quoted. It was therefore well known during the latter part of the Middle Ages. In the 13th century we find it cited from Gratian by Thomas Aquinas, who acknowledges the principle, while he declares the rule obsolete (*Summa Theol.* P. iii. Qu. lxxx. Art. viii. ad 6m). There is, however, as we have already intimated, some reason to think that the practice which Aquinas evidently considered altogether gone by was yet observed by some long after his time. In England John de Burgo, A.D. 1385, refers to our subject in this manner: "After taking the eucharist it is meet for reverence thereof to abstain for some time from food, but not very long. For preparation by abstinence and devotion is more required before receiving the eucharist than after. For the sacrament has its effect at the reception itself, and therefore actual devotion is required then; but after the reception habitual devotion suffices" (*l'upilla Oculi*, P. iv. c. viii. ad lit. H.). It is also thus mentioned by Duranti, who was murdered by the partisans of the League in 1589, "Not only ought men to be fasting when about to sacrifice and communicate, but they ought also in honour of the sacrament to abstain from all food some time after" (*De Rit. Eccl.* L. ii. c. vii. § 6.) [W. E. S.]

**FATHER (Pater).** 1. A name rhetorically given to the priests of any religion (Arnobius, *Adv. Gent.* lib. 4, c. 19).

2. Commonly applied to Christian bishops. Epiphanius (*Hæres. Adv. Aeruin.* n. 4) says that the reason of the title is that by their right of ordaining they beget fathers to the church. Jerome (*Ep.* 52, *ad Theoph.* ed. Migne) says that bishops are content with their own honour, for they know that they are fathers and not lords. Augustine (*Comm. in Ps.* 44) says that the church itself calls them fathers. Chrysostom (*Hom.* 3, *ad Pop. Antioch.*) speaks of looking to the bishop's throne and not seeing the father upon it. The decrees of the council of Nice are usually cited as those of the 318 fathers (*I. Conc. Nic. Proem.*; *I. Conc. Constantin.* c. 1).

3. To a godfather. In the life of Epiphanius it is said that one Lucian became his father in holy baptism (*Epiph. Vita*, n. 8). So Rufinus (in *Hieron. Invect.* c. 1) says that the same person was his instructor in the creed and his father.

4. It is said that Charles Martel sent his son Pepin to Luitprand, king of the Lombards, who cut his hair according to custom, "juxta morem," and thus became his father, "ei pater effectus est" (Paulus Diaconus, *Hist. Longobard.* vi. 53).

5. To the priest by whom baptism was administered. Avitus of Vienne (*Hom. de Rogat.*), says that Mamertus was both his predecessor and his spiritual father by baptism, "spiritualis a baptismo pater." So (Theodori Cantuar. *Poenitentiale*, II. iv. 8) it is stated that one father is sufficient to administer baptism, "in catechumeno et confirmatione et baptismo unus potest esse pater."

6. To a confessor. One of the Benedictine rules provided that no monk should become a spiritual father without the consent of the abbot (*Reg. Tarnat.* A.D. circa 570; Migne's *Patrol.* t. 66, coll. 977).

7. The title "father of fathers" was sometimes assigned to eminent bishops. In one place it is given to the apostle Paul (*Quæst. ad Orthodox.* c. 119, apud Justin Mart. *Opp.*). Athanasius (*ad Solitar. Vit. Agent.* c. 1) speaks of Hosius as being by universal consent called the father of bishops. Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* 19; *De Funeb. Patr.* § 44) says that his father was called the father of all the bishops (ἀρχιεπείας). Gregory the Great (*Epist.* vi.) addresses Lupus of Troyes, as "father of fathers, bishop of bishops." In a letter from the African bishops which was read at the 1st Lateran council, at the close of the epistle, Theodore, bishop of Rome, is styled "father of fathers." In a letter read at the 6th council of Constantinople (Act 13), Sergius is addressed in the same manner. At the 2nd council of Nice, A.D. 787 (Act 6), Gregory Nyssen is said to have been called "father of fathers" by universal consent.

8. The head of a monastery was naturally called *Pater* by Latins, as *Abbas* by Orientals; thus Augustine (*De Mor. Eccl. Cath.* i. 31) speaks of the respect to be paid by the Decani to the one "quem *l'atrem* appellant;" and Gregory the Great (*Dial.* i. 1; cf. ii. 3; iii. 23) speaks of one who was "Pater" in a monastery over 200 monks. [P. O.]

**FAUSTA. [EVILASIUS.]**

**FAUSTINUS.** (1) Martyr at Brescia; commemorated with Jovita, virgin, Feb. 15 (*Mart. Usuardi*), Feb. 16 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

(2) Martyr at Rome with Simplicius, his brother, and Beatrix, his sister, in the time of Diocletian; commemorated July 29 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi, *Cal. Allatii et Frontonis*).

(3) Martyr at Milan in the time of Aurelius Commodus; commemorated Aug. 7 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FAUSTUS.** (1) [FELIX (5).]

(2) Martyr at Rome with Bonus the presbyter, Maurus, and seven others; commemorated Aug. 1 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) Holy Father, A.D. 368; commemorated Aug. 3 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(4) Martyr at Milan; commemorated Aug. 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(5) Saint, at Antioch; commemorated with Timotheus, Sept. 8 (*Mart. Usuardi, Hieron.*).

(6) Martyr at Cordova with Januarius and Martialis; commemorated Sept. 28 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis); "Passio" Oct. 13 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(7) Deacon and martyr; commemorated Nov. 19 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*); with Eusebius (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(8) [DIUS (2).]

[W. F. G.]

**FEASTS OF CHARITY. [AGAPAE.]**

**FEBRONIA.** (1) With Marina, virgins; commemorated Sept. 24 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(2) Martyr at Nisibis, A.D. 286; commemorated June 25 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**FEET, WASHING OF.** [BAPTISM, §§ 34, 67; MAUNDY THURSDAY.]

**FEILIRE, THE, OF AENGUS THE CULDEE.** The word Feilire, derived from "feil" the Irish equivalent of vigilia, is applied to the metrical festology composed by Aengus the Culdee about the year 780. It is the most ancient of five martyrologies belonging to Ireland. The others are (1.) The martyrology of Tamhlacht, which must have been written after 845. (2.) That of Maelduire ua Gorman, dating from between 1156-1173. (3.) The Saltair na Rann, which, however, contains only four Gaelic entries; and (4.) The Kalendar of the Drummond Missal, published in Bishop Forbes' Kalendars of the Scottish saints.

Of the personal history of Aengus we know that he was educated in Cluain Ednach in Queen's County, and travelling into Munster founded Disert Aengusa in co. Limerick. At the time of the expedition of king Aedh Oirdnidhe against Leinster in 799 he was residing at Disert Bethac near Monasterevin. Latterly he went to abbot Maeldruain at Tamhlacht, when he from humility concealed his gifts, and passing himself as a serving man was entrusted with the charge of the mill and kiln, till at last his learning was discovered by accident.

The Feilire consists of three parts. 1. Five quatrains invoking a blessing on the poet and his work. 2. A preface of 220 quatrains; and 3. The festology itself in 365 quatrains for every day in the year (O'Curry, *Early Eccl. MSS. of Ireland*, pp. 359-371. [A. P. F.]

**FELICIANUS.** (1) Martyr at Rome with Fortunatus, Firmus, and Candidus; commemorated Feb. 2 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Rome with Primus under Diocletian and Maximian; commemorated June 9 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi, Cal. Altatii et Frontonis, Sacramentarium Gregorii*).

(3) [VICTOR (10).]

(4) Martyr in Lucania with Jacinctus, Quiritus, and Lucius; commemorated Oct. 29 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*).

(5) [EXSUPERIUS (3).] [W. F. G.]

**FELICISSIMA,** virgin, martyr at Falari with Gracilianus; "Passio" Aug. 12 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FELICISSIMUS.** (1) [HERACLIUS (3).]

(2) [FELIX (14).]

(3) [SIXTUS (2).]

(4) Martyr in Africa, with Rogatianus, the presbyter, under Decius and Valerian; commemorated Oct. 26 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(5) Saint, of Perugia in Tuscany; "Natalis" Nov. 24 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FELICITAS.** (1) Martyr at Tuburbo (at Carthage, *Bede*) with Perpetua, Revocatus, Saturninus, and Secundolus, under Severus; commemorated March 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi, Cal. Bucher.*).

(2) Martyr under Antoninus; commemorated Nov. 23 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FELICULA.** (1) Martyr at Rome with

Vitalis and Zeno; commemorated Feb. 14 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Virgin, martyr at Rome; commemorated June 13 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FELIX.** (1) Saint, at Heraclea; commemorated with Januarius, Jan. 7 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*).

(2) Presbyter, confessor at Nola in Campania; commemorated Jan. 14 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi, Cal. Carth.*).

(3) [DATIVUS (1).]

(4) [HILARY (2).]

(5) Martyr at Caesaraugusta with seventeen others: Apodemus, Cassianus, Cecilianus, Evotus, Faustus, Fronto, Januarius, Julius, Lupercus, Matutinus, Martialis, Optatus, Primitivus, Publius, Quintilianus, Successus, Urbanus; commemorated April 16 (*Mart. Usuardi*), April 15 (*Mart. Adonis*).

(6) Saint, of Alexandria; commemorated with Arctor, presbyter, Fortunus, Silvius, and Vitalis, April 21 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(7) Presbyter, martyr at Valence in France with Fortunatus and Achilleus, deacons; commemorated April 23 (*Ib.*).

(8) Bishop, martyr at Spoletum under Maximian; commemorated May 18 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(9) Martyr in Istria with Zoellius, Servilius, Silvanus, and Diocles; commemorated May 24 (*Ib.*).

(10) Saint, in Sardinia; commemorated with Aemilius, Priamus, Lucianus, May 28 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(11) The pope, martyr at Rome under the emperor Claudius; commemorated May 30 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(12) Martyr in Aquileia with Fortunatus under Diocletian and Maximian; "Passio" June 11 (*Ib.*).

(13) Presbyter, martyr in Tuscany; commemorated June 23 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(14) Martyr in Campania with Aristo, Crescentianus, Eutychianus, Felicissimus, Justus, Martia, Symphorosa, Urbanus, and Vitalis; commemorated July 2 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(15) Son of Felicitas (2), martyr in the time of Antoninus; commemorated with his six brothers, Alexander, Januarius, Martialis, Philip, Silvanus, Vitalis, July 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*).

(16) Martyr in Africa; commemorated with Januarius, Marinus, and Nabor, July 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(17) [SCILLITA.]

(18) The pope, martyr at Rome under Constantius Augustus; commemorated July 29 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Usuardi*); "Passio" Nov. 10; deposition Nov. 17 (*Mart. Adonis*).

(19) Martyr at Gerona in Spain; commemorated Aug. 1 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(20) Martyr at Rome with Aprilis, Martialis, Saturninus, and their companions; commemorated Aug. 22 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(21) [GEORGIUS (4).]



(22) Presbyter, martyr at Rome with Adauctus under Diocletian and Maximian; commemorated Aug. 30 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi, *Cal. Allatii et Frontonis*).

(23) Bishop of Tubzoca, martyr at Venusia in Apulia in the time of Diocletian, with Audactus and Januarius, presbyters, Fortunatianus and Septiminus, readers; commemorated Aug. 30 (*Mart. Bedae*), Oct. 24 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(24) Bishop, martyr in Africa with Nemesianus and Lucius, bishops; also with Dativus, Felix, Jader, Litteus, Polianus, and Victor, under Decius and Valerian; commemorated Sept. 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(25) [FELIX (24).]

(26) Martyr at Nuceria with Constantia, under Nero; commemorated Sept. 19 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(27) Martyr at Autun, with Andochius, presbyter, and Tyrsus, deacon, under the emperor Aurelian; commemorated Sept. 24 (*Mart. Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*).

(28) Bishop, martyr in Africa with Cyprian and 4976 others, under Hunnericus; commemorated Oct. 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(29) [EUSEBIUS (8).]

(30) Martyr at Toniza in Africa; commemorated Nov. 6 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi).

(31) Bishop, martyr at Nola in Campania with thirty others; commemorated Nov. 15 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**FEMORALIA** or **FEMINALIA**. These are drawers or breeches covering the thighs and loins, as the derivation implies. (See Isidore Hispal. *Etym.* xix. 22.) They were an essential part of the dress of the Levitical priesthood (Ex. xxviii. 42, 43), and as such are often referred to by the fathers (see e. g. Jerome, *Epist.* 64, *ad Fabiolam*; i. 360, ed. Vallarsi), many of whom are delighted to find a symbolical meaning in this as in other vestments.

The injunction as to the wearing of breeches during divine service is repeated in sundry monastic rules. Thus the *Rule* of Fructuosus, bishop of Bracara, when settling the dress to be worn by monks, permits the use of *femoralia* to all, but "maxime his qui ministerio implicantur altaris" (*Regula S. Fructuosi*, c. 45: in Holstenius, *Codex Regularum*, part 2, p. 139, ed. Paris, 1663; cf. Grimlaici *Solitariorum Regula*, c. 49; *op. cit.* p. 341). For general rules as to this and other articles of monastic dress see *Magistri Regula*, c. 81 (*op. cit.* p. 257). The *Rule* of St. Benedict enjoins that monks who were going on a journey should borrow *femoralia* from the *Vestiarium*, and on their return should restore them thither washed:—"femoralia, ii qui diriguntur in via, de Vestuario accipiant, qui revertentes lota ibi restituant" (c. 55; p. 117, ed. Venice, 1723). For further references, see Ducange's *Glossarium*, s. vv., and Menard's note to the *Concordia Regularum* (*Patrol.* ciii. 1235). [R. S.]

**FENCING-MASTERS**. [GLADIATORS; LACISTAE.]

**FERETRUM**, a bier on which the corpse, after washing, was placed and carried to burial [BURIAL OF THE DEAD]. It was as a rule made of wood, in which Ambrose (in *Luc.* vii. 14) sees a mystical allusion to the resurrection, drawn from the miracle at Nain (Durant. *de Ritib.* lib. i. c. 23). The *feretrum* of Constantine the Great appears to have been of gold, like his coffin (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* lib. iv. c. 66). The bier was covered with a pall, more or less costly, according to the rank of the deceased. That of Constantine was of purple (ἀλουργικὴ ἀλουργίδι). That of Blesilla, the daughter of Paula, was of cloth of gold, against which Jerome remonstrated vehemently as an unchristian extravagance (Hieron. *Ep.* 25). Constantine's bier was surrounded with a circle of lights burning in golden candlesticks (Euseb. *u. s.*). The bier was carried to the grave sometimes by relations or near friends, sometimes by officials designated to that duty (*Copiatæ, decani, lecticarii*), and in the case of persons of high dignity or sanctity by bishops and nobles, e. g., Basil by his clergy (Greg. Mag. *Orat.* xx.), his sister Macrina by Gregory Nyssen, and other clergy (Greg. Nys. *Vit. Macr.* tom. ii. p. 201); Paula, by the bishops of Palestine, "cervicem feretro subjicientibus" (Hieron. *Ep.* 27). [E. V.]

**FERIA**. The proper sense of this word is that of a holyday, of a festival viewed in the aspect of a day of freedom from worldly business. It is in this meaning that we find the word in classical Latin, though here it occurs exclusively in the plural. Besides this, however, the word has been used in a special sense in the Christian church from very early times to denote the days of the week, *feria secunda, tertia, &c.*, for Monday, Tuesday, &c.

The origin of this system of notation cannot be stated with absolute certainty. It is explained by Ducange (*Glossarium*, s. v.) as arising from the fact that the week following Easter Day was appointed by the emperor Constantine to be observed as one continuous festival, and that originally the year began with Easter. Hence the Monday, Tuesday, &c., of Easter Week would be respectively *secunda feria, tertia feria, &c.*, and in this way, following the example of the first week of the year, the names passed to all other Mondays, &c., of the year. The great objection to this view, which seems to have found many supporters (see e. g. Pelliccia, *De Christianæ Ecclesiæ politia*, i. 277, ed. Colon. 1829), is that long before the time of Constantine we find Tertullian speaking of Wednesday and Friday as *quarta* and *sexta feria* (*de jejunio adv. Psychicos*, c. 2).

It seems more reasonable to explain the phrase as being akin to and probably derived from the Jewish system of notation under which such an expression as e. g. ἡ μὴ τῶν σαββάτων (Mark xvi. 2; Acts xx. 7, and often in the New Testament) means the "first day of the week." This extension of the word *Sabbath*, which, besides the instances adducible from the New Testament, occurs also in the Targums (see e. g. Esther ii. 9), is merely a natural transference of a word from its primary meaning of the point of time, as it were, to express the periods marked out by such points; and an exact parallel is found in the Hebrew שַׁבָּת, which is primarily the new

moon, and hence the month, or period between two new moons. The real *feria* then being Sunday, the other days of the week are reckoned as in the above instances with reference to this. On this view see Heinichen on Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* (vol. iii. p. 87). The explanation given by Durandus (*Rationale divinorum officiorum*, vii. 1. 11) deserves to be quoted, though of course not admissible as a solution—"vocantur ergo feriae a feriando, quia toto tempore a vitiis feriari, id est vacare, debemus, non quod sit a necessariis vitae operibus feriandum."

With the seventh day of the week the name *Subbatum* was so closely associated that it was nearly always used instead of *septima feria*, though Ducange (s. v.) gives an example of this last phrase. In like manner, the first day of the week, from its association with the Resurrection, became 'the Lord's Day' from apostolic times, and thus though the phrase *prima feria* does now and then occur (see e. g. in one of the spurious sermons once attributed to Augustine, *Patrol.* xxxix. 2005), *Dominica* is the regular word for Sunday in ancient liturgies. The days, however, from Monday to Friday inclusive are habitually designated as *secunda feria*, &c., of which practice an examination of, e. g., the Gregorian Sacramentary will furnish abundant examples. A good illustration, showing how completely the word *feria* had passed into this new sense, is furnished by the use of the phrase *feriae legitimae* in the *Libri Poenitentiales* of Theodore of Tarsus and of Bede, as when for some offence a special fast is enjoined "praeter legitimas ferias" (see e. g. *Patrol.* xcix. 968), that is, in addition to those days of the week which were fasts under all circumstances.

For further remarks on this subject see Ducange's *Glossarium*, (s. v.), and Augusti's *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie*, i. 467 sqq.

[R. S.]

**FERIALES** (i.e. *Libri*) were books containing a record of the festivals of the martyrs. Thus Chromatius and Heliodorus, writing to Jerome (*Hieron. Epist.*), beg him to search for the *Feriales* from the archives of Eusebius of Caesarea, as a guide to the feast-days of the martyrs [CALENDAR: MARTYROLOGY] (Ducange, s. v.).

[C.]

**FERMENTUM.** I. The earliest *Ordo Romanus* extant, which is supposed to represent the ritual of Rome in the age of Gregory the Great, A.D. 590, orders a portion of reserved eucharist (*Sancta*) to be brought into the church before the celebration by a subdeacon, to be delivered by him to the archdeacon after the canon, and to be put into the chalice by the latter, saying, "The Peace of the Lord be with you alway." (*Ord. R. I.* nn. 8, 17, 18, in *Mus. Ital.* tom. ii. pp. 8, 12, 13). The bishop of Rome is supposed to be present, and to celebrate. The particle thus used was called *Fermentum*, the leaven, n. 22, p. 16. If the pope was not present, "a particle of the leaven, which had been consecrated by the apostolical, was brought by the oblationary subdeacon, and given to the archdeacon; but he handed it to the bishop, who, signing it thrice, and saying, 'The Peace, &c.,' put it into the chalice." The reason of the name *Fermentum* is now obvious. Leaven is dough reserved from one baking to be mixed

with that prepared for another. and may be said to make the bread of both one. The eucharistic leaven connected successive celebrations with each other in the same manner, and was at the same time a token of union between congregations locally separated from each other. If we may trust to the *Liber Pontificalis*, the custom of sending the *Fermentum* to the several churches in Rome originated with Melchiades, A.D. 311. The same authority tells us that Siricius, A.D. 385, "ordained that no presbyter should celebrate masses through the whole week unless he received a certified (*declaratum*), consecrated (portion) from the bishop of the place appointed (for a station), which is called the leaven" (*Anast. Biblioth. de Vitis Pont. Rom.* nn. 32, 39, pp. 12, 22). The custom is noticed at some length in a letter ascribed to Innocent I., A.D. 402, but apparently composed by a later and inferior writer. From this document we learn that the pope "sent the leaven *per titulos*," i.e. the churches within the city only (those without being in the suburbicarian dioceses), and that it was done on Sundays, "that the presbyters who on that day could not meet him (in worship) on account of the people committed to them, might not, above all on that day, feel themselves cut off from communion with him" (*Innoc. Ep. ad Decent. in Cigheri, V. P. P. Theolog. Univ. tom. iv. p. 178*). The writer had been asked by another bishop, if it was proper to send the *Fermentum* about through a diocese (i.e. beyond the walls of an episcopal city). The question shows that the practice had spread. In the writings of Gregory of Tours, A.D. 573, we meet with a story which proves incidentally that it was not unknown in France. We are told of a certain deacon, in a town in Auvergne, who, "when the time to offer the sacrifice was come, having taken the tower in which was kept the mystery of the Lord's Body, began to carry it to the door (of the church), and entered the temple to place it on the altar," &c. (*Mirac. L. I. cap. 86*).

Before the custom became obsolete, its observance was, it appears, reduced by authority to a few days in the year. For in an ancient gloss on the letter ascribed to Innocent, found by Mabillon in the library of St. Emmeran at Ratisbon, the following statement occurs: "Touching the leaven, which he mentions, it is the custom of the Romans that a portion be reserved from the mass which is sung on Maundy Thursday and the Easter-Eve, and on the holy day of Easter, and at Pentecost, and on the holy day of the Lord's Nativity, throughout the year; and that of the said mass there be put into the chalice, everywhere at the stations, if the pope himself be not present, when he says, The Peace, &c. . . . and this is called *Fermentum*. Nevertheless, on Easter-Eve, no presbyter in the baptismal churches communicates any one before there be sent to him of that very same holy thing which the Lord Pope hath offered" (Mabillon, *Itin. German. Descript.* p. 65; Hamb. 1717). The rite was observed at Rome under the second *Ordo Romanus*, now extant (pp. 43, 9), which is probably at least a century later than the first. Amalarius, who wrote about the year 827, cites some words that relate to it from *Ordo II.* § 12 (p. 49); but there can be little doubt that he understood them of

the "commixture" of a particle of the newly-consecrated oblate (*De Eccles. Off. lib. iii. c. 31*).

II. There was another use of the reserved element, somewhat similar to the above, at the ordination of bishops and priests. The earliest notice occurs in a very ancient Roman directory, and refers (as indeed all the strictly Roman documents do) to bishops only. The pope at the communion which followed the consecration, gave a whole oblate to the newly-made bishop, of which he took a part at the time, but "reserved the rest of it to serve for communions for forty days" (*Ordo VIII. p. 89*). The practice may have spread from Rome, but it was at one time so widely observed that we are compelled to assign its origin to a very early though not primitive date. In the opinion of Morinus (*De Sacr. Ordin. P. III. Exerc. VIII. c. ii. § iv.*), it sprang up in Italy in the 8th century. Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, who was born in the 10th century, asserts that it was observed by all the bishops of his province at the ordination of presbyters, and he believed it to be universal (*Ep. II. ad Einard. apud Martene, de Ant. Eccl. Rit. L. I. c. viii. Art. IX. n. xx.*). Rubrics prescribing it at the consecration of bishops are found in old pontificals of Concha, in Spain (*Martene, u. s. Art. X. n. xxi.*); of Salzburg (*Ibid. Art. XI. Ord. VIII.*); of Toulouse, Rouen, Rheims (*Morinus, de Sacr. Ord. P. II. p. 281; and P. III. p. 130*), and the Latin church of Constantinople (*Mart. u. s. Ordo XIV. note at end*), where the term was forty days; and of Mayence (*Morinus, P. II. p. 278*), where it was thirty. The pontificals of Compiègne (*Mart. u. s. Ord. VII.*) and of Salzburg (*Ibid. Ord. IX.*) testify to the custom at the ordination of priests, the former fixing forty days for them, and the latter only seven. In the pontifical of the Latin church of Apamea in Syria, the pope, who is supposed to consecrate, is directed to give a "whole Host" to the new bishop, but its use is not mentioned. Afterwards, however, it is said that "for forty days from the day of his consecration he ought, if possible, to sing mass daily for the people committed to him." (*Mart. u. s. Ord. XIV.*). This evidently indicates the original purpose, and makes it highly probable that wherever in the west we find an order that the newly ordained shall celebrate for forty days (and this was a common rule: see *Morinus, P. III. Exerc. VIII. c. ii. § vii. p. 132*), there had also existed in connection with it the custom of reserving for those celebrations from the communion at the ordination.

Mabillon (*Comm. in Ord. Rom. p. xxxix.*) states expressly that the particles of the reserved oblate were put day by day into the chalice by the newly-made bishop or priest, as in the rite before described. This is more than probable; but it is right to mention that he gives no reference, and that no direct evidence of the fact has come within the knowledge of the present writer. [W. E. S.]

**FERREOLUS.** (1) Presbyter, martyr at Besançon with Ferrutio, the deacon; commemorated June 16 (*Mart. Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr at Vienna; commemorated Sept. 18 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FERRUTIO.** [FERREOLUS.]

**FERTUM** is "the oblation which is brought to the altar, and sacrificed by the priest" (*Ducange, s. v. quoting Isidore and Papias*); i. e. the element of bread offered on the altar and consecrated. [C.]

**FERULA.** [NARTHEX; PASTORAL STAFF.]

**FESTIVAL** (*ἑορτή, festum, dies festus*). The history of the first rise of festivals in the Christian church is a subject involved in much obscurity. During the first few years, while the essentially Jewish character of the church continued, the Jewish yearly festivals were doubtlessly observed, especially the Passover and Pentecost, which later events had raised to a far higher pitch of dignity. The Sabbath also continued to be observed, and with it the first day of each week became a lesser Easter day.

As time went on, the Jewish element in the church became proportionately diminished, with the breach between it and the Gentile part continually widening. Indeed the tone of the language used by Christian writers in the 2nd century, with reference to the Jewish nation, is on the whole one of undisguised hostility. It is obvious therefore that the tendency would be from the nature of the case to reject such Jewish festivals as had not in some sort been made Christian, and thus, e.g., though some have seen in Christmas a higher form of the feast of the Dedication, it may be considered that the inheritance of the younger from the older church, so far as festivals are concerned, consists of the ennobled Passover and Pentecost. The "first day of the week" was no doubt a Christian festival from the earliest times. Up to the end of the 2nd century, we have no evidence of the existence of any other festival than these three. Gradually, however, from a belief in the lessons of good derivable from a celebration of great events in the history of our faith, and perhaps too from the analogy of the numerous festivals of the older religions, fresh commemorations arose, the earliest being that of the Epiphany, from which afterwards arose the celebration of Christmas as a separate festival. The exact time of the first rise of these, and of the connection between the two, is uncertain; reference may be made to the separate articles. [CHRISTMAS, EPIPHANY.] The time, too, from Easter to Pentecost came to be viewed as one long festival season, and in this period a special distinction began to be attached to Ascension-day, in the 3rd or more probably in the 4th century. Together with these festivals and similar ones which were gradually added (e.g. those of the Presentation and Annunciation in the 6th century), all commemorative of the great events in the foundation of the faith, we find also festivals of another kind, the celebration of the anniversary of a martyr's death, viewed as his natal day into the better life. These would be at first confined more or less to special churches, but would subsequently obtain in many cases a general observance. Thus by the end of the 4th century we find a wide-spread observance of festivals of e.g., St. Stephen, SS. Peter and Paul, and the Maccabees. The festival of St. John the Baptist, which at an early period became one of great importance (see e.g. the canon of the council of Agde, cited below), is not however of the above class, being a commemoration of the actual birth-

day, as one intimately associated with that of the Saviour Himself.

We find, however, considerable diversity of feeling in the primitive church on the subject of festivals. On the one hand, it was most justly felt that a festival, as being a cessation from the world's everyday cares and pleasures, should claim regard as a special means of help for the soul in its heavenward way; on the other hand, it was urged with equal truth, that when the shadows of Judaism had become the realities of Christianity, to lay any special stress on the observance of times and seasons was at any rate to incur the danger of losing sight of the reason why festivals were established at all, and the rather that in Christianity every day was in a new sense consecrated to God. It was the disregard of one or other of these two co-ordinate truths to which must be attributed much of the false ideas that have been held on the subject of festivals. Protests on the second point were deemed necessary by our Lord Himself (Matt. xii. 8; Mark ii. 27), and by St. Paul (Romans xiv. 5, 6; Gal. iv. 9-11; Col. ii. 16). In like manner too, Origen (*contra Celsum* viii. 22) urges that the Christian who dwells on the thought of Christ our Passover, and of the gift of the Holy Ghost, is every day keeping an Easter and a Pentecostal feast. Similar remarks are found also in Chrysostom (*Hom. i. de S. Pentecoste*, c. i.; vol. ii. 458, ed. Montfaucon: cf. *Hom. xv. in 1 Cor.* c. 3; vol. x. 128). These passages, however, are not to be viewed as objections brought against the celebration of festivals, but rather as answers to those who saw in them but a relic of Judaism. Tertullian, in very sweeping language, condemns the practice of holding festivals altogether on this ground,—“*Horum igitur tempora observantes et dies et menses et annos, galaticamur. Plane, si judaicarum caerimoniarum, si legalium sollemnitatum observantes sumus. . .*” and asks why in the face of St. Paul's language as to times and seasons, Easter is celebrated, and why the period from thence to Whitsunday is spent as one long season of rejoicing (*de jejunio adv. Psychicos*, c. 14). Jerome, on the other hand, while endorsing such views as those which we have referred to as held by Origen and Chrysostom, proceeds further to maintain the definite advantages arising from the observance of festivals (*Comm. in Gal.* iv. 10; vol. vii. 456, ed. Vallarsi: cf. Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 22).

We shall now briefly notice the chief points in which a festival was specially distinguished in its observance from ordinary days. (1) The essential idea of a Christian festival was obviously such as to make ordinary festivities, other than those of a religious character, unseemly at such times; and thus numerous imperial edicts were promulgated from time to time, prohibiting public games, etc. on Christian holy days (Eusebius, *Vita Constantini* iv. 18, 23; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* i. 8; *Cod. Theodos.* lib. xv. tit. 5, ll. 2, 5; vol. iv. pp. 350, 353, ed. Gothofredus; *Cod. Justin.* lib. iii. tit. 12, l. 11; p. 208, ed. Gothofredus). Of the two references to the Theodosian Code, the former enjoins that “*Nullus Solis die populo spectaculum praebeat*”; the latter specifies Sundays, Christmas, the Epiphany, Easter, and the anniversary of apostolic martyrdoms as the days to which the prohibition extended, “. . .

omni theatrorum atque Circensium voluptate per universas urbes earundem populis denegata.”

(2) In like manner all legal business had to be suspended. (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. ii. tit. 8, ll. 1, 2; vol. i. pp. 118, 121; *Cod. Justin.* lib. iii. tit. 12, ll. 7, 11; pp. 207, 208). A special exemption was allowed in the case of emancipation or manumission (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. ii. tit. 8, l. 1; *supra*). (3) The celebration of public worship was of course a necessary concomitant of a festival. The council of Eliberis [305 A.D.] condemns the man who on three consecutive Sundays was absent from the church (can. 21; Labbe i. 973). The council of Agde (506 A.D.) while sanctioning generally the practice of communicating in private chapels, forbids it elsewhere than in the public assembly on the more important festivals. These are specified in another canon of the same council as Easter, Christmas, the Epiphany, Ascension-day, Pentecost, the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, “*vel si qui maximi dies in festivitatibus habentur.*” (cann. 18, 21; Labbe iv. 1386; cf. *Concil. Aurel.* iv. [541 A.D.] can. 3; Labbe v. 382). (4) Fasting was a thing utterly foreign to the idea of such days; indeed it was a distinguishing mark of sundry heretics to turn the festivals into seasons of fasting. The so called *Apostolic Canons* censure those who would fast on the Lord's day or the Sabbath (i.e. Saturday, which, it will be remembered, was regarded in the East as a day of distinctly festal character), and orders that any of the clergy who does so shall be deposed (*καταπέσιθω*, can. 65, al. 66, Labbe i. 40); and a previous canon (52 al. 51) had spoken of a bishop, priest or deacon, who abstained from flesh and wine on a festival as “*a cause of scandal to many.*” (See also Tertullian, *de Corona Militis* c. 3; *Concil. Gangrense* [circa 324 A.D.] can. 18; Labbe ii. 424; *Concil. Carthag.* iv. [398 A.D.] can. 64; Labbe ii. 1205). On these days in earlier times were held Agapae [AGAPAE], a custom which was afterwards changed into the plan of the richer members of a Christian community feeding the poorer (cf. e.g., Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 39). (5) Among minor but significant ways of distinguishing a festival it may be added that at such times it was usual to offer prayer standing, not kneeling; “*die dominico nefas . . . de geniculis adorare. Eadem immunitate a die Paschae in Pentecosten usque gaudemus*” (Tertullian, *de Corona Militis* c. 3). Irenaeus, in referring to the same practice, speaks of this absence of kneeling as figurative of the resurrection (*Frug.* 7; vol. i. p. 828, ed. Stieren: cf. Justin Martyr, *Quaest. et Resp. ad Orthodoxos* 115; Jerome *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* c. 8; vol. ii. 180; Epiphanius *Expos. Fidei* c. 22; vol. i. 1105, ed. Petavius; Isidore *de Eccl. Off.* i. 33; Rabanus Maurus *de Inst. Cler.* ii. 42. See also *Concil. Nicaenum* i. [325 A.D.] can. 20; Labbe ii. 37; also Dr. Pusey's note to the Oxford translation of Ephrem Syrus, pp. 417 sqq.).

Festivals may be divided into *ordinary* and *extraordinary* (*seriae statutae, indictae*), according as they came in regular course in the Christian year, or were specially appointed in consequence of some particular event. The former may again be divided into *immoveable* and *moveable* (*feriae immobiles, mobiles*), according as they did or did not fall on the same day in every year; those in the latter division obviously com-



sisting of such as depended on Easter, the time of which, depending on the Jewish or lunar calendar, to which the Paschal festival originally belonged, varies with reference to its place in the Julian or solar year [EASTER]. It follows that the number of Sundays between Christmas and Easter, and again between Easter and Christmas, is variable. Besides the obvious divisions of *feriae majores, minores*, there is further that into *feriae integrae, intercisae*, according as the festival lasted for the whole or part of a day. Such divisions as those made by the Roman church of *festum simplex, duplex, semiduplex*, to say nothing of further subdivisions (*principale duplex, majus duplex, etc.*), fall quite beyond our period. (For information concerning them see Ducange's *Glossarium*, s. v. *Festum*). On the subject of the repeated commemorations of the more important festivals, see OCTAVE, and for the preliminary preparation for festivals, see VIGIL.

Among the literature on the subject of Christian festivals may be mentioned the following:—Hospinianus, *Festa Christianorum*; Tiguri, 1593. Dresser, *de festis diebus Christianorum, Judaeorum et Ethnicorum liber, quo origo, causa ritus et usus eorum exponitur*. Lipsiae, 1594. Gretser, *de festis Christianorum*, Ingolstadt, 1612. Gueti, *Hortologia*. Parisiis, 1657. Lambertini, *Commentarii duo de Jesu Christi matrisque ejus Festis et de Missae Sacrificio*. Patavii, 1752. Augusti, *die Feste der alten Christen*. Leipzig, 1817. Ullmann, *Vergleichende Zusammenstellung des Christlichen Festcyclus mit Vorchristlichen Festen, als Anhang zu Creuzer's Symbolik*. Leipzig, 1821. Nickel, *Die heiligen Zeiten und Feste nach ihrer Geschichte und Feier in der Katholischen Kirche*. Mainz, 1825–38. Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Katholischen Kirche* (vol. v. part 1, pp. 119 sqq.) Mainz, 1825–38. Staudenmaier, *Der Geist des Christenthums, dargestellt in den heiligen Zeiten, heiligen Handlungen und der heiligen Kunst*. Mainz, 1838.

[R. S.]

## FESTUM. [FESTIVAL.]

## FESTUS. (1) [JANUARIUS (10).]

(2) Saint in Tuscany; commemorated with Joannes, Dec. 21 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi).

[W. F. G.]

## FIDEI ADVOCATUS. [ADVOCATUS; DEFENSOR.]

## FIDEJUSSORES. [SPONSOR.]

## FIDELES. [FAITHFUL.]

## FIDELIUM MISSA. [MISSA.]

## FIDELIUM ORATIO. [LORD'S PRAYER.]

## FIDES. (1) [SOPHIA.]

(2) Virgin, martyr at Agen; commemorated Oct. 6 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

[W. F. G.]

FILIOLA (Spanish, *Hijuela*), a name given in the Mozarabic liturgy to the VEIL of the chalice. One of the rubrics relating to the oblation of the elements is: "[The Priest] places the chalice on the altar, and takes the *Filiola*, and without blessing it puts it on the chalice" (*Mabillon, De Liturg. Gall.* p. 42; Neale, *Eastern Church*, introd. 439).

[C.]

FILLET, THE BAPTISMAL. [BAPTISM, p. 163; CHRISMAL.]

FINCHALE, COUNCIL OF (*Finchallense Concilium*), held A.D. 798 or 9, at Finchale, near Durham, and presided over by Eanbald, archbishop of York, in which, after the faith of the first five general councils had been rehearsed from a book, a declaration of adhesion to them was reiterated in the words of archbishop Theodore, and the council of Hatfield, A.D. 680 (see c. of H.), and other regulations for the good of the church in Northumbria and elsewhere, and for the keeping of Easter, were passed (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils* iii. 527).

[E. S. Ff.]

FINES (*mulcta, emenda, ἐντιμία*). *Mulcta* signified a fine paid by way of penalty to the judge: *emenda*, satisfaction made to the injured party. On the variations from this usage, see Du Cange, s. v. *Emenda*. Fines are found in the records of the early English church among the penalties inflicted for ecclesiastical offences. The laws of Ethelbert of Kent, A.D. 597–604 (c. i.) require the following compensation to be made for injuries; "to the property of God and the church twelve fold, a bishop's property eleven fold, a priest's property nine fold, a deacon's six fold, a clerk's property three fold." The laws of Ine, king of Wessex, A.D. 690 (c. 2), order a man to have his child baptized within thirty days, "if it be not so, let him make 'bot' with thirty shillings, but if it die without baptism, let him make 'bot' for it with all that he has;" (c. 3) a lord to pay thirty shillings who compels his 'theouman' to work on Sunday, a freeman working without his lord's command to pay sixty shillings; and (c. 13) any one committing perjury before a bishop to pay one hundred and twenty shillings. In the laws of Wihtred of Kent, A.D. 696, it is decreed (c. 9) that if an 'esne' do work contrary to his lord's command from sunset on Saturday to sunset on Sunday, he must make a 'bot' of eighty shillings. The Penitential of Egbert (vii. 4) directs an offender for certain crimes either to do penance or pay a fine to the church, or divide money among the poor; and elsewhere (xiii. 11) allows a fine to take the place of fasting; but this latter instance is rather of the nature of a Redemption than a direct penance. (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Eccl. Documents*, vol. iii. pp. 42, 214, 233.)

[G. M.]

FINTANUS, presbyter, and confessor in Ireland; commemorated Feb. 17 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

[W. F. G.]

FIR-TREE OR PINE. See Aringhi, vol. ii. p. 632–3. "Praeter cupressum, et pinus quoque et myrtus pro mortis symbolo, etc. Et pinus quidem, quia semel excisa nunquam reviviscit et repullulascit." These are rather general or human reasons for choice of the pine as an emblem of death, than as conveying any specially Christian thought. See Herodotus vi. 37, on the threat of Croesus to the people of Lampascus. But the fir, or some tree much resembling it, accompanies the figure of the Good Shepherd, Aringhi, ii. 293, from the cemetery of St. Priscilla. Also at pp. 75 and 25; and it is certainly intended to be represented among the trees which surround the same form in vol. i. 577. The latter painting is from the Callixtine, and is

certainly an adaptation from the common fresco-subjects of Orpheus. The shepherd bears the syrinx or reeds, but sits in a half-reclining position, as Orpheus with the lyre; and various trees are surrounding him. This association of the fir or pine with the Good Shepherd, and of both with Orpheus, would account for the introduction of different species of "trees of the wood," the fir being also characteristic of the mountains or wilderness in which the lost sheep is found. Herzog thinks it was placed on Christian graves (as well as others), as an evergreen tree, and therefore a symbol of immortality; which is by no means unlikely. [R. St. J. T.]

**FIRE, KINDLING OF.** In the first *Ordo Romanus* (c. 32, p. 21; cf. p. 31), among the ceremonies of Maundy Thursday, the following is mentioned. At the ninth hour fire is produced by a flint and steel sufficient to light a candle, which ought to be placed on a reed; a lamp lighted from this is kept unextinguished in the church until Easter eve, to light the Paschal taper, which is to be blessed on that day. The directions of pope Zacharias (*Epist.* 12, *ad Bonif.*) are different. He says, that the tradition of the Romish church was, that on Maundy Thursday, three lamps of more than usual capacity were set alight in some hidden spot in the church, with oil sufficient to last till Easter eve, and that from these on the latter day the baptismal tapers were to be lighted. "But," he continues, "as to the crystals which you mention we have no tradition." The latter words seem to prove incontestably that the custom mentioned in the *Ordo Rom.* I., of striking fire from flint or "crystal," was not introduced at Rome in the time of Zacharias (†752), when it was already practised in some churches—probably in Gaul or Germany—known to Boniface. Pope Leo IV., however (†855), recognises it as an established custom to produce fresh fire on Easter eve, saying (*Hon. De Cura Past.* c. 7), "in sabbato paschae extincto veteri novus ignis benedicatur et per populum dividatur." Amalarinus (*De Ord. Antiq.* c. 44) says that he learned from Theodorus, archdeacon of Rome, that no lamps or tapers were used in the Roman church on Good Friday, but that on that day new fire is kindled, the flame from which is preserved until the nocturnal office. Compare Martene, *Rit. Ant.* IV. xlii. 6.

For the kindling of tapers on Candlemas Day, see **MARY THE VIRGIN, FESTIVALS OF.** [C.]

**FIRE, ORDEAL OF.** [ORDEAL.]

**FIRMAMENT.** The male figure observed beneath the feet of our Lord, in representations



No. 1

## FIRST FRUITS

of the dispute with the doctors (see Bottari, *tav.* xv., Sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, and woodcut No. 1) is said to be intended for Uranus, or the firmament of heaven. It is always holding a veil or cloth above its head, which appears to symbolize the stretching out of the heavens like a curtain, *Pa. civ.* 2; *la. xl.* 22; and more particularly *Pa. xviii.* 9, of "the darkness under God's feet."

In another instance, from a tomb in the Vatican (Bottari, *tav.* xxviii., woodcut No. 2), a



No. 2

feminine bust is shown holding a floating drapery over its head, which seems inflated by the wind. The figure above seems to walk firmly over it. On the significance of this, see Buonarroti, *Vetri*, p. 7; Bottari, *i.* p. 41; Visconti, *M.P.C.* tom. iv. pl. 418. Garrucci (*Hagioglypta*, p. 92, note 1) does not assent to the common belief that this represents the firmament. (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chrét.*, s. v. *Ciel*.) [R. St. J. T.]

**FIRMATUS**, deacon; deposition at Anzerre, Oct. 5 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**FIRMINUS**. (1) Bishop, martyr at Amiens; commemorated Sept. 25 (*Mart.* Usuardi).

(2) Bishop, confessor at Uzeta; commemorated Oct. 11 (*ib.*). [W. F. G.]

**FIRMUS**. [FELICIANUS (1).]


**FIRST FRUITS** (*Primitiae*, of animals or men, *πρωτόγονα*; of raw produce, *πρωτογενήματα*; of prepared produce, *ἀναπαγὰς*. Aug. *Quaest.* in *Num.* xviii.). Compare **FRUIT**, OFFERING OF.

The custom of dedicating first fruits to God obtained early in the church (*Orig. c. Cel.* vii. 33, 34). Irenaeus thinks that Christ enjoined them when he took bread and wine at the last supper (*Haer.* iv. 32), and that they ought to be paid (*Oportet*, *ib.* 34). Origen says their payment is becoming and expedient, and refusal is unworthy and impious, yet he distinctly states that the Levitical law of first fruits is not binding in the letter upon the Christian church. (*Num.* xviii. *Hom.* xi.). But as the idea grew that the clergy had succeeded to the position and to the rights of the Levites, first fruits were considered obligatory, to withhold them was to defraud God; they are more incumbent upon Christians than Jews, for Christ bids his followers to sell all they have, and also to exceed the

righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees; the priest whom they support will bring a blessing on the house by his prayers, the offerer by his spirit of thankfulness. (Jerome in *Ezek.* xlv.; in *Mal.* iii.; *Greg. Naz. Epist.* 80, *Orat.* 15. *Apost. Const.* ii. 25.) Yet, though the payment was so vigorously pressed, we find in *Cassian (Collat.* xxi. 1 seq.) that abbot John regards first fruits as voluntary gifts, while Theonas says he has not even heard the reason for paying them before. The council of Friuli (A.D. 791, can. 14), quotes *Malachi* iii. as conclusive proof of the obligation of first fruits.

Most stress is laid upon paying first fruits of the corn-floor and the wine-press, but the *Apostolic Constitutions* mention others and regulate their distribution. First fruits of the corn-floor and wine-press, of sheep and oxen, of bread and honey, of wine in cask, are to be paid for the support of the priests, but of clothing, money, and other possessions for the orphan and widow (*Const.* vii. 30). The bishop alone has the right to receive and apportion first fruits (ii. 25). At first they were brought with the other oblations at the celebration of the eucharist. This was found inconvenient, and it was ordered

tural or anagrammatic meaning is perhaps the most popular at the present day. In *Matt.* xiii. 47-48; *Luke* v. 4-10; it is used in the parable of the net for the members of the church; and our Lord there assigns it its significance; His parabolic use of it is frequently imitated in early Christian art, where the fishes in the church's net, or caught by the hook of the fisher, correspond exactly to the lambs of the fold, or to the doves, which also represent the faithful on many Christian tombs and vaultings (see a. vv.) But the anagrammatic use of the word *IXΘYC* appears to have been very early. It was derived, as all know, from the initials of the word; *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Ἰσραὴλ*. This appears to be in the mind of St. Clement of Alexandria (*Paedag.* iii. c. 11, p. 106), and to have been so well understood in his time as to have required no explanation, since he recommends the use of the symbol on seals and rings, without giving an explanation of its import. The other devices he commends are the dove, ship, lyra, and anchor. At so early a period as the middle of the 2nd century, and under the continual dangers of persecution, the use of such a symbol for the person of the Lord was perfectly natural, as it



(*Canon. Ap.* 4) that they should not be brought to the altar, but to the bishop and presbyters, who would distribute to the deacons and other clerics. The church of Africa (*Cod. Can. Afr.* 37), made an exception in favour of honey and milk, which were needed as accompaniments of the sacrament of baptism.

The payment of first fruits was accompanied by a special formula (Jerome on *Ezek.* xlv.); lo, I have brought to thee first fruits of the produce of the earth, which thou hast given me, O Lord. The priest replied with the blessing written in *Deut.* xxviii. 3. A special form of thanksgiving is found in *Apost. Const.* viii. 40.

The amount of first fruits was not fixed by the Levitical law, but left to the liberality of the worshipper. Tradition handed down one-sixtieth as the minimum, those who were more religious gave one-fortieth, the rest something between. (Jerome on *Ezek.* xlv.; *Cassian Coll.* xxi. 3). [J. S.]

**FISH.** [See EUCHARIST IN CHRISTIAN ART, p. 625.]

The Fish is a symbol of almost universal occurrence in the painting and sculpture of the primitive church. Like the Dove or the Lamb it is used in more than one sense; and its non-scriptural

would attract no notices from the outer world; and in the same manner, with even more obvious reasons, the form of the cross was frequently disguised up to the time of Constantine. [See CROSS.] But see also Tertullian (*De Baptismo*, c. 1) "Nos pisciculi secundum *ixθyς* nostrum in aqua nascimur." Also Jerome *ad Bononiam*, *Ep.* 43, "B. tanquam *ixθyς* filius aquosus petit." [BAPTISM, p. 171.] But the mystic senses assigned to the emblem by various fathers often seem to the modern mind somewhat gratuitous and ill-founded. They strain their imaginations, apparently, to find reasons in the nature of things for a devoutly ingenious arrangement of initial letters; and seem to assume that there must be real analogy between the Divine Lord and the fish, because the initials of the name and titles of the one made the Greek name of the other. The pleasure derived from the anagram, or the facility it may have given for concealing Christian doctrine from the heathen, seem occasionally to have overcome the thought that the Lord Himself used the fish as an emblem of His people only, not of Himself—of the sheep, not the Shepherd. Aringhi dwells more naturally on the Scriptural meaning, and the various examples he gives (vol. ii. p. 684; ii. p. 690; also that

from the inscription made in Stilicho's consulship A.D. 400, vol. i. p. 19) all speak of the fish in the Scriptural sense as a type of the disciple. The lamp in Aringhi (ii. 620; see woodcut) has the monogram on the handle, and the two fishes on the central part. He also refers to the dolphin as king of fishes, speaking of its reported love for its offspring; with reference to the tomb of Baleria or Valeria Latobia, now in the Vatican. Martigny states that because Christ is man, He therefore is a fish of His own net, and gives prophetic significance, following Aringhi, to the story of Tobias and the fish which delivered Sara from the power of the evil spirit. This he literally accepts, and follows the various attempted connexions of the anagram with the fish of the last repast at the sea of Galilee; and sees in them the sacramental representatives of the body of our Lord, quoting St. Augustine, (*Tract cxxiii. in Joann. xvi.*) and Bede's observation on the same passage, *Piscis assus, Christus est passus*. These analogies are difficult to follow, especially when we consider the Scriptural use of the emblem from the Lord's own mouth.


The fish as the believer, (Ambrose, iv. in *Luc. v.* "pisces qui hanc enavigant vitam") is more frequently represented on the hook of the gospel fisherman, than in the net of the church. [See FISHERMAN.] Bread and fish are the universal viands of the representations of earlier Agapae, as frequently in the Callixtine catacomb. The genuineness of some at least of these paintings is generally allowed, and Dr. Theodore Mommsen mentions in particular an Agape with bread and fish, in the vault named after Domitilla, the grand-daughter of Vespasian, on the Ardeatine way and near the ancient church of SS. Nereus and Achilles. In this painting so impartial and accurate an observer has full confidence, as coeval with the vault; though he thinks the case incomplete for the vault itself being so early as 95 B.C.; and observes that the painting of this subject, as of those of Daniel, Noah, and the Good Shepherd, is less excellent than that of the vine in the vaultings of the original chamber of Domitilla without the catacomb, which is quite like a work of the Augustan age.

The use of this emblem is connected by Martigny with the "disciplina arcani" of the early church. There can be little doubt that reverent mystery was observed as to the eucharist, and that in ages of persecution, till Constantine's time, no public use of the cross was made, as a sign of the person of the Lord. Till then, the fish-anagram was perhaps in special and prevailing use, and it may have yielded its place from that time to the cross, the sign of full confession of Jesus Christ. For the secret discipline after the time of Constantine seems to have consisted mainly in the gradual nature of the instructions given to catechumens, and the fact that for a time the chief doctrines of the faith were not brought before them.

[R. St. J. T.]

The tesserae given to the newly-baptized were frequently in the form of the symbolical fish, as pledges or tokens of the rights conferred in baptism (Allegranza, *Opus. Erud.* p. 107). Of this kind is probably the bronze fish given by Costadoni (*Del Pesce*, iv. 22), inscribed with the word *CoCAIC*. See woodcut.

Boldetti (*Osservazioni*, p. 516) discovered in the catacombs three glass fishes, with a number inscribed upon each; thus, x. xx. xxv. The purpose of the numbers is altogether uncertain.




The custom of decorating baptisteries with fish has a similar origin. In the ruins of an ancient baptistery near the church of St. Prisca at Rome, two beautiful mosaics representing fish were discovered, which are now in the Kircher museum (Lupi, *Dissert.* i. 83). See BAPTISM, p. 171. [C.]

**FISHERMAN.** Our Lord or His disciples are frequently represented as the fishers of men in ancient art, St. Clement of Alexandria uses the simile for both. *Hymn to the Saviour*,



No. 1.

24 sqq.; *Paedagog.* iii. 106. See also Aringhi, ii. 620. Martigny gives an example (see cut No. 1.) from an article by Costadoni, *Del pesce* (vol. 41, p. 247, in the collection of Calogera, Venice, 1738-1787), representing a man clothed in the skin of a fish, bearing a sporta or basket, which may, as Polidori supposes, represent the divine or apostolic fisher, or the fish of the church's net. The net is more rarely represented than the hook and line, but St. Peter is represented



No. 2.

casting the net, in an ancient ivory in Mamachi (*Costumi i. prefaz.* p. 1). The net of St. Peter, with the Lord fishing with the line, is a device of the papal signets. In the Callixtine catacomb (De Rossi, *IXOTC* tab. ii. n. 4) the fisherman is drawing forth a huge fish from the waters which flow from the rock in Horeb (see cut No. 2). See also Bottari, *tav. xlii.*, and a cornelian given by Costadoni, *Pesce* *tav. xxx.*, on a small glass cup given by Garrucci (*Vetri*, vi 10), a figure in tunic and pallium (supposed to represent the Lord) holds in his hand a large fish



as if just drawn from the sea (ent No. 5). At St. Zenone in Verona, the patron saint is thus



No. 1.

work. This symbol, like the Vine, is adopted from Pagan decoration, which of course proves its antiquity. (H. St. J. T.)

### FISHERMAN'S RING. (RING.)

**FISTULA** (called also *caliculus*, *canna*, *canula*, *siphon*, *arundo*, *papa*, *papillaria*). A tube, usually of gold or silver, by suction through which it was formerly customary to receive the wine in communicating. The ancient *Ordo Romanus* thus explains its use: "*Diaconus tenens calicem et fistulam stat ante episcopum, nequid ex sanguine Christi quantum voluerit sumat; et sic calicem et fistulam subdiacono commendat.*" Among other instances, five silver-gilt *fistulas* of *communicandum* are enumerated among the sacramental vessels of the church of Mayence; and at a later date, pope Victor III. left to the monastery of Monte Cassino, "*fistulam auream cum angulo, et fistulas argenteas duas.*" Pope Adrian I. is said by Anastasius to have offered "*calicem majorem fundatum cum siphone prostantem libras xxx.*"; and the ancient Carthusian statutes recite that the Order has no ornaments of gold or silver in its churches, "*præter calicem, et caliculum, quo Sanguis Domini sumitur.*"

The adoption of the *fistula* doubtless arose from caution, lest any drop from the chalice should be spilt, or any other irreverence occur in communicating. This seems intimated by the rule of the Cistercian Order (*Lit. Us. Ord. Cist. cap. 53*), which says that the *fistula* is not necessary in *Missa solennis*, when the ministers alone communicate; but that when more communicate it should be used. Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc. iii. 31*) states that it was the custom of the Ariens to communicate by drinking from the chalice, as if the use of the *fistula* was for that reason preferred by the orthodox.

The *fistula* has fallen into disuse since the practice of communicating in one kind has prevailed. It is, however, still retained in solemn papal celebrations for the communion of the pope. The senior cardinal bishop purifies the tube (*caliculus aureus* Pape) with wine, and, after kissing it, places it in the chalice, which he delivers into the right hand of the pope, who communicates by suction. Cardinal Bona states that the *fistula* was used in his time in the Benedictine monastery of the congregation of St. Maur, in France, where also the assistants communicated in both kinds.

The *fistula* does not appear to have been adopted in the Eastern church, which made use of a spoon for communicating. [See Voigt, *Historia fistulas Eucharisticas*; Kræmer, *Lit. pp. 204-5*; Bona, *Re. Lit.*; Martene, *De ant. rit. Lib. iv.*; Catalani, *Carmin. &c.*] (H. J. H.)

**FLABELLUM** (*fan*, *fanon*, *fanon*). Among the evidences of the Eastern origin of the Christian religion is the use of fans, *flabella*, during the celebration of the Eucharist. Having its birthplace and earliest home in a climate teeming with insect life, where food exposed uncovered is instantly blackened and polluted by swarms of flies, it was natural that the bread and wine of its sacramental feast should be guarded from defilement by the customary precautions. The *flabellum*, or *moscivora*, having been once introduced among the furniture of the altar for necessary uses, in process of time became one of its regular ornaments, and was thus transferred to the more temperate climes of the West, where its original purpose was almost forgotten.

The earliest notice of the *flabellum* as a liturgical ornament is in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (viii. 12), which direct that after the oblation, before and during the prayer of consecration, two deacons are to stand, one on either side of the altar, holding a fan made of this membrane (parchment), or of peacock feathers, or of fine linen, and quietly drive away the flies and other small insects, that they may not strike against the vessels. In the liturgies also of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, the deacons are directed to fan the holy oblations during the prayer of consecration. This fanning, according to Germanus (*Contemp. rer. Eccl. p. 137*), who, though a late authority (A.D. 1227), may be taken as an evidence of earlier usage, ceased with the Lord's Prayer, and was not resumed. Early writers furnish many notices of the use of the *flabellum* as an essential part of the liturgical ceremonial. Cyril of Scythopolis, in his *Life of St. Euthymius*, § 78 (c. A.D. 550), describes Domitian standing at the right side of the holy table, while St. Euthymius was celebrating, with the mystical fan (*μαρτὴ μωσχαῖος ἁγίου*) just before the Trisagion. Moschus also (*Prat. Spirit. § 196*) when narrating how some shepherd boys near Apamea were imitating the celebration of the Eucharist in childish sport,\* is careful to mention that two of the children stood on either side of the celebrant, vibrating their handkerchiefs like fans (*οὐρὸς ποταμίου* [*ascellæ*] *ὑπομνήσας*). The life of Nicetas (ap. Sursum, April 5) describes St. Athanasius assisting at the divine mysteries, "*ministerii flabellum tenens erat enim diaconus.*" Among the ornaments of the church of Alexandria specified in the inventory given, *Chron. Alexand. A.D. 624* (ap. Menard. ad *Surv. Grege. p. 319*) are *ῥίπον ἁγίου*.

As the deacons were the officers appointed to wave the fan over the sacred oblations, the delivery of the *flabellum*, or *fanon*, constituted a part of many of the Oriental forms for the ordination to the diaconate. Thus *Eucholog. p. 253*, after the *ἀποκάλυψις* or stole has been given and placed on the left shoulder, the holy fan (*ἅγιον ἁγίου*), is put into the deacon's hands, and he is placed "*at the side of the holy table to fan;*" and again, p. 251, the deacon is directed to take the *fanon*, and stand at the right side of the table, and wave it over the holy things (*ἁγίων*).

\* We may compare with this the well known story of St. Athanasius seeing the boy-bishop and imitating his comparisons on the shore at Alexandria.

*σπασιν τὸν ἄγιον*) (cf. Marten, *de Ritib. Eccl.* ii. 525). Marten gives similar examples from the ordination of the Maronite deacons (*de Rit.*

ii. 545), chorepiscopi ("diaconi tenentes flabella," *ib.* p. 554), and patriarchs (*ib.* 559); as well as of the Jacobite deacons (*ib.* 579, 580). Renaudot (ii. 80) asserts that though mentioned in the ordination services, the *flabellum* does not appear in the Syrian liturgies. A *flabellum*, formed of a silver disk, was used in the Armenian church, as it still is. Neale (*Eastern Ch.* p. 396) remarks that the use of the *flabellum* was much more frequent among the Armenians than in the Greek church.

The *flabellum* in ordinary use in the Greek church represented a cherub or seraph, with six wings, in allusion to Is. vi. 2. These wings were by preference made of peacocks' feathers, originally on account of their beauty, subsequently with




No. 1. Greek Flabellum. From Martigny.



No. 2. Armenian Deacon, with Flabellum. From Martigny.

mystical reference to the living creatures of the Apocalypse (Rev. iv. 6, 8). Goar (*Euchol.* p. 137) gives the annexed figure of a Greek



No. 3. Flabellum with pendant Bell. From the 'Book of Kells. Westwood's Anglo-Sax. and Irish MSS.

*flabellum* (No. 1), consisting of an angelic head affixed to the end of a handle, the fan formed

by the six wings surrounding the face (*Be. Rev. Liturg.* lib. i. c. 25, § 6). The *flabella* of Armenians and Maronites were formed of di-



No. 4. Figure holding Flabellum and the Holy Kadic. From the 'Gospels of Treves.' (Westwood, Anglo-Sax. and Irish MSS.)

of silver or brass, surrounded with little bell. The figure (No. 2) given by Martigny from Brun (vol. v. p. 58) represents an Armenian



No. 5. Deacon with Flabellum. From Book of Kells.

deacon with his *flabellum*. We give also similar examples from the *Book of Kells* (No. 3) and the *Gospels of Treves* (No. 4), derived from West-



No. 6. Deacon with Flabellum. From MS. in the Vatican Library.

wood's *Anglo-Saxon and Irish MSS.* pl. 53, No. 1 and pl. 20 (see also p. 153).

Although there is no mention of the *flabellum* in the *Ordo Romanus*, or Latin ritual books, there is no doubt that it was used by the Western church at an early time. This is evidenced by a story given by Moschus (*Prat. Spiritual.* § 150) of a deacon who had falsely accused his




No. 7. Deacon with *Flabellum*. From MS. in Public Library, Rouen.

bishop, being removed from the altar when he was holding the fan in the presence of pope Agapetus, A.D. 535, because he hindered the descent of the Holy Spirit on the gifts. An earlier example is furnished by a gilded glass found in the catacombs, representing a deacon fanning the infant Saviour, seated on the knees of His Virgin Mother (Boldetti, *Observations*, p. 202),

ment attached to a handle. Bona, u. c., cites also the ancient Clunias Consuetudinal, and that of St. Benignus of Dijon, together with a Pontifical Ceremonial of the time of Nicholas V. c. 1447. The *flabellum* often appears in inventories of church furniture. In that taken at St. Riquier, near Abbeville, in 831, mention is made of a "*flabellum argenteum ad muscas a sacrificiis abigendas*." Other later examples, including some from our own country, will be found in Mr. Albert Way's paper on the *Flabellum* (*Archæol. Journ.* v. 203), sufficiently establishing its use in the churches of the West, where it could be scarcely regarded as requisite as regarded its original intention. We may cite also a letter of St. Hildebert of Tours, c. 1098 (*Ep.* 2, 71), accompanying the present of a *flabellum* made to a friend, in which the writer expounds its mystical signification; the flies representing the temptations of the devil to be driven away by the Catholic faith.

The *flabellum* appears to have gradually fallen into disuse in the Western church, and to have almost entirely ceased by the 14th century. At the present day, the only relic of the usage is in the magnificent fans of peacocks' feathers, carried by the attendants of the pope in solemn processions on certain great festivals.

Though the original intention of the *flabellum* was one of simple utility, various mystical meanings collected round it. Reference has been already made to the idea that these feather fans typified the cherubim and seraphim surrounding the heavenly throne, *αἱ περὶ τὸν εἶδος τοῦ Θεοῦ Χερουβὶμ* (German. u. s. p. 163), *τὰ περὶ τὸν αὐτὸν οἱ δαίμονες ἐμφαίνονσι τὰ ἑξατέρωγα Σεραφὶμ καὶ τὴν τῶν πολυμορφῶν Χερουβὶμ ἐμφέρειαν* (*ib.* p. 169). Germanus also holds, according to Neale (*Eastern Ch.* p. 306), that the vibration



No. 8. The Wooden *Flabellum*. From *Archæological Journal*.

of which we give a woodcut (No. 5). The annexed engraving (No. 6), showing a deacon vibrating his fan during the celebration of the eucharist, is from a miniature in the Barberini Library (Martigny, *de l'usage du flabellum*). In the next illustration (No. 7) from an illumination in a MS. in the Public Library at Rouen, a bishop is seen bowing his head in the act of elevating the wafer, over which the attendant deacon waves a *flabellum*, apparently made of parch-

ment of the *flabella* typifies the tremor and astonishment of the angels at our Lord's Passion. We find the same idea in a passage from the monk Job, given by Photius (cod. ccxv. lib. v. c. 25), who also states that another purpose of the vibration of the *flabella* was the raising of the mind from the material elements of the eucharist, and fixing them on the spiritual realities.

Two *flabella* are still preserved, that of Theodolinda of the latter part of the fifth century, in

the treasury of the Cathedral of Monza, and that of the Abbey of Tournus, now in the Museum of the Hôtel de Cluny, assigned by Du Sommerard to the ninth. The former (No. 8) is constructed like a modern lady's fan, only circular, formed of purple vellum, illuminated with gold and silver, with an inscription round the upper edge on either side, describing its purpose, which was evidently domestic and not liturgical. The fan is contained in a wooden case, with silver ornaments, probably a reconstruction on the original plan (W. Burges, *Archaeol. Journ.* xiv. pp. 17-19). The Tournus fan was liturgical (No. 9).



No. 9. Flabellum of the Abbey of Tournus. From Du Sommerard, *Les Arts du Moyen Âge*.

It is described by Du Sommerard, *Arts du Moyen Âge* (ii. 195, iii. 251, v. 231), and figured in his *Atlas* (ch. xiv. pl. 4), and *Album* (ix. série, p. 17). It is circular when fully expanded, and is ornamented with the figures of fourteen saints, in two concentric zones on either side. On one side are represented four female saints, the Blessed Virgin with Our Lord in her arms, St. Lucy, St. Agnes, and St. Cecilia, in one zone, and St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Andrew, in the second; on the other side, the two zones contain male figures alone, St. Maurice, St. Denys, St. Philibert, St. Hilary, and St. Martin, with a "Judex," and a "Levite." Latin hexameters and penta-

meters are inscribed on three concentric bands on the fan, describing its use and its oblation in honour of God and St. Philibert. The relics of this saint, who died in 684, were translated to the Abbey of Tournus, where he was held in especial honour. The verses are very curious. We give one of the three series. It will be observed that some words have been misplaced by the painter to the confusion of the metre:—

"Sunt duo quae modicum confort estate flabellum  
Infestas abigit muscas et mitigat aetum,  
Et sine dot tedio gustare manna ciborum. (sic)  
Propter calidum qui vult transire per annum,  
Et intus cupit ab aëre existere muscis (sic)  
Omni eo student estate mundi flabetio (sic)  
Hoc quoque flabellum tranquillae excitat auras  
Estos cum faret (ferret?) ventum facit etque serenae  
Fugat et obnoxae importunaeque volucres."

The handle is of ivory, measuring about 2 feet in length; round the pommel is inscribed the maker's name, "Johel me scae fecit in honore Marine." When shut up it goes into a case ornamented with ivories, representing subjects from Virgil's *Eclogues*.

The making of fans of palm leaves, both for ecclesiastical and domestic purposes, employed the leisure of the Syrian solitaires. St. Fulgentius, bishop of Rusipum, while still an anchorite, is recorded to have made fans for the use of the altar (ap. *Sirius*, ad Jan. 1). The fans sent by Marcella to the Roman ladies, for which she is thanked by St. Jerome (lib. i. *Epist.* 41), were for ordinary not religious use.

(Martigny, *de l'usage du flabellum*; Bingham, viii. 6, § 21, xv. 3, § 6; Bona, *Her. Liturg.* i. 25, § 6; Martene, *ll. cc.*; Augusti, *Chrast. Archæol.* iii. 536 sq.; *Archæol. Journ.* v. 200, xiv. 17.) [E. V.]

**FLAGELLATION** (*Flagellatio*). Flogging was a punishment inflicted on certain orders of the clergy, on monks, nuns, serfs, and slaves; but all orders of the clergy were forbidden (*Apost. Can.* 28) themselves to strike an offender either for correction or in self-defence. Augustine is a witness (*Ep.* 159 ad Marcell.) that this mode of discipline was employed not only by schoolmasters and parents, but by bishops in their courts. In the church of Mount Nitria (Palladius, *Hist. Lausiac.* c. 8, quoted by Bingham) three whips were kept hanging up; one for chastising offending monks, another for robbers, and the third for strangers who misconducted themselves. The council of Agde, A.D. 506 (c. 38), orders monks who will not listen to admonition to be corrected with stripes, and (c. 41) the secular clergy who are guilty of drunkenness to be flogged. The 1st council of Mâcon (c. 8) sentences any of the junior clergy who summon an ecclesiastic before a lay tribunal to receive "forty stripes, save one" (*Conc. Venet.* c. 6; *Conc. Spaenens.* c. 15). The rule of Isidore of Seville (c. 17) directs that minors shall not be excommunicated but be beaten. The higher orders of the clergy are exempted from the degradation of personal chastisement by the 4th council of Braga, A.D. 675 (c. 6). The laws of Ine king of Wessex, A. D. 690 (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Eccl. Documents*, vol. iii. p. 214) grant a pardon from his scourging to any one who takes refuge in a church. [G. M.]



**FLAMEN.** Bishops are supposed by Ducange (s. v.) to be called by the old ethnic title of *flamen* in the second, third, and fourth canons of the council of Elvira. But the "flamines" there mentioned are almost certainly priests of heathen deities, who are warned against relapsing into their former practices after conversion (Bingham, *Antiq.* xvi. iv. 8). [C.]

**FLAMINA.** A name occasionally used for the banners borne in a procession. Thus Wolfhard, in the life of St. Walpurgis (iii. 11, in *Acta SS.* Feb. 25) speaks of crosses and "signifera flamina," being borne in a procession (Ducange, s. v.). [C.]

**FLATTERY.** [CAPTATORES.]

**FLAVIANA,** virgin; deposition at Auxerre, Oct. 5 (*Mart.* Hieron., Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**FLAVIANUS,** martyr; "Passio" Jan. 30 (*Mart.* Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**FLAVIUS,** martyr at Nicomedia with Augustus and Augustinus; "Passio" May 7 (*Mart.* Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**FLENTES.** [PENITENCE.]

**FLORA,** with Maria, virgins; martyrs at Cordova; commemorated Nov. 24 (*Mart.* Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**FLORENTIA,** martyr at Agde with Modestus and Tiberius, in the time of Diocletian; commemorated Nov. 10 (*Mart.* Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**FLORENTINUS.** [HILARY (6).]

**FLORENTIUS.** (1) Martyr at Carthage with Catulinus, the deacon, Januarius, Julia, and Justa; commemorated July 15 (*Mart.* Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) Presbyter, confessor in Poitou; commemorated Sept. 22 (*Mart.* Usuardi).

(3) Martyr with Cassius and many others; commemorated Oct. 10 (*ib.*).

(4) Bishop of Orange; commemorated Oct. 17 (*Mart.* Adonis, Usuardi).

(5) Martyr at Trichateau in France; commemorated Oct. 27 (*ib.*). [W. F. G.]

**FLORIANUS,** martyr in Austria; commemorated May 4 (*Mart.* Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**FLORUS.** (1) Martyr; commemorated with Laurus, Aug. 18 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) [DEMETRIUS (3).] [W. F. G.]

**FLOWERS.** 1. *Use of natural flowers.*—The early Christians rejected the ancient heathen custom of strewing the graves of the dead with flowers and wreaths. This is clear from the testimony of Minucius Felix, who (*Octav.* 12, § 6; cf. 38, § 3), makes the heathen Caecilius reproach the Christians with refusing wreaths even to sepulchres. But they had adopted the practice in the 4th century; thus St. Ambrose (*De obitu Valentini*, c. 56) says, as of a lawful custom, "I will not sprinkle his tomb with flowers, but with the sweet scent of Christ's Spirit; let others sprinkle basketfuls of lilies; our lily is Christ;" and Jerome (*Epist.* 20, ad *Pammachium*) says, "other husbands strew over the tombs of their wives violets, roses, lilies, and purple flowers, and

soothe their grief of heart by these kind offices." So also Prudentius has an allusion to it (*Cathemerin. hymn x., circa exequias Defunctorum*, 177-8).

"Nos tecta forebimus ossa  
Violis et fronde frequenti."

And the same writer again (*Peristeph.* ix. 201, ff.) exhorts the votaries of St. Eulalia on her festival (Dec. 10), to pluck such flowers as the genial winter yielded—the violet and the crocus—to heap their baskets, while he (the poet) would bring his garlands of verse, woven in dactylic strain; "thus should we venerate the relics, and the altar set above the relics."

In course of time the churches, many of which in their origin were but memorials or vast sepulchres of martyrs, came to be adorned with garlands of leaves and flowers. The basilica of Paulinus at Nola, for instance, appears to have been ornamented in this manner. Jerome (*Epist. ad Heliodorum*) notes it as especially praiseworthy in Nepotianus, that he had decorated both basilicas and memorial churches of martyrs (*basilicas ecclesiae et martyrum conciliabula*), with various flowers and foliage and vine-leaves, mentioning distinctly the two classes of churches, those which were built over the remains of martyrs, and those which were not. St. Augustine mentions (*De Civ. Dei*, xxii. 8) a blind woman bringing flowers to the tomb of St. Stephen, when the relics were translated. Venantius Fortunatus, in a poem addressed to St. Rhadegund (*Carmina*, viii. 9), gives a somewhat more detailed description of the floral decoration of a church for Easter. In spring-time (he says) when the Lord overcame hell, vegetation springs more freshly. Then do men decorate the door-posts and desks with flowers; women fill their laps with roses, these too for the temples. The altars are covered with wreaths; the gold of the crocus is blended with the purple of the violet; white is relieved with scarlet. So rich are the flowers that they surpass gems in colour, frankincense in odour. Gregory of Tours (*De Glor. Mart.* c. 50) tells us that the basilica of Severinus was decorated with lilies; and further (*u. s. c.* 91), that at Menda, in Spain, three trees were planted before the altar of St. Eulalia, the flowers of which, being carried to the sick, had often wrought miracles. He also informs us (*De Gloria Confess.* 31) that St. Severus used to gather lilies and other flowers to decorate the walls of his church.

At Whitsuntide a profusion of flowers was (in some places) showered down from some elevated spot to the floor of the church, to symbolize the outpouring of the gifts of the Spirit (*Martene, De Rit. Ant.* IV. xxviii. 17).

2. *Sculptured or painted flowers.*—The word "paradise" (meaning garden) having been used in the church from an early period to designate the future abode of the blessed, the custom would easily and naturally arise of ornamenting with flowers, the cemeteries and crypts containing the venerated remains of martyrs, and even the humble graves of the faithful. Here accordingly we find flowers lavished in every direction, and in every device, in wreaths, in bunches, in crowns, in vases, in baskets. In the cemetery of St. Agnes we trace a beautiful idea from the antique in the decoration of the entrance to the

first chamber—little winged genii carrying on their shoulders small baskets filled with flowers, to be strewed on the graves of the saints who repose within (Bottari, *Sculture e Pitture*, tav. cxxxix.). In the churches of Rome and Ravenna the mosaics of the apse usually represent the delights of paradise; there we find figures of our Lord with the Virgin and other saints upon a groundwork of grass and flowers (Clampini, *Vol. monim.* I. tab. xlv. et passim). The bottoms of ancient glass cups have been found embellished with the same subjects treated in the same manner (GLASS, CHRISTIAN).

A flower rising out of a crown placed between St. Peter and St. Paul in the place where the monogram generally appears has been thought to be a symbol of the Lord. An example may be seen on a gilt vase (Bocarmuotti, *Frammenti di Vetra*, xvi. 1).

(Martens, *De Rit. Ant. lib. III. c. 10, § 15*; Bistartim's *Denkschrift*, iv. 1, 130; Martigny, *Dictionnaire*, s. v. *Flours*). [C.]

#### FOLLATI. [8008.]

**FONT, BAPTISMAL.** In the article BAPTISMAR, full particulars have been given of the building or chamber set apart for the administration of the sacrament of baptism. It remains now to speak of the cistern or vessel for containing the water. This was known under different names; the general Greek appellation being *καταβάτης*, the Latin, *puteus*. Other names were *νεφέλη*, *νεφέλαι*, *νεφέλαι*, *νατοριον* (Ducange, *Constitutiones*, Christ. lib. iii. c. 81, p. 73).

The material in the Western church was, as a rule, stone; frequently porphyry, or other rich marbles. It was permitted by the council of Larida, A.D. 524, that if the presbyter could not procure a stone font, he might provide himself with a "vas conveniens ad baptizandi officium" of any material (Labbe, *Concil. iv.* 1615), which was to be reserved for that sacrament alone (Leo IV. *de Cura Pastoralis*; Labbe, *Concil. viii.* 37). In the Eastern church the font was usually of metal or wood, and seldom or never possessed any beauty. (Neale, *Eastern Church*, i. 214.)

The usual form of the font was octagonal, with a mystical reference to the eighth day, as the day of our Lord's resurrection, and of regeneration by the Spirit (cf. Ambrose, *Epist.* 20, 44). This explanation of the octagonal form is given in the following lines attributed to St. Ambrose, first published by Gruter, *Thes. Inscr.* p. 1166, descriptive of the baptistery of the church of St. Thecla, in which Alypius and his companions were baptized by him, *Master*, A.D. 387.

"Octagonum sanctos baptismi consergit in unum,  
Octagonum Font est numero dignus eo.  
Hec numero decuit: meriti Baptismatis aulam  
Surgere quo populus vera anima rediit.  
Luce reorgentis Christi qui claudere remittit  
Mortis et a tomulis scriptis eximit,  
Conferentemque raso maculoso crimine solvens  
Fontis purissim diluit irrigat."

The piscina is sometimes found of a circular form, and is occasionally, though very rarely (as at Aquileia) hexagonal (cf. BAPTISMAR, woodcut, p. 175). Gregory of Tours (*de Glor. Martyr.* lib. i. c. 23), speaks of a font in the

shape of a cross in Spain. The form of a sepulchre is stated to have been sometimes adopted, in allusion to the Christian's burial with Christ in baptism (Rom. iv. 4).

The piscina usually formed a basin in the centre of the baptistery, rather beneath the level of the pavement, surrounded with a low wall. It was entered by an ascent and descent of steps. According to Isidore Hispal. (*Orig.* xv. 4; *de Dia. Off.* ii. 24) the normal number was seven; three in descent to symbolize the triple renunciation of the world, the flesh, and the devil; three in ascent to symbolize the confession of the Trinity, and a seventh, "septimus . . . qui et quartus" at the summit of the enclosing wall, for the officiating minister to stand on. But the rule concerning the number was not invariable. At Nocera, the number of steps is five, two in ascent, and three in descent. The descent into the piscina of St. John Lateran is by four steps. We find frequent references in the fathers to the catechumens going down into the font for immersion, e.g. Cyril, *Myst.* ii. § 4; "ye were led to the pool of Divine baptism . . . and descended three times into the water, and ascended again;" *Id. Myst.* iii. § 1. "After you had come up from the pool of the sacred streams"; Ambrose, *de Sacr.* lib. i. c. 2. "Venisti ad fontem, ingressus es." The most detailed description of a baptismal font, is that given in the life of St. Sylvester, in the *Bibl. Pap.* of the so-called Anastasius (§ 37). This font is said to have been presented by Constantine the Great to the church of the Lateran, in which he is falsely recorded to have been baptized himself. The description is at any rate of value as indicating the decoration and arrangements of an early font. The cistern is stated to have been of porphyry, overlaid within and without with silver. In the middle of the font were two pillars of porphyry, carrying a golden disk, in which the Paschal lamp burnt, fed with balsam, and with an asbestos wick. A lamb of pure gold on the brim of the basin, and seven silver stags, in allusion to Ps. xlii. 1, poured out water; on either side of the lamb were silver statues of Christ, and the Baptist. The font erected by St. Innocent at the church of SS. Gervasius and Protasius, c. 410, was also ornamented with a silver stag, pouring out water (Anastasius § 57). Over the fonts, doves of silver or gold were sometimes suspended, in allusion to the circumstances of Christ's baptism. [K. V.]

**FONT, BENEDICTION OF.** In the 4th century, the ceremony of blessing the water to be used in baptism was already regarded as of high antiquity. Basil the Great, says expressly (*De Spiritu S. c. 37*), that the benediction of the baptismal water was one of the rites which the church had received from ecclesiastical tradition, not directly from Scripture; i.e. it was then of immemorial usage. The principal traces of it in the remains of early literature are the following.

The passage sometimes cited from the Ignatian letter to the Ephesians (c. 18), that Christ was baptized to purify the water, is very far from proving that any special benediction of the water took place at the time of baptism. Nor is it by any means certain that the heretics mentioned by Irenaeus (*Haeres.* i. 31, § 4), who poured oil

and water over the head of those whom they baptized, did so as imitating the consecration of the water by pouring in chrism, as practised by the orthodox. But when Tertullian (*de Baptismo*, c. 4), after speaking of the aboriginal consecration of the element of water at creation by the Spirit of God, goes on to say, "Therefore all waters acquire the blessing of consecration (sacramentum sanctificationis) from their primeval prerogative, God being invoked (invocato Deo)," he probably alludes to a special invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the water which took place before baptism. Some years later, Cyprian (*Epist.* 70, c. 1) says that the water for baptism should first be cleansed and sanctified by the priest. So bishop Sedatus of Thuburum (*Sententia Episc.* n. 18, in Cyprian's *Works*), speaks of baptismal water consecrated by the prayer of the priest (aqua sacerdotis prece in ecclesia consecrata). The Arabic canons of Hippolytus (can. 18, p. 75, quoted by Probst, p. 77), direct the candidates for baptism to stand by the font of pure water made ready by benediction. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.* lib. 3) says that simple water, having uttered over it the invocation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, acquires a power of holiness (*ἀγίασμος*). Ambrose (*De his qui initiuntur*, c. 5) mentions exorcism, benediction, invocation of the Holy Trinity, and prayers. We have here, perhaps, the earliest distinct mention of the exorcism of the baptismal water. An example of the form of exorcism may be seen in BAPTISM, § 30, p. 158.

With regard to the form of benediction, we have already seen that Tertullian speaks of an invocation over the water. Probably the earliest form extant, which cannot be assumed with certainty to be older than the beginning of the 4th century, is that of the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii. 43), in which the priest, after a recitation of the mercies of God analogous to the PREFACE of the eucharistic office, proceeds, "Look down from heaven, and sanctify this water, and grant grace and power that he who is baptized according to the command of Thy Christ, may with Him be crucified and die and be buried and rise again to the adoption which is in Him, by dying unto sin, but living unto righteousness." Compare Dionysius Areop. *Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 2.


Another ceremony, the pouring in of chrism, generally so as to form a cross on the surface of the water, was probably of later introduction, though it is found at least as early as the 6th century [BAPTISM, p. 158]. Gregory of Tours (*De Gloria Mart.* l. 23) after a curious description of the miraculous filling of certain fountains in Spain, proceeds to say that the water was sanctified by exorcism and sprinkled over with chrism; a passage which proves that in the time of Gregory (†594), the pouring in of chrism was regarded as a matter of course. And it may be mentioned in illustration, that according to Floard's description of the baptism of Clovis (*Hist. Remana. Eccl.* l. 13), it was after the benediction of the font that chrism was found wanting, and supplied by the advent of the miraculous AMPULLA; on receiving which, St. Remi sprinkled the font with chrism (chrismate fontem consecravit).

In Mabillon's *Vetus Missale Gallicanum* (c. 25, p. 382), we find exhortation, prayer, exorcism

of the water, preface, benediction of the font, another preface (called *Confessio Pontis*) then the rubric, "Postea facis tres cruces de chrismo." In the Gallican *Sacramentary* printed by Martene (l. i. 18, ordo 3) from a MS. at Bobbio, a somewhat more explicit description is given of the making of the cross on the water with chrism, "Deinde in fonte chrismat decurvente signum † facis." And again (Martene, n. c. ordo 10), the priest "accipiens vas aureum cum chrismate fundit chrisma in fonte in modum crucis, et expandit aquas cum manu sua." It may be observed that in the *Missale Antiochicum* quoted by Binterim (l. i. 86), where the threefold infusion of oil in the form of a cross is described, it is expressly stated to be unconsecrated oil (oleum non benedictum).

The description in Amalarius (*De Eccl. Off.* i. 25) corresponds generally with that of these sacramentaries. Amalarius expressly mentions insufflation as one of the rites in EXORCISM (see that word). After the expulsion of the evil spirit by exorcism, he simply says, "manipular aqua crucis signaculo," not distinctly mentioning the pouring in of chrism in the form of a cross.

In the Gregorian *Sacramentary* (pp. 71-73) is mentioned another rite, that of plunging tapers into the water to be consecrated. Two lighted tapers are carried before the bishop to the font;



after the benediction, the aforesaid two tapers are plunged into the font, and the bishop "insufflates" on the water three times. After this the chrism is poured into the font, and the children are baptized. This dipping of the taper into the font is represented in the accompanying woodcut, from a Pontifical of the 9th century [compare the cut on p. 159], where however only one taper is given. The ceremony mentioned by Amalarius (*De Eccl. Off.* i. 25) of plunging the tapers of the neophytes (BAPTISM, p. 162, § 56) into the font, seems to be distinct from this.

(Martene, *De Ritu. Ant.*; Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*; Probst, *Sacramente u. Sacramentalien*.) [C.]

**FOOTPRINTS ON SEPULCHRAL SLABS, AND GREAT RINGS.** Sepulchral slabs have been found in the catacombs and elsewhere, incised with footprints.\* The two feet as a rule point the same

\* The white marble slab preserved in the church of St. Sebastian outside Rome, said to have been brought from the chapel of "Domine quo vadis," bearing the prints of two feet, plainly believed to be those of our Blessed Lord, when met by St. Peter coming to be crucified a moment later, in the city from which his apostle was fleeing, is probably nothing more than a sepulchral stone of the kind described above, round which the exquisitely beautiful legend, found first in Ambrose, has crystallized. It

way, though sometimes, but rarely, they are turned in opposite directions (Fabretti, *Inscript. Antiq.* p. 472). A slab in the Kircherian Museum, given by Lupi (*Epitaph. Sever. Martyr.* p. 68), bears two pairs of footprints pointed contrary ways, as of a person going and returning (fig. 1). Some of these slabs are certainly Christian, though the fact in other cases is uncertain. A slab given by Boldetti (c. vii. p. 419), inscribed with *IANOTPLA EN* (Januaria in Deo) at one end, bears the sole of a foot, with *IN DEO* incised upon it, at the other. Perret gives a slab erected by a Christian husband to his wife, with a pair of footprints incised on it, not bare, as is customary, but shod in shoes or sandals (*Catacombes*, vol. v. pl. 28, No. 53). Sometimes but more rarely we find a single foot seen in profile (*ib.* pl. 52, No. 37).

The signification of this mark is much controverted. Boldetti (p. 507) and others regard the footprint as the symbol of possession, denoting that the burial-place had been purchased by the individual as his own. This view is based on the false etymology of "possessio," quasi "*pedis positio*," given by Paulus (*Dig.* 41, tit. 2, § 1), and probably needs no refutation.



Fig. 1. Memorial Slab with Footprints, in the Kircherian Museum. From Lupi.

The idea of Pelliccia (*de Christ. Eccl. Polit.* iii. 235) and Cavedoni (*Ragguagli di monum. dell' Art. Crist.* p. 40) that a sense of their loss and a deep regret and affection for the departed was thus indicated, is a mere romantic fancy. More may be said for Lupi's view (u. s. p. 68), that as such emblems were sometimes dedicated as votive offerings by travellers on their return from a journey, they were intended on a Christian slab to indicate a holy thankfulness for the safe completion of the earthly pilgrimage of the departed. Another more prosaic, but by no means improbable, interpretation, especially of a single foot, is that found in Thomassinus (*de Donariz*, c. 7) and Fabretti (*Inscript.* c. vi. p. 487), quoted by Lupi (u. s.), that it was a thank-offering for recovery from gout or other disease affecting the foot.

should be remarked that the basilica of St. Sebastian was erected over one of the chief Christian cemeteries, that from which the name *catacomb* has been transferred to the rest, so that the presence of such a memorial slab is easily accounted for. In the church of St. Radegund at Poitiers a well defined footprint in the stone supposed to indicate the spot where our Saviour appeared to that saint, probably has a similar origin. The Roman remains at Poitiers are numerous. The footprints shown as our Lord's in the church of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives mentioned by Augustine (*de Jovian. Hom.* xiv. 4; Jerome *de locis Hebraicis*; Bede *de nom. loc. in Act. Apost.*) are stated by Stanley (*S. & P.* p. 482) to be "nothing but a simple cavity in the rock with no more resemblance to a human foot than to anything else."

## FORMA

The same emblem is frequently found on seal rings. The sole of the foot bears sometimes the name of the owner, e.g., *FORIVNIVS* (Boldetti, p. 506; Perret, vol. iv. pl. xi. No. 4); *SVSTVS* (Arlingh, ii. 698; Agincourt, *Sculpt.* pl. viii. No. 23), from the catacomb of St. Agnes; sometimes a Christian motto or device, e.g., *SVS IN DEO* (fig. 2) (Perret, u. s., No. 5), and the monogram of Christ (*ib.* No. 6). In an example given by Perret (vol. iv. p. xxiii. No. 21), we see the stamp of such a seal bearing the sole




Fig. 2. Seal-Ring from the Kircherian Museum. From Perret.

of a foot, with *PAVL* incised on it, five times repeated on the mortar in which a gilt glass had been embedded, in the catacomb of St. Sixtus. [E. V.]

**FORGERY** is a particular case of the offence called *Falsum*.

*Falsum* is any perversion or corruption of truth done with malice (*dolo malo*) to the prejudice of another. It may be committed either by word, as in the case of perjury; by act, as in the case of coining base money; or by writing, as in the case of forgery. In the case of the latter, the crime of *falsum* is equally committed whether a man has written a document which is not what it professes to be, or forged a seal or a signature, or erased or destroyed the whole or a portion of a document maliciously to the prejudice of another. *Falsum* was punished under the empire by deportation, or even (in extreme cases) by death (*Codex Theod.* lib. ix. tit. 19, ll. 1 et 2). The special precautions taken by the authorities of the church against the forgery of ecclesiastical documents seem to belong to a later period than that with which we are concerned; but no doubt the *falsarius*, like other offenders against the laws of truth and justice, incurred ecclesiastical censures. (Ferraria, *Bibliotheca Prompta*, a. v. *Falsum*; Bingham's *Antiq.* xvi. xii. 14.) [C.]

**FORMA.** An impression or representation, as (for instances) the stamp on coins, whether effigy or mark.

(1.) It is used for the impression of a seal; and it seems highly probable that *liberas formatas* (COMMENTATORY LETTERS, DIMISSORY LETTERS), derived their name from the fact that seals were appended to them. Sirmond quotes a Vatican gloss which interprets the term "*formata epistola*" by "*sigillata*," and the Greek interpreter of the 23rd canon of the *Codex Eccl. Afric.* [*Carth.* c. 28], renders "*formatam*" by *τετυμμενη*, clearly in the sense of "sealed." The second council of Châlons (c. 41), testifies to the



fact that seals were appended to such documents.

And not only is the word *formata* used absolutely for a sealed official document, but *forma* came to be used in the same sense. Thus Capitolinus describes Antoninus as consulting his friends before he drew up authoritative documents (*formas*); and the word is similarly used by Christian writers (Ducange, s. vv. *Forma*, *Formatae*).

(2.) From the same use of the word *Forma* for an effigy or stamp, it arises that the word *Formata* designates the formed or stamped bread used in the Holy Eucharist. The *Ordo Romanus* in the rite for the consecration of a bishop has the following; "cum autem venerit ad communicandum Dominus Pontifex porrigit ei *formitam* atque sacramentum oblationem integram." Ménard takes this to mean an "epistola formata;" but it seems in the highest degree improbable that the consecrator would present an official document to the newly-ordained bishop at the moment of communicating, and Ducange (s. v. *Formata*) has shown that the word is elsewhere used to designate the eucharistic bread.

(3.) The word *Forma* is also used to designate the seats or stalls used by clerks or monks when saying their offices in choir. The gloss on the rule of St. Benedict (*De Supellect.*) explains *Forma* as "sella arcuata, θρόνος." The desk in front of such a stall, on which its occupant might lean, seems to be sometimes called *formula* (*Supplex Lib. Monach. Fuld. Cur. Magno*, c. 5, in Migne's *Patrol.* cv. p. 419; compare Gregory of Tours, *De Glor. Confess.* c. 92; *Hist. Franc.* viii. 31). [C.]

FORMARIUS, the person in a monastery who was especially appointed to promote the spiritual welfare of the brethren, and to be a model of life to them, "qui in bonis sit forma" (*Regula* S. Ferreoli, c. 17); an elder brother fitted to benefit the souls of the monks, who should studiously devote himself to watching over them (*Reg.* S. Benedicti, c. 58). The corresponding person in a monastery of women was called *Formaria* (*Reg.* S. Caesarii ad Virgines, c. 37; Ducange, s. v.). [C.]

#### FORMATA. [FORMA.]

FORNICATION (*Fornicatio*, πορνεία) is defined to be "copula carnalis soluti cum soluta"; a sin committed by two persons, male and female, who are not connected by blood within the prohibited degrees of kindred, and are neither married nor contracted. This is in substance, Augustine's definition (*Quaest. in Deuteron.* n. 37). The older definitions of fornication seem to refer almost entirely to the freedom of the woman from the marriage bond, without regard to the condition of the man [ADULTERY]. Thus Basil (*ad Amphilo-* ch. c. 21) regards the sin of a married man with an unmarried woman as simple πορνεία, not μοιχεία; and Gregory of Nyssa (*Epist. Canonica*) defines fornication to be a gratification of lust which takes place without wronging another; which words Balsamon (in loco) explains to mean, intercourse with a woman who is not married (Πορνεία λέγεται ἡ χωρίς ἀδικίας ἑτέρου μὲν, ἡγουν ἡ πρὸς ἐλευθέραν ἀνδρὸς γυναῖκα). To the same effect Theophylact (on St. Matt. v. 32) says that fornication is committed with a woman not

under marriage bond (εἰς ἀπολελυμένην). Ambrose, however, lays down the wider and truer principle, "nec viro licet quod mulieri non licet; eadem a viro quae ab uxore debetur castimonia" (*De Patriarch.* i. 4). Concubinage, the continued cohabitation of an unmarried man with an unmarried woman, is a special case of fornication.

The word *fornicatio* is also used to designate all kinds of sexual sin and unnatural crime; see, for instance, Theodore's *Penitential*, I. ii. Fornication in this wider sense is commonly called luxury by later canonists.

It was one of the first cares of the apostolic church to repress this evil held so venial among the Gentiles (Acts xv. 20; 1 Cor. vi. 18; Eph. v. 3, 5); nor were the rulers of the church in later times less anxious to put down all forms of uncleanness. Basil (*ad Amph.* c. 22) lays down the rule, that men practising concubinage after seduction should be excluded from communion for four years, in the first of which they are to be excluded from the prayers, and weep at the door of the church; in the second to be received as hearers; in the third to penitence (εἰς μετάνοιαν); in the fourth to attend divine service with the congregation, abstaining from the offering; and then to be admitted to communion of the good (κοινωνίαν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ). In the case of concubinage, the great bishop evidently feels that the times will not bear due severity. He holds (*ad Amph.* c. 26) that it is best that persons living together in fornication should be separated; but if they persist in living together, "let them be warned of the penalty of fornication; but let them not be meddled with (ἀφιέσθωσαν), lest a worse thing come upon them." So previously (c. 21) he acknowledges the difficulty of treating certain cases, and confesses that custom is too strong to be contended against. For fornicators in general he enjoins (*Ib.* c. 59) seven years' exclusion from the sacraments; two among the *Fientes*, two among the *Aulientes*, two among the *Substrati*, and one among the *Consistentes* [PENITENCE].

The treatment of sins of uncleanness occupies a large, perhaps an undue space in later Penitentials; as (e.g.) in those of Theodore (I. ii.), Bede, (c. 3), Egbert (cc. 2 and 4), Halitgar (i. 16, 17), and others.

Periods of penance are prescribed, varying according to the condition of the offender, and the nature of the offence. The offence of a cleric was naturally more heinous than that of a simple lay person, and might be punished by degradation, as well as by the same kind of penalties as those inflicted on the laity. And it is evident from the repeated denunciations of such sins by bishops and councils, and the elaborate provision made to separate the clergy and the monks from the society of women, that the celibate clergy were only too liable to fall into the sin of incontinence (Thomassin, *Vetus et Nova Eccl. Discip.* I. ii. 61, §§ 8-12). [C.]

#### FORTUNATIANUS. [FELIX (23).]

FORTUNATUS. (1) Martyr at Smyrna with Revocatus and Vitalis; commemorated Jan. 9 (*Mart.* Hieron., Usuardi).

(2) [FELICIANUS (1).]

(3) [FELIX (7).]

- (4) [FELIX (12).]  
 (5) Martyr in Africa; commemorated with Crescencianus and Lucianus, June 13 (*Mart. Bedae*).  
 (6) [HEMMAGORAS].  
 (7) Bishop at Todi; "Natalis" Oct. 14 (*Mart. Usuardi*).  
 (8) Saint, of Rome; commemorated Oct. 15 (*ib.*). [W. F. G.]

FORTUNUS. [FELIX (6).]

FORUM. [JURISDICTION.]

FOSSARI or FOSSORES. The grave-diggers or sextons of early Christian antiquity were known by these designations. [COPIATAR; DUCANUS.]

Padre Marchi has drawn a very definite picture of guilds of *fossores*, organised under special regulations, attached to each of the *tithi* of Rome, and acting under the directions of the bishops and presbyters. (*Monum. Primæ*, pp. 87-91.) But the evidence he adduces is of the slightest texture; and the good father probably did not intend his description to be regarded as more than a pleasing hypothesis.

The term *fossor* is of frequent occurrence in the inscriptions of the catacombs. Marchi, p. 91, gives several epitaphs of *fossores*. Boldetti, i. 15, gives the following from St. Callistus: "Sergius et Junius Fossores || B. N. M. in pace bisom." But the most common appearance of the term is in the later epitaphs, which testify to the purchase of graves from individuals of this class. The burial of the departed was probably at first a work of Christian charity, performed without fee or reward by their surviving brethren. Afterwards, when the church had become more numerous, it was carried out at the public expense under the special care of the presbyters of the *tithi* of Rome. When Christianity became the established religion, the *fossores* evidently established a kind of property in the catacombs, which authorized them to sell graves either to living persons for their own burial, or to the friends of the deceased. This state of things seems to have had a wide-spread but transient existence. The examples are almost innumerable in which the purchase of graves of the *fossores* is plainly stated in the epitaph. No trace of such bargain appears before the latter years of the 4th century, nor later than the first quarter of the 5th century. According to De Rossi (*R. S.* i. p. 218), the last known mention of *fossores* is A.D. 426. As examples of these bargains, belonging to the time when interment had become the private enterprise of the *fossores*, and Christian burial had been degraded into a trade, we may refer to the instances already given under CATACOMBS. The eager craving after sepulture in the proximity of the holy dead, to which some of these epitaphs bear witness, has been the cause of the destruction of many paintings of high interest. The *fossores* could not afford to have a taste either archaeological or artistic, and pierced the painted walls to make new highly-priced *loculi*, as recklessly as the exquisite carved work of so many of our cathedrals has been cut away for the erection of tasteless monuments.


The *fossor* at his work appears frequently in

FOUNDLINGS

the frescoes of the catacombs. (Basis, pp. 306, 335, 339, 373; Ariaghi, li. pp. 23, 62, 87, 101.)

Bottari, tom. ii. tav. 118, gives two pictures from the catacomb of Marcellinus and Peter. One represents a young man, his beard closely shaven, in a short tunic, girt round his waist, his legs and feet bare, excavating the rock with his pick, a lamp hanging by his side. The other depicts an older man in a long tunic, not at work, holding a lamp affixed to a long handle ending in a sharp point, and a little below on the shaft a hook for suspension.

The most curious and interesting of these representations is that of a *fossor* named Diogenes, from the cemetery of Callistus (see woodcut).



He wears a tunic marked with *gemma* on its hem, carries a pick over his right shoulder, and a lamp in his left hand, and is surrounded by a heap of levers, picks, and other tools employed in his work. Above is the inscription: "Diogenes Fossor in pace depositus Octavo Kalendas Octobris." (Boldetti, lib. i. cap. 15; Bottari, tom. ii. p. 126, tav. 99.) A *fossor's* pick has been discovered by De Rossi in the cemetery of Callistus, much oxidised, but still recognisable. (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Christ.* p. 281.) [E. V.]

FOUNDATION. [ENDOWMENT; PROPERTY OF THE CHURCH.]

FOUNDER. [PATRON.]

FOUNDLINGS (*Alumni*). Compare EXPOSURE OF INFANTS.

From an early period the church provided ORPHANAGES [see the word] for the reception of children left destitute by the death or desertion of their parents. But, independently of such institutions, it also maintained a large number by appeals to individual charity, and exhorted the faithful to feed and shelter the innocent creatures in their own houses. The number of these *alumni*, "nurslings," was large; the rescue of a deserted infant being considered as an act specially inspired by Christian charity. The word *alumnus* consequently occurs much oftener in Christian than in pagan inscriptions. Sometimes we find the adopting parents raising a tomb to their *alumnus* (Perret, *Catacombes*, v. xlii. 15). In the cemetery of Pontianus the name of a young person departed is inscribed upon a circular ivory tablet thus: *EMERENTIS | VICTORINAE || ALYMERAE SVAR* (Fabretti, *in-*

script. *Antiq.* iii. 331). In other instances the *fontaine* is a token of the child's gratitude to his benefactor, whom he calls father and mother (Perrut, *ibid.* 4). FELICIANUS ALVENS in the following inscription expresses the happiness of the adopted son under the care of his tutelary parents.

ANTONIVS DISCOLIVS FILIVS ET HERIVS  
FELICIANVS ALVENS VALERIE CRISTENT  
MATRI DIXIT ANNO RVN XIII INTERLANTOR.

De Rossi (*Inscript. Christ.* I. 46) gives the epitaph of an alumnus of the date A.D. 340. Le Blant (*Inscr. Christ. de la Gaule*), mentions an inscription at Trèves to the memory of an alumnus who survived only one month and a few days. Infants were generally exposed at the doors of churches (*Ons. Aries II.* ann. 51, A.D. 451).

A person wishing to adopt an exposed child was required to place in the hands of the minister of the church near which it was found a written statement giving the sex of the child with the time and place of its discovery, in order that it might be restored to its parents if they wished to reclaim it. If no such claim were put forward within ten days after its exposure, the child belonged by right to those who had given it shelter (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Christ.*, s. v. *Enfants Trouvés*). [C.]

**FOUNTAIN OR WELL.** [See ROCK, and EVANGELISTS, REPRESENTATIONS OF.] Our Lord is represented (in Bottari, *tav. xvi.*; Buonarroti, *Vetri*, *tav. vi. et passim*) as the Source of the Gospel and Fons Pietatis, from under whose feet flow the four Rivers of Paradise. [See FOUR RIVERS.] In the Lateran (CROON, p. 490) and other baptismal crosses the Holy Dove is the fount or source from which the sacred rivers flow. The well springing in the wilderness is rather a Hebrew, Arab, or universally Eastern usage, than a specially Christian one. In some early baptisms of our Lord, as that in the ancient baptistery of Ravenna, the river-god or presiding deity of the sources of Jordan is introduced. For the fountain or stream flowing from the Rock of Moses, and fishes therein. [See FISHERMAN.] [R. St. J. T.]

**FOUNTAINS AT THE ENTRANCE OF CHURCHES.** The natural symbolism which required external purity in the worshippers, as an index of the cleanness of heart necessary for approaching God with acceptance, dictated the erection of fountains or cisterns of water in the *atria*, or forecourts of the primitive churches, for the people to wash their hands, feet, and faces, before they entered the sacred building. Such a fountain was known by different designations, *αφύρ* (Euseb. *H.E.* x. 4; Chrys. *Hom.* 57, Ed. Basil.), *φύρα* (Soz. *H.E.* ii. 38), *φύλα* (Paul. Silentiar. i. vers. 177), *ἀνθήρα* (Theophanes), *αὐτοψήσιον* (Eutholog.), *Cantharus* (Paul. Nolan. *Ep.* xiii. xxxi.), *Aymphosium* (Anast. § 69). The earliest notice we have of this arrangement is in Eusebius' description of the church erected by Paulinus at Tyre (Euseb. *H.E.* x. 4). He speaks of "fountains" being placed as "symbols of purification" in the centre of the cloistered atrium, affording means of cleansing to those who were going into the church. A similar basin was erected by Paulinus of Nola, in the

atrium of the basilica of St. Felix, its purpose being expressed by the following *versus* over one of the arches of the opposite cloister—

"Sancis aliis foveis interitit atri lymphis  
Cantharus, intrantibus manus lavat ante minibus."  
Paul. Nolan. *Ep.* 38 ad Sever.

This "cantharus" was protected by a brason canopy, or tarret of lattice work—

"Quam emicillata tegit atri columba turris."  
Paulin. *Poem.* 36 (*Nol.* x.)

Other brason basins supplied from the same source stood in different parts of the forecourt, as well as a row of marble basins, *conchae*, at the entrance of the church (ib.).

Paulinus also describes a "cantharus" in the atrium of the basilica of St. Peter at Rome (*Ep.* 13, p. 73), "ministra manibus et oris nostris fuenta ructantem." This was covered by a dome or *tholus*, of brass, supported on four columns, typifying the fountain of living water flowing from the four gospels, the foundation of the evangelical faith. This *cantharus* and its *quadrifortius* were adorned with marbles and mosaic by Symmachus, c. 500, who also erected another external fountain below the steps of the atrium for the convenience of the people thronging thither "ad usum necessitatis humane" (Anast. *de Vit. Pont.* § 79). Another was placed by Leo III. c. 800, outside the silver gates of the same basilica (ib. § 360). The popes vied with one another in the magnificence of these fountains. Leo the Great, c. 450, placed a very remarkable one in the atrium of the basilica of St. Paul, on the Ostian way, for the supply of which he recovered a long-lost spring, as recorded in the verses of Ennodius.

"Perdidit huius longeva turris cisternam  
Quam illi nunc place cantharus ore venit.  
Provida postoritur per totum cura Leonis  
Hanc effusus Christi largi fonsa cecit."  
Ennod. *Carm.* 146, ed. Struend.

Anastatius also describes a "symphosium" erected by Hilarus, c. 465, in the *triporticus* of the oratory of St. Cross, adorned with columns of vast size, and pillars of porphyry from apertures in which the water flowed into a porphyry basin (Anast. *u. s.* § 89). Ennodius also (*u. s.*) speaks of the water of the baptistery of St. Stephen coming through the columns, "per columnas." In other cases the water issued from a statue in the centre, sometimes of grotesque form, or from lions' mouths, from which arrangement the basin erected by Justinian in front of St. Sophia at Constantinople was called *αὐτοψήσιον* (Ducange, *Constantinop.* *Christ.* lib. iii. c. 22). This fountain was made of jasper, with incised crosses. There were other smaller basins in the cloisters for the instructions of the people (Ducange, *u. s.*). A *cantharus* discovered at Constantinople bore the palindromic given by Gruter (*Inscript.* p. 1046).

#### NIVON ANOMHMA MH MONAN OVIN.

These fountains were usually supplied with water from running springs, as that at St. Paul's already mentioned. Where springs were absent, the supply came from rain water tanks, as at the basilica of St. Felix at Nola (Paul. Nolan. *Poem.* 27 (*Nol.* ix.) v. 463, sq.).

Such fountains were solemnly consecrated and

blemed on the annual recurrence of the vigil of the Epiphany (identified in primitive times with



From a Mosaic, St. Vitale, Ravenna.

the day of our Lord's baptism, when the element of water was hallowed, Chrys. *Homil. in Bapt. Christ.* vol. ii. p. 369, Montf.), or of the festival itself (Ducange, u. s.). The office is given in the Eucharistion.

We find frequent reference in the early fathers to this custom of washing the hands and face before entering the church, e. g. Tertull. *de Orat.* c. 11; Chrysost. *Homil.* 51, in Matt.; in Joann. 72; *Homil.* 3, in Ephes.; in *Psalm.* 140, ad Pop. Ant. 36, &c. Cf. also Baronius, ad ann. 57, No. 106-110. [HOLY WATER.]

The accompanying woodcut from one of the mosaics of St. Vitale at Ravenna, representing the dedication of that church by Justinian and Theodora, gives a contemporary picture of one of these fountains.

[E. V.]

**FOUR RIVERS, THE.** In ancient art our Lord is frequently represented, either in person or under the figure of a lamb, standing upon a hillock from whence issue four streams of water. (See woodcut.) These are supposed by many to signify the four rivers of Eden, which went forth to water the earth (Gen. ii. 10); others (Cyprian, *Ep.* 73, § 10, ad Jubaian.; Bede, *Expos. in Gen. II.*; Theodoret, in *Psalm.* XLV.; Ambrose, *De Paradiso*, c. 3) discern in them the four gospels, flowing from the source of eternal life to spread throughout the world the riches and the life-giving powers



The Four Rivers under the Lord's feet. From Martigny.

of the doctrine of Christ. St. Ambrose again (u. s.) is of opinion that the four rivers are emblems of the four cardinal virtues. The four first oecumenical councils, so often by early writers placed on a par with the gospels themselves, are sometimes compared to the four rivers of Paradise. Jense, bishop of Amiens in the eighth century, in writing to his clergy, thus illustrates the veneration due to these

\* This figure is also given at p. 408.

angust assemblies (Longueval, *Hist. de l'Egl. Gallicane*, tom. v. p. 144).

In several sarcophagi of ancient Gaul, we find two stags quenching their thirst at these streams: these are supposed to represent Christians partaking in the gospels and the eucharist of the "well of water springing up into everlasting life." [Cross, p. 498.] The two stags are occasionally found in mosaics, in that of the ancient Vatican for example (Clampini, *De Sacr. Antiq.* tab. xlii.).

However we explain it, this subject was extremely popular in the primitive church; we find it repeated over and over again in the catacombs, either in frescoes or in the sculptured ornaments of sarcophagi, and sometimes on the bottoms of glass cups, which have been discovered therein. It appears also in the mosaics of some basilicas, for instance, in that which is described by Paulinus (*Epist.* 32, ad Sever.), and in that mentioned by Florus, deacon of Lyons (Mabillon, *Anal.* p. 416, ed. Paris. See also Clampini, *Vet. Mon.* li. tab. xxxvii. xlii. xlix. lli., &c.). To illustrate this passage of Paulinus,

"Petram superstat ipse Petra Ecclesiam  
De qua sorori quatuor fontes manant."

Rosweil refers to the mosaic of St. John Lateran, and the sarcophagus of Probus and Proba, as represented by Bosio. We are informed by Spa (Recherches curieuses, p. 34) that the four rivers of Paradise in human form, with their names beneath, are represented in mosaic on the pavement of Rheims Cathedral (Martigny, *Dict. de Antiq. Chret.*). [C.]

**FRACTION.** The rite of breaking the bread in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist is technically so called. There are three kinds of fractions, which are in use at the present time; though but one of them is essential to the sacrament, and can be traced with certainty to the infancy of the church. The three are, (1) a fraction illustrative of the words of institution, and therefore a direct imitation of our Lord's action, (2) purely symbolical fractions after the consecration has been completed, (3) the necessary fraction for the distribution of the bread among the communicants.

(1) The first of these has a place in the English office, the celebrant being ordered to "break the bread" while he utters the words, "He brake it." Nothing could be more natural than that in reciting the words of institution, the priest should "suit the action to the word," and break the bread as "He brake it." It is very probable, therefore, that this was a common, if not the universal, practice, in what we may call the first ritual period. Traces of it are found both in the East and West. In the Coptic liturgy of St. Basil, the celebrant is ordered at those words to "break the oblation into three parts;" but he is at once to reunite them, "so that they be in a manner as not divided." (Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient.* i. p. 15.) They are put together again with a view to a later and purely symbolical fraction. There is but one extant Latin missal, which is reported to contain an order for the actual fraction at this time, viz., that of Rheims, of the middle of the 16th century, in which the following rubric occurs, "Dicens frangit frangit modicum." (De Vert, *Explication des Cérémonies de l'Eglise*, tom. i. p. 262.) In our own country the ministrants of



Sarum and York to the last ordered the celebrant to "touch the host," while a manuscript Manual in the possession of the Rev. W. J. Blew goes further, and prescribes "the sign of a fraction." The frequency of the latter custom in England may be likewise inferred from its condemnation by John de Burgo, A.D. 1385 (*Pupilla Oculi*, pars iv. cap. x.), and its prohibition in the Manual authorised by Cardinal Pole in the reign of Mary. The foregoing facts are mentioned because they appear to support the antecedent probability that the fraction, which is now peculiar to the English and Coptic liturgies, was once general. The reason for giving it up need not be sought for. When the bread was once broken, it would not be possible for the priest to perform the subsequent symbolical fraction, introduced at a later period, with the same convenience and effect.

(2) From an early period we find other ceremonial fractions, more or less elaborate, employed, the evident intention of which was to develop and enforce the devotional allusion to our Lord's sufferings on the cross. No fraction of any kind is mentioned in St. Cyril's account of the liturgy of Jerusalem (*Catechesis Mystag.* v. cc. 17, 18), nor in the Clementine liturgy, which exhibits the ritual and worship of the 3rd or 4th century. [APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.] In that of St. Mark, which from its long disuse has undergone less change than any other which was ever in actual use, the fraction for distribution is alone mentioned (Renaudot, tom. i. p. 162). In St. James, which is still used at stated times, and has been much altered in the course of ages, the celebrant "breaks the bread, and holds half in his right hand, half in his left, and dips that in the right in the cup, saying, 'the union of the all-holy body and the precious blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ.'" (Assemani, tom. v. p. 54.) In the Office of Prothesis in the common Greek liturgy, there is a preparation of the bread by the aid of a knife (ἀόγχιη), accompanied by symbolical allusions. [PROTHESIS.] After the *Sancta Sanctis*, which follows close upon the Consecration, "The priest dividing it ('the holy loaf') into four parts with care and reverence says 'The Lamb of God, the Son of the Father, is dismembered and divided, &c.' Then he takes the uppermost part of the holy loaf (which is stamped with the letters ΙC, for Ἰησοῦς), and holds it in his hand, and the deacon pointing with his orarion to the holy cup, says, Fill, Master, the holy cup. And the priest says, The fulness of faith of the Holy Ghost. And he makes the sign of the cross and casts it into the holy cup" (*Euchologium*, Goar, pp. 60, 81, 175). These rites, though not perhaps in their present form precisely, must have been in use before the separation of the Nestorians and Eutychians from the church; but whether they were known to St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, the alleged remodellers of the Greek liturgy, it is impossible to say. On the first part of the foregoing ceremony, Symeon of Thessalonica, the mystical expositor of that rite, observes, "He divides the bread into four parts, and these he arranges in the form of a cross, and in this he beholds Jesus crucified." *De Templo &c.* printed in Goar, p. 228. In the Coptic liturgies the rite is still more elaborate. There is first a

special prayer, *Prooemium ante fractionem*, preceding it; which is in fact an act of thanksgiving, and is called a Benediction in the office itself. After crossing both the bread and the cup with a finger dipped in the latter, he says a "Prayer of Fraction." Later on, in preparation for the communion, "he divides the body into three parts, as he had done before at the words *He broke it*;" but this time transversely to the former fractures. The piece from the middle of the Corban is the largest, and from this he takes a small piece (*Isbodicon*, or in the Greek Alexandrian liturgies *Ἰσβουδικόν*, corruptions of *Δεσποτικόν*, the Lord's body), which he sets aside. The larger piece from which it is taken is put in the middle of the paten, and the other eight are placed about it so as to form a cross. The allusion to the Passion is thus expressed by an act rather than by words. The priest next breaks up, in prescribed order, all but the large piece in the middle, and "collects about that the holy body which he has broken." The *Isbodicon* is put into the cup; a rite corresponding to the *Commixtio* of the West. The fraction now described, into which a devout priest could evidently infuse great solemnity is common to the three Coptic liturgies; which fact implies that the former fraction at the words *He broke it* is so also; although it is only prescribed in that of St. Basil. (See Renaud. tom. i. pp. 19-23; and Gabriel's *Ritualis*, *ibid.* p. 258.) Whether the same ceremonies were observed in the Greek liturgies of Egypt cannot be decided, owing to the brevity of the rubrics and the absence of commentaries; but the Coptic of St. Basil carries us up to a period earlier than the conquest of Amrou in the 7th century. The rubrics of the Ethiopic liturgy do not prescribe any fraction, but as it was derived from the Coptic, and retains the Coptic *Oratio Fractionis*, we may infer that it had a solemn fraction similar to that which we have described.

In the Syrian rite the priest (in a short office of Prothesis) "divides the bread into as many pieces as may be necessary, censes them, and sets them on the altar, saying, He was led like a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep, etc." (Renaudot, tom. i. p. 3.) After the consecration he breaks a small piece off with the words, "Thou art Christ our God, who on the top of Golgotha in Jerusalem wast pierced in Thy side for us, etc.," or something conveying the same allusion. (*Ibid.* pp. 22, 40, etc.) Before the communion he dips this particle (pearl) "into the chalice and signs the rest with it crosswise, saying, The Blood of the Lord is sprinkled on His Body, in the Name of the Father," etc. The pearl thus used is then put into the chalice with a prayer alluding to the union of the Godhead and Manhood in Christ (Renaudot, tom. ii. pp. 3, 41). Another symbolical action, viz. that of touching the body in the paten with the moistened pearl, is not marked in the rubric. It is done in allusion to the piercing of our Lord's side with a spear (Barsalibi, *ibid.* p. 111). Among the Nestorians the consecrated oblate is broken into two parts. One of these is laid on the paten, and with the other the priest crosses the cup. He then dips the latter to the middle in the cup, and "signs with it the body which is in the paten." Both signs are made with appropriate words. He then unites the two

pieces of the oblate; and it is here that we find the passion symbolized, the wounded and bleeding body of our blessed Lord being evidently represented by the broken and wine-stained bread. He further with his right thumb crosses the oblate "so as to make a slight crack in it, where it has been dipped in the blood, and puts a part of it into the chalice in the form of a cross." (Renaud. tom. ii. p. 594.) The Armenian celebrant breaks the oblate into two parts over the chalice, saying, "The fulness of the Holy Ghost. Then dividing one part into three he casts them into the chalice of the blood in the form of a cross" (Le Brun, *Explication de la Messe*, Diss. x. Art. xx.).

There are no directions for any fraction in the early Roman sacramentaries, nor for the commixture which now follows the symbolical fraction; but in the first *Ordo Romanus*, a directory of worship of the 8th century, if not earlier, we find the following method prescribed. The bishop (for a pontifical celebration is described) "breaks an oblate on the right side, and leaves on the altar the piece (particulam) which he breaks off." It is explained that this is done "in order that the altar be not without sacrifice," while the mass is performed, a piece (fermentum) reserved from a former celebration, and placed on the altar before the service began, having just before been put into the chalice. This is the only fraction before that for distribution, and there is nothing to give it a symbolical character (*Ordo Rom.* i. § 19, p. 13). There appears to have been no symbolical or merely ritual fraction in the primitive liturgy of Milan, although for "many ages" an oblate has been broken before the Lord's Prayer, with the words, "Thy Body is broken, O Christ," etc. (Muratori, *Liturgia Rom. Vet.* Diss. c. x. tom. i. col. 134). An anthem, called *Confractorium*, is sung during this fraction, but with no special reference to the Passion (Pamelii *Liturgicon*, tom. i. p. 304). There is some evidence of a symbolical fraction in the Gallican church before its liturgy was tyrannically suppressed by Adrian I. and Charlemagne. In an exposition of the old Gallican liturgy written by Germanus bishop of Paris, A.D. 555, or one of his disciples, we read, "The confractio and commixture of the body of the Lord was set forth of old by the holy fathers" (Martene *de Ant. Eccl. Rit.* i. c. iv.; Art. xii. Ord. i.). The sacramentaries are without rubrics; but several of the prayers, *post secreta*, which were said immediately after the fraction, refer expressly to the sufferings of the cross. Thus, for example, in the *Missale Gothicum* in the *Post Secreta* for Christmas: "We believe, O Lord, Thy Advent; we commemorate Thy Passion. For Thy Body was broken (confractum) in the remission of our sins; Thy holy Blood was shed for the price of our redemption" (Mabillon, *Liturgia Gallicana*, p. 192). In the semi-Oriental ritual of Gothic Spain and Gallia Narbonensis, the priest broke the oblate in halves and divided one-half into five parts, the other into four. He then formed a cross with seven of them, putting five in a line to make the stem, and one on each side of the second from the top to make the arms. Each piece had a name given it. The uppermost in the stem was called *Corporatio* (i.e. Incarnation). Then followed in order *Nativitas*, *Circumcisio*,

*Apparitio* (Epiphany), *Passio*. The piece which formed the left arm of the cross (taken from the spectator) was called *Mors*; that on the right *Resurrectio*. The two remaining pieces *Gloria* and *Regnum* were placed in the paten below *Resurrectio* in a line with it. See the illustration below. Thus the whole course of our Lord's being, acting, and suffering in the flesh, with the fruits of it, was in a manner represented (*Missale Mixtum dictum Mozarabes*, ed. Leslie, pp. 5, 6, 230-1).

	Corporatio	
Mors	Nativitas	Resurrectio
	Circumcisio	Gloria
	Apparitio	Regnum
	Passio	

In some of the ancient liturgies the fraction now described took place before, and in some, after the Lord's Prayer which followed, or more properly closed, the prayer of consecration. In the Greek, Roman, and Egyptian St. Mark it comes after. In the Gallican (*Liturg. Gall.* p. 192), the Milanese, Mozarabic, Coptic, and apparently in all the Syrian liturgies (Renaudot, tom. ii. pp. 22, 38, 131, 138, etc.) it comes before. To these we may add the Ethiopic, but, in that liturgy, as in our own, the Lord's Prayer is said after the communion (Renaud. tom. i. p. 518).

(3) The earliest notices of, or allusions to, a fraction refer only to the necessary division of the bread for distribution among the communicants. St. Augustine: "That which is on the Lord's Table . . . is blessed and hallowed, and broken small (comminuitur) for distribution" (*Epist. cxlix. ad Paulin.* § 16). Clement of Alexandria: "Some having divided the eucharist according to custom, permit every one of the people to take his own share" (*Stromata*, L. i. c. i. § 5). Pseudo-Dionysius: "Having exposed to view the bread that was covered and undivided, and divided it into many parts, and having divided the oneness of the cup unto all, he symbolically multiplies and distributes unity." Again: "Bringing into sight the covered gifts, and dividing their oneness into many parts . . . he makes those who partake to have communion (with each other) in them" (*De Eccl. Hierarch.* c. iii. § iii. nn. 12, 13). In the liturgy of St. Mark, in immediate preparation for the

communion, "the priest breaks the bread, and says, Praise ye God in [i.e. Psalm cl. as in the Septuagint]. The priest divides the bread, saying to those present [i.e. to the deacons, &c. who assist], The Lord shall bless and minister with you," &c. Then, after a few versicles entirely free from any mystical allusion, he communicates. In St. James the later Greek rite of putting the bread into the chalice has been adopted. "When he distributes a single portion into each chalice, he says, A holy portion of Christ, full of grace and truth, of the Father and the Holy Ghost, to whom be glory, &c. Then he begins to divide [i.e. the bread in the chalices with a spoon], and to say, The Lord is my Shepherd," &c. (Ps. xxiii.). In the common Greek rite, a second part of the prepared loaf which is stamped XC (for *Xριστός*) is divided for the communion of the priest and his assistants, who receive the elements separately. The other two (marked NI and KA; see *ELEMENTS*, p. 603) are also divided according to the number of the other communicants, and put into the chalice. As intinction began to appear in Spain in the 7th century (see *Can. ii. Conc. Braccar. Labb. tom. vi. col. 563*), the method of fraction now described as attendant on it was probably in use among the Greeks so early as the 6th. In the 4th and 5th we find Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria, still recognizing the practice of receiving in the hand (see Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 632, and *COMMUNION, HOLY*, p. 416), which is incompatible with intinction. We have already described the last fraction in the Coptic liturgy. The rubrics do not specify any further preparation for the communion. Nor are those of the Ethiopic, Armenian, or Syriac more explicit. The last named liturgy, however, may receive illustration from the Nestorian, in which "another fraction of the same Host into lesser particles for the distribution of the communion" is expressly ordered, though no method is prescribed (*Renaudot, tom. ii. pp. 595, 611*).

In the West the Mozarabic priest preparing for the communion put the "particle" called *Regnum* into the chalice, received himself that called *Gloria*, and if any others received must, it is presumed, have used the remainder for their communion, breaking them up as the number of communicants might require. We say *presumed*, for the present rubrics, which recognize but one Host, divided as before described, direct him afterwards to consume all the particles in order. The tract of Eldefonsus, printed by Mabillon in an appendix to his dissertation *De Pane Eucharistico (Analecta Vetera, p. 549)*, prescribes the use of several Hosts, the number varying with the festival or season. We have no information respecting the early practice of the Gallican and Italian churches. In an *Ordo Romanus* which probably carries us up to the 7th century, and certainly to the 8th, the last fraction is thus described. The bishop of Rome, it should be said, is the chief officiant. "Then the acolytes go behind the bishops about the altar; the rest go down to the presbyters; that they may break the Hosts [which were then small loaves]. A paten goes before near the throne, two regionary subdeacons carrying it to the deacons, that they may break. But they look on the face of the pontiff that he may give the signal to break.

CHRIST. ANT.

And when he has given it by a motion of the head, having again saluted the pontiff, they break them" (*Ordd. Rom. i. ii. iii. pp. 14, 49, 59*). [W. E. S.]

FRANKFORT, COUNCIL OF (*Franco-fordense concilium*), held at Frankfort, A.D. 794, "by favour of God, authority of the pope, and command of Charlemagne, who was present and attended by all the bishops of the kingdom of France and Italy, with the province of Aquitaine" (300 in number, according to later writers), as we read in the first of the fifty-six canons ascribed to it. From the same canon we learn that the first thing discussed in it was the heresy of the Spanish prelates Felix and Elipand, since called Adoptionism, which was condemned; and from the second canon that a decree of a recent synod of the Greeks, visiting all with anathema who would not worship and serve the images of the saints as they would the Trinity, was repudiated as well as condemned. This is about all we know of what passed at Frankfort; at any rate we have no direct authentic record extant of its proceedings beyond its canons. And of these the second has been made a subject of hot controversy both in ancient and modern times. Contemporaries aver that bishops Theophylact and Stephen (without naming their sees) represented pope Adrian at Frankfort, and that the council repudiated there was that "falsely called the 7th." In the modern heading to this council, on the other hand, it is asserted that "the acts of the 2nd Nicene council respecting images were confirmed there." There are four dogmatic epistles printed in the collections of councils as having emanated from Frankfort. (1) A letter from pope Adrian to the bishops of Spain. (2) Another from the bishops of Italy against Elipand. This is better known as "the sacrosyllabus" of Paulinus of Aquileia, but it is said to have been published at Frankfort, and sent by order of the council into Spain. (3) A third is from the bishops of France and Germany to the bishops of Spain. (4) A fourth from Charlemagne to Elipand and the rest of the Spanish bishops. In this the three preceding are stated to have been sent by him after holding a council, and conferring with the pope on the subject of which they treat, without however naming Frankfort. Still, after reading the 1st canon of Frankfort, we may not doubt their having been brought out there. As little can we doubt another work having been brought out there also, for the light it throws upon canon 2. The title given originally to this work was "the capitulary respecting images;" but it is in four books, now known as the "Caroline." It has been ascribed to Alcuin, Angilbert, and Angilram in turn; it is ascribed to Alcuin still (*Bibl. ker. Germ. tom. vi. 220*). What it says of itself (*Praef.*) is, that it was jointly composed by Charlemagne and his prelates in refutation of two councils "held in the parts of Bithynia" (both calling themselves the seventh); one iconoclastic (that of Constantinople, A.D. 754), the other in favour of images (the 2nd Nicene, A.D. 787), and within three years of this last (or four years before it was brought out). But, in reality, there was no need of refuting the first of them, as this had been already done by the last (*Art. Conv. Nic. ii.*). The last alone.

therefore, now stood for refutation. "De causis destructionis," says Hieronim (in *consuet. Hinc. L. c. 20*), "non modicum volumen, quod in palatio adolescentulus legi, ab eodem imperatore Romanum est per quosdam episcopos missum"—and then follows a reference to c. 28 of the fourth book, which identifies it at once. Further, not only was it sent to Rome, but it elicited a formal reply from the pope, as pope, vindicating in detail the teaching of the 2nd Nicene council which he had confirmed himself (Mansi xiii. 759 and seq.). In this work it is the 2nd Nicene council accordingly which is attacked all through: the creed of Fulgencius the heretic (St. Aug. Op. 2. App. pt. ii. lib. Sen.) is paraded in the opening c. of the 3rd book as St. Jerome's, and called "the tradition of the Catholic faith in its integrity," in opposition to that of the 2nd Nicene council, which is attacked further on for wanting the "Filioque" clause (c. 8): while c. 17 of the same book unravels the statement of canon 2 of this council, by showing that what is condemned there as having been decreed by the 2nd Nicene council under anathema, was no more than the informal utterance of one of the bishops who spoke there, named Constantinus. If the pope then was really represented at Frankfurt by his legates, they must have left after the condemnation of Adoptionism, or, at all events, before this canon was framed. Most of the other canons, indeed, are couched in a style of their own, "Statutum," or "definitum est a Domino Rege, et a sancta synodo." The 33rd canon runs thus: "Ut Catholici fides sanctae Trinitatis, et oratio Dominica, et symbolum fidei omnibus praedicetur et tradatur." It has been assumed that what was meant here by "Catholici fides" is the Athanasian Creed. But it would seem, rather, from the two verbs which follow, that as by the Lord's Prayer and Creed are meant what had to be "delivered," so by the "Catholic faith" is meant merely what had to be "preached." Besides, this phrase was applied to so many things than (Foulkes' *Ath. C. Append. p. 32 and seq.*), that its actual meaning cannot be ascertained where the context is not explicit. The 55th is remarkable as showing how Angilram had been employed. "Dixit Dominus rex . . . se a sede apostolica . . . licentiam habuisse, ut Angilram archiepiscopum in eum palatio aedibus haberet, propter utilitatem ecclesiarum." Now the only work extant with which his name is associated, is a collection of canons said to have been given by him to the pope, or received from the pope when he was at Rome, containing indisputable germs of the false Decretals. In the next canon Alcuin is commended to the fellowship and prayers of the council. There is a strong family likeness, in conclusion, between this council and that of Paris, A.D. 825, which should not be overlooked by anybody wishing to form a just notion of either (Mansi xiii. 859 and 863 and seq.). [E. S. VI.]

**FRATER, FRATERNITAS.** 1. The name *Frater* was applied among themselves to all Christians [FATHER]. Tertullian (*Apolog. c. 38*) says that those who recognise one God as their father, and have drunk of one Spirit, are called brethren. Jerome (*De Perpet. Virg. c. 15*) says that all Christians are called brethren. The *Primo Clemens* (*Apoc. ad Jacob. Proem.*)

speaks of the priests and deacons, and all the other brethren. Hence the title *Fraternitas* was commonly applied to all the members of the church, or of a particular church, regarded collectively; as by Tertullian (*Apolog. c. 39*; and perhaps *De Virg. Val. c. 14*), and Cyprian (*Epist. 51, c. 1*) where "*fraternitas*" is equivalent to "*clerus et plebs*."

*Frater* and *Fraternitas*, in this sense, are frequently found in inscriptions. Thus, in an Algerian inscription (Reinier, *Ins. de l'Algérie*, no. 4025), a church is designated *ECCLIA FRATERN*. In a Greek epitaph copied by Marin. (*Arch. Prefat. p. xi.*), from the Olivieri collection at Pesaro, the body of the faithful is addressed with the salutation, "peace to the brethren," *ΕΙΡΗΝΗΝ ΕΧΕΤΕ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ*. Another (Muratori, *Thesaur. i. iv. p. MCCCLXIV. 9*) is dedicated by "the brethren" (*fratres reddiderant*) to Alexander, their brother. Another (Brunati. p. 106) appeals to the "good brothers" (*fratres boni*). In another, from the cemetery of Priscilla, "the brethren" bid farewell to Leontina.

Some proper names appear to have arisen from this idea of brotherhood. As that of Adolphus, which is found on a marble in the museum of Lyons (Bottan, p. 597, lxi.). (Martigny, *Dictionnaire des Antiq. Chréti. et Art. Fraternité*).

2. Persons of the same official body styled each other *Fratres*; thus, not only does Cyprian speak of fellow-bishops as *Fratres*, but he addresses presbyters and deacons by the same title (e.g. *Epist. 16*). When in the same epistle (c. 2), he says, that "*fraternitas nostra*" has been deceived by certain persons, it seems doubtful whether he means the body of bishops, or the members of the church in general. Hesius (*Conc. Sardic. c. 8*) speaks of a fellow-bishop as "*frater et coepiscopus*." From this official use of the word "*Frater*," it arose that the members of a council speak of themselves as "*concilium fraternitatis*" (*I. Conc. Lugd. c. 8*), i.e. of the episcopal brotherhood. So *I. Syn. Rom. c. 2; IV. [III] Syn. Rom. c. 1*.

3. A monastic order is emphatically a brotherhood (*fraternitas*), and its members *Fratres*, or *Fratres Spirituales* (*Fructuosi Regula, cc. 4 and 8*). See BROTHERHOOD, MONASTERY. [P. O.]

**FRATERNUS**, bishop and confessor at Auzerre; commemorated Sept. 29 (*Mart. Cambridg.*); deposition Sept. 29 (*Mart. Hieron.*).

[W. F. G.]

**FRESCO.** The object of this article is to furnish a brief historical sketch of the rise and progress of pictorial decoration in the religious buildings of the early Christians. Embellishment in mosaic will be treated of in a separate article, but all other wall decorations will be included, not those only strictly comprehended under the title *fresco*,\* i.e. when the colours are mixed

\* The word *fresco* is by a popular error commonly used for all kinds of wall-painting. Accurately speaking it is restricted to that which the word signifies, painting on freshly-laid plaster, executed while the wall is still damp, in water colours and pigments not liable to be injured by the lime. *Dry fresco* is painting on old plaster without effresco. *Dissempo* (a *tempore*) is on a dry wall with opaque colours, made up with some viscous medium, glue, white of egg, milk, or gum, diluted or "tempered" with water. *Stenciling* is painting with watery colours, the colours being burnt in afterwards.



with water simply, and applied to fresh plaster while wet. This was the ordinary mode of colouring walls among the wealthier Romans; but the care and skill it required, and the tedious processes necessary for preparing the walls for the colours, forbade its use where economy was an object. In the better-class houses at Pompeii, Rome, and elsewhere, the wall-decorations are executed in fresco; but the greater part of the paintings in ordinary dwellings are in distemper of various degrees of excellence. We are at present deficient in accurate information as to the exact process employed in the paintings of the catacombs; but considering the general absence of wealth among the primitive Christians, it is probable that the less expensive method would be adopted. Whenever paintings were repainted or touched up, the plaster being dry, the distemper process must have been necessarily employed. That encaustic painting in wax was also employed in early religious pictures is certain from the references in the fathers to that process. Chrysostom and Basil (*Contra Sabellian.* p. 805) in the East, and Paulinus in the West, may be cited. The latter speaks of "imagines ceris liquentibus pictas" (*Ep.* xxx. § 6), while Chrysostom more than once refers to *κηρόχυτος γραφή*. Hermogenes, the African painter, is reproached by the vehement Tertullian as being "bis falsarius, et cauterio et stilo" (*Adv. Hermog.* c. 1). The fact is that Christian art followed the technical rules of the period, and adopted whatever processes were in use among the artists of the day, and were most suited to the particular work in hand, whether fresco, tempera, or encaustic.

Nor was it only in the processes adopted but also in the character of the pictorial decorations themselves that the early Christians conformed to the practice of the age in which they lived. Indeed, it could not be otherwise. As has been remarked with perfect truth by Raoul Rochette, "un art ne s'improvise pas." A school of painting is the result of a long previous train of education, and cannot spring into existence in a moment "fully formed, like Minerva from the brain of Jupiter" (Northcote, *Rom. Sott.* p. 198). There was nothing exceptional about Christian art. It was no more than the continuation of the art Christianity found already existing as the exponent of the ideas of the age, with such modifications as its purer faith and higher morality rendered necessary. The artists employed were not necessarily Christian; indeed, in most cases, especially in the earliest times, they would probably be pagans, working in the style and depicting the subjects to which they were accustomed, only restricted by the watchful care of their employers that no devices were introduced which could offend the moral tone of Christians. In the earliest examples there is absolutely nothing distinctive of the religion professed. "At first," writes Mr. Burgon (*Letters from Rome*, p. 250), "they even used many of the same devices for mural decoration as the pagans had used, always excepting anything that was immoral or idolatrous; introducing, however, every here and there, as the ideas occurred to them, something more significant of their own creed, until by-and-by the whole was exclusively Christian." The deep-rooted aversion of the early Christians to all sculptured or pictorial

representations, natural in a community that had sprung from the bosom of the Jewish church, for a considerable period forbade all attempts to depict the person of the Saviour or the events of either Testament, and limited the efforts of Christian art to the simple naturalism of the decorations already common, or the arabesques in which the fancy of the artists loved to indulge. The earliest Christian frescoes with which we are acquainted present the same subjects from pastoral life and the vintage, the trellised vines and bunches of grapes, the bright-plumaged birds and painted butterflies, the winged genii and gracefully draped female figures, with which we are familiar in the wall-decorations of the Roman baths and the houses of Pompeii. By degrees the natural instinct for the beautiful asserted itself, and the desire to make the eye a channel for the reception of the truths of revelation led to the introduction of symbolic representations, which, without attempting directly to depict sacred things, conveyed to the initiated the expression of the truths believed by them. The actual change in the character of the subjects represented was at first inconsiderable. The vine laden with clusters became a recognised symbol of Christ "the True Vine" and the "much-fruit," by which Christians, as "branches," were called to glorify the Father. The pastoral subjects, especially those in which the Shepherd was the principal figure, at once led the mind of the worshipper to the contemplation of Christ the "Good Shepherd." To the devout imagination a Fish represented at once the Saviour Himself, the anagrammatic *ΙΧΘΥΣ*, and the human object of His salvation, the Christian deriving his life from the waters of baptism (cf. Tertull. *de Baptism.* c. i.), while the Fisherman spoke of Him who by the Gospel-hook takes men for life, not for death.<sup>b</sup> [FISH; FISHERMAN.] Not only were these natural emblems made to breathe a Christian spirit by the infusion of a new element of life, but even directly mythological personages were pressed into the service of the church. Orpheus captivating the wild beasts by the sound of his lyre was adopted as a symbol of Christ subduing the savage passions of men by the melody of the gospel, and Ulysses deaf to the alluring voices of the sirens represented the believer triumphing over the seductions of worldly and sensual pleasure (Martigny, *Dict. des Ant. Chrét.* pp. 447, 643; De' Rossi, *Bulletino*, 1863, p. 35). The hold which the old forms still maintained long after the ideas of which they were the exponents had passed away, is seen in the combination with Scriptural scenes of those personifications of Nature under the human form so frequent in pagan times, which lasted even down to a late date. In the delineation of the ascension of Elijah, one of the most frequently repeated subjects of early Christian art, the Jordan is represented as a river god, with his urn.

<sup>b</sup> This image is beautifully developed in the grand Orphic hymn attributed to Clement of Alexandria, thus nobly rendered by Dr. W. L. Alexander (*Ante Nicene Fathers*, vol. i. p. 344):—

"Fisher of men whom Thou to life dost bring;  
From evil sea of sin,  
And from the billowy strife,  
Gathering pure fishes in  
Caught with sweet bait of life."

Thus also "a mountain is occasionally represented by a mountain god, a city by a goddess with a mural crown, night by a female figure with a torch and star-bespangled robe, &c." (Kugler, *Handbook of Painting*, part i. p. 9).

So slow and timid was the commencement of Christian art. The profane abuse of sculpture and painting which had associated these forms of art with idolatry and licentiousness formed an almost insuperable barrier to its recognition as the handmaid of religion. The earlier fathers viewed all sculptural or pictorial representations with suspicion if not decided disapprobation. The stern Tertullian, transferring the prohibitions of the Old Testament to the New, absolutely condemned all representations of religious objects, and reproached Hermogenes as vehemently for painting as for his defence of second marriages: "pingit illicite, nubit assidue, legem Dei in libidinem defendit, in artem contemnit" (Tertull. *adv. Hermog.* c. i.; *De Idolatr.* c. 5; cf. Neander, *Antignosticus*, Bohn's tr. pp. 225, 451). We find similar but milder condemnations of the pictorial art in Clement Alex. (*Protrept.* c. 4) and Origen (*cont. Cels.* lib. iv. c. 31). Sacred art being thus frowned on it was only by gradual and cautious steps that symbolism gave way to direct historical representation, the events selected to be depicted being, at first, themselves symbolical of those great gospel facts which a deep-seated reverence as yet forbade them to portray. The persons and incidents of the Old Testament included within the limited cycle in which Christian art originally moved had all a typical or allegorical reference to the leading doctrines of Christianity, and reminded the devout worshipper of the Sacrifice, Resurrection, and Redemption of Christ. This will be apparent from the cycles of O. T. subjects given in the latter part of this article.

It was something that in spite of the profane and licentious associations of pictorial art, and the aversion of some of its most influential teachers, painting should have secured admission thus far into the service of Christianity. But it was still halting at the threshold, and timidly shrinking from the province of its greatest triumphs, so long as it was restricted to allegory. It could only accomplish its object in elevating the mind, and connecting beautiful and ennobling ideas with the external facts on which the faith is founded, when it adequately depicted the Person of the Saviour and chief events of His saving life. Referring to the article JESUS CHRIST for fuller details of the pictorial history of the Redeemer, and of the slow degrees with which the pious horror of any direct delineation of His outward form was broken down (of the persistence of which feeling the notorious decree of the council of Elvira,<sup>c</sup> A.D. 305, forbidding the depicting of the objects of worship and adoration on the walls of churches is a remarkable evidence), it will be enough here to say that portrait-like representations of our Blessed Lord are found among the early wall-paintings in the Roman catacombs, and that a limited number of events from His life on earth, belonging to a strictly-defined cycle, are of constant occurrence in the same localities. It deserves notice that this

cycle does not include any representations of the history of the Passion or Crucifixion. A feeling of awful reverence forbade any attempt to portray the atoning death of Christ in any but a symbolical or allegorical form. "The catacombs of Rome . . . offer no instance of a crucifixion, nor does any allusion to such a subject of art occur in any early writer" (Milman, *u. s.* p. 338). The most ancient instance known does not date earlier than the 8th century (Münter, *Sinbilder*, p. 77). Beyond the domain of sacred allegory and Scriptural painting, Christian art busied itself in the representation of saintly personages and of the martyrdoms, the memory of which was still so vivid in the church. It is difficult to point to indubitably early examples of the first class, and all traces of the latter class have perished. That representations of holy persons were not unfrequent in the time of St. Augustine is certain from his reference to wall-paintings of St. Peter and St. Paul as commonly existing, "pluribus locis . . . pictos" (*de Consens. Evang.* i. 10). But the paintings of St. Cornelius and St. Cyprian, in the crypt of Cornelius, in the Callistine catacomb, are in the style of the 8th century, while the *Orante* called St. Cecilia by De' Rossi, in the crypt bearing her name, is of the 9th; and the figure of St. Urban, in the same crypt, "can hardly have been executed before the 10th or 11th" (Northcote, *u. s.* p. 159). The paintings of saints in the catacombs of Naples may be assigned to an earlier period: some belonging to the 5th, others to the 8th century. Although all representations of martyrdoms have perished, there is no doubt that such existed. Prudentius (c. 405) speaks of a picture of the martyrdom of St. Cassianus, of which he says expressly, "Historiam pictura refert" (*Peristeph. Hymn.* ix. v. 5), and he elaborately describes the paintings of the martyrdom of St. Hippolytus, which embellished the walls of the chapel in which the body of the saint had been deposited (*Peristeph. Hymn.* xi. v. 141 sq.). Paulinus of Nola also at the commencement of the 5th century, decorated a chapel erected by him with martyrs (*Poem.* xxviii. v. 20, 21). At a still earlier period we have the testimony of St. Gregory Nyssen as to the prevalence of this practice in the Eastern church. He describes the martyrdom of St. Theodore as painted on the walls of a church dedicated to that saint, "The fiery furnace, the death of the athlete of Christ . . . the painter had expressed by colours as in a book . . . The dumb walls speak and edify" (*Orat. in Theod.* tom. iii. p. 579).<sup>d</sup>

Early Christian paintings may be conveniently treated of under three divisions, Roman, Byzantine, and Lombardic.

I. *Roman*.—All the earlier Christian buildings above ground having yielded to time and human violence, the catacombs are the only source of examples of primitive Christian art. In them, as has been already remarked, the earliest examples offer nothing exclusively Christian, and differ hardly at all from the contemporaneous pagan decorations. Agincourt long since called attention to this fact in his great work (*L'Histoire de l'Art par les Monumens*), proving by comparative representations in successive plates (*Peinture*,

<sup>c</sup> "Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod solitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur" (*Conc. Illib.* can. 36; *Labbe, Concil.* vol. i. p. 974).


<sup>d</sup> See Pusey, *Note to Tertullian's Apology*, lib. of the Fathers, vol. x. p. 109 sq.

pl. v. vi.), that the first Christian sepulchral chambers were arranged and decorated after heathen models. The artists probably adhered to the old faith; and even if this were not so, they were only accustomed to work in one style, and could not extemporize a new one. In some of the most ancient chapels of the catacombs it has been truly said that "you are not certain whether you are looking on a pagan or a Christian work. There is the same geometrical division of the roof, the same general arrangement of the subjects, the same fabulous animals, the same graceful curves, the same foliage, fruit, flowers, and birds in both" (Burgon, *Letters from Rome*, p. 250; Northcote, *u. s.* p. 190). Agincourt could discover no difference in style, except, perhaps, what was not unnatural, greater signs of hurry, and coarser execution. It is only the occurrence of the figure of the Good Shepherd, which usually occupies the central position, or some Scriptural subject, such as Jonah or Daniel, or some Christian symbol, that clears up the doubt as to the religion of the art we are studying. The entire absence of all

same charge to the island of Pontia (*Dictionary of Christian Biography*, DOMITILLA). In this burial-place, therefore, we have work of the end of the 1st or the beginning of the 2nd century. The frescoes which ornament the walls and ceilings of the sepulchral chambers and their recesses or *cubicula*, are clearly contemporaneous with the original building, and are, especially in the



No. 2. Spring. From the Crypt of St. Nereus and Achilleus.



No. 1. Painting on Ceiling. From the Crypt of St. Domitilla.

gloomy associations in connection with death deserves remark. The cheerful symbolical decorations which adorn the sepulchral chambers—the graceful vine, the clustering grapes, the birds and bright landscapes—bespeak a faith which nerved its possessors to meet the most terrible sufferings with calmness and even with delight, as the path to never-ending joys, and to view death as the door to eternal life, the true birthday of the soul. Every thing that meets the eye excites pleasurable emotions, and indicates a heart full of peace and happiness.

As an example of Christian mural decorations of the very earliest period we may instance the *Catacomb of Domitilla* on the Appian way (see p. 314). This catacomb is attributed to Flavia Domitilla, a near relative of the emperor Domitian—perhaps his niece, the daughter of his sister who bore the same name. She was the wife of Flavius Clemens, the cousin of Domitian, and his colleague in the consulship A.D. 95, who was accused of "atheism," by which we are almost certainly to understand Christianity, and put to death by the emperor. Domitilla was banished on the

subordinate embellishments, of rare beauty. There is a vaulted roof, over which a vine trails with all the freedom of nature, laden with clusters, at which birds are pecking, while winged boys are gathering or pressing out the grapes, of which no decorative artist of the Augustan age need be ashamed (Mommson, *Contemp. Rec.* May 1871, p. 170). The annexed woodcut (No. 1) gives a faint idea of its exquisite grace and beauty. Traces of landscapes also still exist here, which are of rare occurrence in later Christian burial vaults. In the portion of this catacomb known by the names of St. Domitilla's chamberlains, St. Nereus and St. Achilleus, a painted *cubiculum* exhibits representations of the four seasons, which are very curious. They are represented as female figures, with small butterfly wings attached to their shoulders. We give woodcuts of Spring and Autumn (Nos. 2, 3).



No. 3. Autumn. From the Crypt of St. Nereus and Achilleus.

The latter has an attendant genius emptying out a cornucopia of fruit. There is an entire absence of anything distinctively Christian in these decorations, which reproduce the wall-paintings of the best period of Greco-Roman art. On the walls, however, we find the usual allegorical and Scriptural subjects—the Good Shepherd, the

Fisherman, an *Agape*, Daniel in the Lions' Den, &c.\*

Another equally beautiful specimen of the vine ornamentation is exhibited on the vault of a square chamber of the cemetery of Protestata, otherwise known as that of St. Urban, beneath the church of the same name, lying to the east of the Via Appia, near the circus of Maxentius. This burial-place belongs to the earliest period, and the character of the decorations corresponds with hitherto art of the 3rd century, and is not at all inferior to the best works of the age. The accompanying woodcut (No. 4) gives an imperfect notion of the elaborate beauty of the design. The vault of the chamber is divided into four bands, each containing a continuous wreath of foliage and flowers, among which are nests, and the birds visiting their young. The highest wreath is of laurel or bay, a symbol of victory, indicative of the Christian triumph. Immediately round the arch of the *arconcellum* is a band of reapers cutting down corn and binding up the sheaves. The *playdof* of the *recess* originally bore the Good Shepherd with a sheep upon his shoulders; but the design has been almost



No. 4. Vaulted Vault of *Arconcellum* in the Cemetery of St. Protestata.

destroyed by the excavation of later *loculi*. The paintings are small and exquisitely beautiful, even in their present state of decay. The family to whom this burial-place belonged was evidently one of considerable wealth and dignity. But the specimens already adduced seem to have been surpassed by the great vine of the Callistine catacomb (Bottari, vol. ii. tav. 13), the "antique style of beauty" of which is noticed by Kugler. A stem of a vine encircles each side of the arch of an *arconcellum* with its graceful spirals, lovely little naked boys standing on its branches and plucking the clusters. The soffit of the arch is similarly decorated with village scenes. The wall of the *recess* presents what is commonly, but erroneously, designated the *Dispute with the Doctors*. Christ, represented as a beardless young man seated on a curule chair, holds a scroll in his left hand and turns towards a number of hearers, probably intended for his

apostles, some of whom are seated and others standing (woodcut No. 5).

The general arrangement of the mural decorations of the sepulchral chambers or *cubicula* of the Roman catacombs is remarkably uniform. The arch-headed tomb *recesses* or *arconcella*, which occupy three sides of the square chambers, have the back wall, the soffits of the arches, and the wall above them painted, in the earlier examples with mere ornamental arabesques, in the later with subjects drawn from the narrow Scriptural or symbolical cycle to which reference has already been made. The ceilings are even more richly decorated, the subjects being usually depicted in panels distributed round a central picture, which most commonly exhibits a representation of the Saviour under a typical form. The general appearance of these *cubicula*, and the distribution of the paintings, is shown in the accompanying illustration from the *cubiculum* of the *Omnia* in the catacomb of St. Callistus (No. 6). The paintings are early—probably of the 3rd century—representing trellis work overgrown with flowers, pansies and other birds, and winged genii. In the centre of the vault is the head of *Omnia*, giving its name to the chamber. The ornamentation of an early ceiling is exhibited in woodcut No. 7, representing the roof of the chapel of St. Callistus. The central panel contains Christ under the typical form of Orpheus. Four of the eight circumscribing panels contain Biblical subjects—(1) Moses smiting the Rock; (2) Daniel in the Lions' Den; (3) The Raising of Lazarus; (4) David armed with his Sling. The intermediate panels represent pastoral subjects—two of sheep, two of cattle. Another chamber, depicted by De' Rossi (vol. i. pl. 10), called that of Orpheus, is quite Pompeian in character. The ceiling is a beautiful work of art. Orpheus is seen in the centre, surrounded by heads of genii with dishevelled and flowing hair, and supported by eight oblong panels, two containing the Good Shepherd, two female *cranes*, and the remaining four winged genii bearing crooks, floating lightly in the air. The paneled walls are embellished with a rich profusion of arabesques, combining doves, pansies, and other birds, dolphins, and sea monsters, the only unmistakably Christian emblem being the lamb bearing the eucharistic bread.

The style of these earliest efforts of Christian art has been sadly depreciated. They are characterized by Lord Lindsay (*Hist. of Christ. Art.*, vol. i. p. 30) as "poor productions," where "the meagreness of invention is only equalled by the feebleness of execution," "inferior, generally speaking, to the worst specimens of contemporary heathen art." Such a verdict evidences but slender acquaintance with the paintings which are the subjects of his criticism. The earlier Christian frescoes, as we have seen, are quite on a level with the best specimens of pagan art of the time, and the rapid decadence manifested in the later examples belongs not to Christian art alone but to art in general. The judgment of Kugler is far more favourable. He speaks of the "grandeur of arrangement" exhibited by the earliest paintings, and admires the "peculiar solemnity and dignity of style" which characterize them, though he acknowledges that these excellencies are "accompanied by certain technical deficiencies," chiefly such as naturally arose from

\* The very early date of these decorations is acknowledged by La Normant, who considers some of the paintings in St. Donatilla's cemetery to be of the same style as those in the well known pyramidal tomb of Gaius Sestius, &c. 25.



might hasty execution (Kugler, *u. s.* p. 14). The mode of execution, according to Crowe and Cavalcaselle was as follows (*Hist. of*

outlines of their figures with strong dark lines. The eyes, nose, and mouth were similarly defined with black lines. A dash of warm yellow-red



No. 3. Arcadum. From the Cemetery of St. Callistus.



No. 4. The Catacomb of Uccina. From the Cemetery of St. Callistus. From De' Rumi.

*Painting*, vol. i. p. 3, note). The artists boldly stained the rough-coated walls with light water-colours of a lively tint, and rapidly defined the

tone was thrown over the flesh portions of the figure, the shadows being worked in in broad masses with a deeper tint of the same warm hue.

The details were almost entirely left to the imagination of the beholder. The draperies were coloured in the primary keys, indicating a tolerable acquaintance with the laws of harmony. The general effect of these simple processes is pronounced by the same critics to be good. The "attitudes are not without grandeur, nor the masses of light and shade without breadth, nor the drapery without simplicity." The artists were evidently capable of much better things.

With the lapse of time and the general decay of artistic power in Rome, corresponding to the universal deterioration of taste and genius which characterized the later days of the empire, we notice a very sensible decline in the decorations of the catacombs. The design becomes increas-

another and always unlike nature" (North '16, v. s. p. 197). In fact, as Dean Milman has truly remarked (*Lat. Christ.* vi. 605), the characteristic of Christian painting was not art but worship, and its highest aim was to awaken religious emotion and suggest religious thought. Thus imitation took the place of invention, and imagination was crushed by precedent. The gradual decadence of the art may be clearly traced in the chronological series given in Agincourt's plates (*Peinture*, pl. v.-xii.). The excellence of design, freedom of drawing, and harmony of colouring which mark the earlier frescoes gradually disappear as we advance. We find proofs of declension at the end of the 3rd century (Pl. viii.). The drawing is not bad, but





Fig. 7. Ceiling of the Crypt of St. Callistus. From Perrot.]

ingly rude and clumsy, and the execution shows greater carelessness and neglect of detail. The figures are ill-proportioned—sometimes square and short, at others inordinately elongated. The free play of the earlier designs is succeeded by a lifeless rigidity. This mechanical stiffness was fostered by the narrowness of the cycle of Scriptural subjects represented, and the unimaginative sameness of the mode of representation. Each subject had received a well-defined traditional type, consecrated by repetition, from which it was deemed irreverence to deviate. Thus Christian art became "almost hieratic in its character, as in ancient Egypt or modern Greece, so fixed and immovable were its types: always like one

there is no movement and little expression, and the treatment is monotonous. In the two succeeding centuries the deterioration proceeds, though the decline is not so rapid as might have been anticipated. Classic forms continued till the end of the 5th and first half of the 6th century. Cavalcaselle instances as an example of the art of this period a chapel in the catacomb of St. Peter and St. Marcellinus (otherwise called St. Helena). The vault is decorated with a large figure of Christ seated in a curule chair, in the act of benediction. The head is very fine and pure. Below, above the tomb, are figures of St. Peter and St. Marcellinus and two others ranged on either side of the Holy Lamb standing on a

rock, whence issue the four rivers of Paradise. The frames are long and attenuated, the heads small, the hands and feet defective in drawing. Another typical example is the colossal head of Christ in the act of benediction, from the cemetery of St. Pontianus. For the first time the jewelled nimbus bears the Greek cross. The Saviour is of imposing aspect, but conventional. The execution is hasty, and the decline marked. It probably belongs to the 7th century, but is assigned by Martigny to Hadrian I. 772-775. The celebrated paintings which decorate the well or baptistery, the jewelled cross, and the Baptism of Christ are described in the articles BAPTISTERY, p. 174; and CATACOMBS, p. 313. These pictures, in their present state, are probably restorations of the originals, coarsely painted over an older underlying picture at the time of the repair of the catacomb by Hadrian I. (cf. Tyrwhitt, *Art Teaching of Primitive Church*, p. 173). These

duce the original painting, and that any arguments founded upon such uncertain data must be precarious. The words of Mr. St. John Tyrwhitt, with regard to a particular instance, may be applied to a large number of these frescoes, "the workmanship is so grossly rude and careless, that one is led to suspect that ancient retouchings have taken place at some time in the bathos of art; and the addition of the coarsest outlines, both on the lighted and shaded side of the objects, seems to show that the original painting had nearly vanished from the wall when some well-meaning and totally-ignorant restorer made an attempt at securing its meaning" (*Art Teaching*, &c., p. 180). The fact of these restorations has been lately made patent to those who have no opportunity of examining the originals by the invaluable series of photographs taken in the catacombs by the magnesium light, which we owe to the unwearied zeal and munificent libe-



No. 3. Ceiling of the Vestibule of the Catacombs of Naples. From Bullen's.

restorations may be taken as examples of the retouchings and repaintings of earlier originals which prevailed so extensively when the catacombs became the objects of religious visits, and which render it so difficult accurately to determine the date of any particular picture. In the catacombs at Naples which have not been so much cared for, and are less tampered with by modern restorers, the wall-pictures may be seen in several instances peeling off, disclosing successive strata one behind another. There is no reason to question the good faith of the original restorers, who probably followed the outlines of the decaying subjects as far as they could make them out, and only supplied forms and details when the original had quite disappeared. But it must always be borne in mind, in examining the frescoes of the catacombs, that we are in all probability looking at a work of the 8th or even a later century, which only partially repro-

duces the original painting, and that any arguments founded upon such uncertain data must be precarious. The words of Mr. St. John Tyrwhitt, with regard to a particular instance, may be applied to a large number of these frescoes, "the workmanship is so grossly rude and careless, that one is led to suspect that ancient retouchings have taken place at some time in the bathos of art; and the addition of the coarsest outlines, both on the lighted and shaded side of the objects, seems to show that the original painting had nearly vanished from the wall when some well-meaning and totally-ignorant restorer made an attempt at securing its meaning" (*Art Teaching*, &c., p. 180). The fact of these restorations has been lately made patent to those who have no opportunity of examining the originals by the invaluable series of photographs taken in the catacombs by the magnesium light, which we owe to the unwearied zeal and munificent libe-

rality of Mr. J. H. Parker. The rude later touches and hard outlines are in many instances clearly to be traced over the original painting. It is needless to pursue the melancholy history of the decline of religious art any further. The power of drawing grew feebler and feebler, all sense of beauty of form perished, proportion was disregarded, the colouring became crude and inharmonious, until, with the close of the 8th century, a period of darkness set in, when Christian art was lost in the Western world, and only dragged on an unnatural and mechanical existence in the traditional Byzantine art of the East.

The remarkable series of frescoes which embellish the catacombs of Naples must not be passed over. They have, however, been so fully described in a previous article (CATACOMBS, p. 316), that it is needless to enlarge upon them here. The chief authorities for these paintings

are the plates of Bellermann's work (Hamburg, 1889). The greater part there given are no longer visible. The vault of the vestibule is painted in the Pompeian style, and probably by pagan artists, some of the subjects being distinctly heathen. It belongs to the first half-century of the Christian era (No. 8). The vault has been subsequently plastered over, and a second set of subjects of the 8th century painted over it. But the new coat did not adhere well, and has fallen off to a large extent, exhibiting the first painting below it. There is also a good painting of a peacock, with vases and flowers, belonging to the first period. Among the paintings that decorate the chapels we may call attention to one presenting full-length figures of St. Paul with a scroll, and St. Laurence with his crown of martyrdom in his hand. They are not nimbed, and are assigned by Mr. J. H. Parker to the 5th century (No. 9). Half-lengths of St. Desiderius and St. Agutius, in another recess, deserve notice as exemplifying the bad drawing of the 8th century. The faces are elongated, the sockets of the eyes exaggerated in size, the hands enormous and clumsy, and the whole displays a barbaric ignorance of form and blindness to beauty.



No. 9. SS. Paul and Laurence, Catacomb at Naples.

II. *Byzantine*.—Up to the commencement of the 7th century there was no decided difference between Eastern and Western art. Wherever Roman civilization extended Christian art was essentially the same. It was not till the middle of the 7th century that the distinction between Roman and Byzantine art began to arise. That was the epoch of the greatest decadence of art in the West, crushed by the Lombard invasion, while in the East, under the emperor Justinian, a new and vigorous intellectual life was rapidly developing itself and manifesting its energy, as elsewhere, in the domain of art. This new influence rapidly made itself felt through the civilized world. The style of art universally prevailing in the latter part of the 7th and the 8th centuries and onward was that which, as distinguished from the Roman school, is known by the title of Byzantine (Kugler, *Handbook of Painting*, i. p. 47). The characteristic mental differences of the West and the East were reflected in their artistic works. The contemplative prevailed in the productions of the Byzantine art schools, as the practical did in those of Rome. The idea of dramatic historical painting was alien to the Byzantine genius. Even the movements of life were distasteful. Calm, motionless figures offered themselves to the devotion of the worshippers in dignified

repose. Ease stiffened into rigidity, tradition usurped the place of invention, the study of nature was laid aside, and the artist followed a strictly prescribed type which allowed no scope for the play of the imagination, and ended in a system of mere mechanical copying, where, in Kugler's words (*u. s. p. 56*), "the capacity of the artist was only regulated by the number and quality of the tracings which he had been able to procure from the works of his predecessors." A fuller discussion of Byzantine art and the chief examples remaining, must be reserved for the article treating on mosaic decorations (MOSAICS). Byzantine frescoes of the 6th, 7th, and 8th centuries, it is believed do not exist; though, from the permanence of the traditional type, and the strict adherence to artistic rules, there is no doubt that later compositions enable us to realise their character with great accuracy. We have no account of catacomb paintings in the East, though it is possible that such are only awaiting more thorough research. One such was not long since discovered at Alexandria, and is described by De' Rossi (*Bulletino*, Novemb. 1864; Agost. 1865), and Northcote (*Rom. Sott.* p. 221). It contains a liturgical painting, apparently representing the participation in the eucharist, together with the miracle at Cana and the multiplication of the loaves and fishes, with Greek inscriptions over. But it belongs to a period anterior to the development of Byzantine art, and differs little, if at all, from the paintings of the Roman catacombs.

III. *Lombardic*.—The relics of the new style of art consequent on the Lombard invasion in the 6th and 7th centuries are very scanty, and quite insufficient to furnish data for determining its character with any minuteness. It is probable, however, that the "naturalism and insistence on fact, the vigorous imagination of truth and wild play of fancy in fiction, the delight in action, motion, and contest, the taste for hunting and battle, the irresistible or unresisted taste for the humorous grotesque," described so vividly by Mr. Ruskin (*Stones of Venice*, vol. i. append. 8), as characterizing their more lasting works in architecture and sculpture, were exhibited in their pictorial efforts, in which, with all their rudeness and total license of style, there lay, as Kugler remarks (p. 45), "a germ of freedom from which, later, a new school of development was to spring." The historical subjects which Queen Theodelinda caused to be painted on the walls of her palace at Monza, at the beginning of the 7th century, have unhappily perished, if, indeed, they were frescoes and not mosaics.

Some account is given by Von Rumohr (*Ital. Forschung*, vol. i. p. 193, Berl. 1827) of the examples of the Lombardic style still existing in the remains of the frescoes in the tribune of the subterranean church at Assisi, and in the crypt of SS. Nazaro e Celso at Verona. The former are placed by him in the 8th century. The lights are laid on in *impasto*, an art subsequently lost. The frescoes at Verona are very similar in design and execution. Several Biblical scenes are there rudely painted on a coarse white ground.

IV. *Cycles of Scriptural Subjects*.—Attention has been already drawn to the remarkable fact that out of the almost infinite wealth of historical subjects in the Old and New Testaments suitable for pictorial representation, by



which important doctrines are set forth or holy lessons imparted, a comparatively small number were selected, and that the limits thus laid down were scarcely ever transgressed by the artists. Nor were these, generally speaking, precisely the subjects that we should have *a priori* expected to have been the object of exclusive preference. Many of the most striking events of the O. T., and the most characteristic incidents of the life of Christ are entirely passed over, while some which appear to us subordinate are repeated times without number. The explanation of this procedure is to be sought in the principle of typical parallelism which guided the church from the first in her choice of subjects for delineation. Her leading idea was to veil the great facts of Redemption "under the parallel and typical events of the patriarchal and Jewish dispensation—admitting no direct representations from gospel history but such as illustrated the kingly office of the Saviour and the miracles by which He prefigured the illumination of the spirit and the resurrection of the body" (Lord Lindsay, *Christian Art*, vol. i. p. 48). It followed therefore that even these events were not treated so much as facts of history, to be portrayed with any idea of reproducing the incident as it may be conceived to have occurred, but as types in which the spiritual meaning was predominant. Consequently, not the choice of the subject alone but the mode of treating it was matter to be regulated by authority. Nothing beyond the minor details and the mode of execution was left to the artist. The church dictated what should be painted and how. "The symbolical system of this hieratic cycle," says De Rossi, "is established beyond all dispute, not only by the choice and arrangement of subjects, but also by the mode of representing them." "Christ's resurrection, with that of the church in His Person, is the theme on which in their peculiar language the artists of the catacombs seem never weary of expatiating" (Lord Lindsay, *u. s.* p. 51), and representing to the eyes and hearts of the beholders under every varied form of symbol, type, and allegory. The earliest allusion

every sarcophagus of the early Christian church. The same events, with the others belonging to this cycle, are continually referred to in the writings of the early fathers, who thus evidenced the hold they had taken of the popular mind, as familiar illustrations of the truths of revelation.

We may select one or two of the subjects of most frequent recurrence in early Christian art to illustrate what has been said as to the adherence to a traditional type, even when quite at variance with all historical probability. No subject meets us more constantly than Noah in



No. 10. Noah in the Ark.

the ark receiving the dove with the olive-branch, in evident allusion to the sacrament of baptism and salvation in the church (1 Pet. iii. 21). But with slight modifications of detail the type never varies. As in the illustration given above (No. 10), the ark is always a small square box with an open lid, out of which a man many sizes too large for his receptacle appears, and welcomes back the dove. Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac is of perpetual recurrence.<sup>1</sup> Both are usually clad in tunics. In an example from the cemetery of Priscilla, Abraham wears highpriestly robes.



No. 11. Jonah. From the Cemetery of St. Callixtus. De Rossi.

to a cycle of this kind, not, it is true, containing any reference to pictorial representation, occurs in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. v. c. 7). Some of the Scriptural events there spoken of as types or pledges of the resurrection of man, viz. the deliverance of Jonah from the whale's belly, the preservation of the three children in the fiery furnace, and of Daniel in the lions' den, from the O. T., and the cure of the man sick of the palsy, and of the blind man on whose eyes Christ laid clay, the feeding of the five thousand, the miracle of Cana, and the raising of Lazarus, are those which meet us perpetually painted in almost every catacomb, and carved on almost

This ram is a frequent accessory. The history of Jonah, the type of His work, death, and resurrection, chosen by Christ himself, in its three scenes, when once seen will be universally recognised, from the sameness of the form of the sea-monster and the details of the picture. In our illustration (No. 11) all these typical events are combined into one picture. Daniel in the lions' den, infinitely repeated, adheres on the whole to the same form and arrangement. One given by Perret repre-

<sup>1</sup> Augustine speaks of the sacrifice of Isaac, "not loquendum" (Cant. *Psalm* lib. xii. c. 12).

sents him as wearing the Phrygian cap, which also usually distinguishes his companions the three children in the furnace, another of the most commonly occurring types of deliverance (No. 12). The permanence of one type sanctioned by ecclesiastical tradition exhibited in these and almost every other Scriptural representation in these early paintings, anticipates the authoritative statement of the church made some centuries



No. 12. The Three Children. From the Catacomb of St. Hermas. (Bois, p. 265.)

later in the iconoclastic controversy, "Non est imaginum structura picturarum inventio, sed ecclesiarum catholicarum probata legislatio et traditio" (Conc. Nic. ii. art. vi., Labbe Concil. vol. vii. p. 831).

The same restriction to one cycle and adherence to one authorised pictorial form are seen in the frescoes from the N. T. (See JESUS CHRIST.)

The following may be accepted as a tolerably complete account of the cycle of the O. T. subjects found in the catacombs. We have only included those which had received a fixed traditional form, and were constantly repeated, excluding those only occurring once or twice:—

I. (1) The Fall, with Adam, Eve, the tree, and the serpent. (2) The Offering of Cain and Abel. (3) Noah receiving the Dove. (4) The Sacrifice of Isaac. (5) Moses removing his Shoes. (6) Moses striking the Rock. (7) David with his Sling. (8) Elijah's Translation. (9) The Three Children in the Fiery Furnace. (10) Daniel in the Lions' Den. (11) Jonah (a) Swallowed by the Whale; (b) Disgorged; (c) Reposing under his Booth. (12) Job on the Dunghill; to which may be added, though of much rarer occurrence, (13) Tobias with the Fish, and (14) Susanna and the Elders.

The New Testament cycle, under the same restriction, is as follows:—

II. (1) The Adoration of the Magi. (2) The Miracle at Cana. (3) Christ and the Woman of Samaria. (4) The Healing of the Paralytic, the man carrying his bed. (5) The Healing of the Blind Man. (6) The Cure of the Woman with

\* The most detailed description of the members of these Scriptural cycles, with references to the localities in which they may be sought for, is supplied by the Danish bishop Dr. Fred. Mønter, in his work of learned research, *Sindbilder und Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen*, Altona, 1828.

the Issus of Blood. (7) The Multiplication of the Loaves and Fishes. (8) The Raising of Lazarus. (9) Zacchæus. (10) The Triumphant Entry into Jerusalem. (11) Christ before Pilate, the latter washing his hands. (12) Christ and the Apostles on the Shore of the Sea of Galilee, after the Resurrection, with bread and fish. To these may be added, though not strictly belonging to the cycle, (13) the Annunciation (Bottari, *l. op.* 176), (14) Our Lord's Baptism, in the catacomb of St. Pontianus, and (15) the Five Wise Virgins, from St. Agaw (Perret, ii. 42).

We must not omit to mention the frescoes representing the *Agape* which so frequently meet us. In many of these there is nothing distinctively Christian, and Mr. Tyrwhitt remarks on the close resemblance between the *Agape* of the catacombs of St. Domitilla, and St. Callistus, and the confessedly heathen banquet of the *sever* priests in the Gnostic catacomb. That of which we give a woodcut (No. 13), from the catacomb of SS. Marcellinus and Peter, already described (p. 312), presents nothing by which we can determine whether the feast depicted had a religious character or not. In others, however, the decussated loaves, the bread and fish in *sever* baskets, and the seven persons, in evident allusion to the interview between Christ and *sever* of his disciples at the sea of Galilee, evidence the Christian origin and purpose of the painting.



No. 13. Agape. From the Catacomb of SS. Marcellinus and Peter. (Bois.)

We have already lamented the entire absence of all examples of religious paintings derived from churches or basilicas, owing to the destruction of the buildings themselves, or of the decay or removal of the pictures. This want however is in some degree compensated for by contemporaneous lists of the subjects represented, and to some extent of the manner in which they were depicted, for which we are indebted to St. Ambrose and St. Paulinus of Nola.

In the latter half of the 4th century the Ambrosian basilica at Milan was decorated with a cycle of 21 Scriptural paintings, all but four of which represented O. T. subjects. They are described in the "*Disticha ad picturas sacras in Basilica Ambrosiana*," given in the "*Index Sacrorum Sanctorum Ambrosiano*," published by Biraghi (Milano, 1862). The subjects are (1) Noah and the Dove. (2) Abraham beholding the Stars. (3) Abraham entertaining the Angels. (4) The Sacrifice of Isaac. (5) The Meeting of Isaac and Rebecca. (6) Jacob craftily obtaining the Birthright. (7) Jacob and the Speckled and Ring-straked Flocks. (8) Joseph's Coat shown to Jacob by his Sons.

(9) Joseph sold by his Brethren. (10) Joseph and Potiphar's Wife. (11) Joseph's Dreams. (12) Absalom caught by his Hair. (13) Jonah swallowed by the Great Fish. (14) The Wolf lying down with the Kid. (15) Jeremiah's Prophetic Commission. (16) The Ascension of Elijah. (17) Daniel in the Lions' Den. (18) The Annunciation. (19) Zacchaeus in the Sycamore Tree. (20) The Transfiguration. (21) St. John reclining on Christ's Breast. This cycle is remarkable as including several subjects seldom or never occurring in existing remains. Subjects (1), (4), (13), (16), and (17) are among the most frequent, but all the rest are found most rarely, while of the majority it would be difficult to name an example.

The most detailed accounts of the decoration of a church with Scriptural paintings are those given by Paulinus of Nola in the early years of the 5th century, when describing the basilica erected by him in honour of St. Felix (*Poem.* xxvii.). We here find the first direct enunciation of the principle set forth by Joannes Damascenus (*Orat. I. de Imagin.* vol. i. p. 314), and constantly repeated since, that "pictures are the books of the unlearned." The festival of St. Felix, which occurred in the winter, gathered together an immense concourse of country folk, who thought to do honour to the tomb of the saint by passing the night in feasting, too usually resulting in a gross debauch:

"male credula sanctos  
Perfusis balante mero gaudere sepulchris."  
(*Ib.* v. 565.)

In the hope of beguiling the gross minds of these illiterate peasants from the sensual delights which were their chief attractions, and awakening purer thoughts and holier aspirations by the examples of the holy personages there depicted, and at the same time with the view of imparting to them some knowledge of the chief facts of sacred history, and at any rate of leaving them less leisure for their coarser pleasures, Paulinus adopted the somewhat unusual expedient (*raro more*) of embellishing the portico of the new basilica with a series of Scriptural paintings. They occupied either the ceiling or the upper portion of the wall, only to be seen with up-turned face and head thrown back (*ib.* vv. 511-513). The series embraced subjects from the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Ruth. Those particularised by Paulinus (*ib.* vv. 515-535, 607-635) are the Creation of Man, Abraham's Departure from Ur, the Angels received by Lot, Lot's Wife, the Sacrifice of Isaac, Isaac opening the Wells, Jacob's Dream, Joseph and Potiphar's Wife, the Crossing of Jordan, Naomi and her Daughters-in-law, and the Passage of the Red Sea. The titles of the various pictures were written over them:

"ut littera monstret  
Quod manus explicuit."—(*Ib.* 534.)

The description of the last two subjects indicates, as Dean Milman remarks (*Hist. of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 399 note), if it was drawn from the picture itself, considerable talent on the painter's part for composition and landscape as well as for the drawing of figures. Not content with these pictorial embellishments of his new basilica, Paulinus decorated the old basilica of St. Felix in a similar manner, selecting subjects from the

New Testament, that thus "that which was new might be an ornament to the old, and the old to the new." These occupied a lower position, and could be viewed "lumine recto" (*Poem.* xxviii. vv. 167-179). Three narrow chapels (*cellae*) opening out of the atrium, exhibited examples of male and female virtue. One was painted with the history of Job and Tobit; another with those of Esther and Judith. That in the centre commemorated martyrs of both sexes (*ib.* vv. 15-27). The paintings in the apse of the basilica at Fondi are also described by Paulinus in a letter to his friend Severus (*Ep.* xxxii. 17). The subjects were of the same nature as many still extant in the apses of basilicas; a crowned cross standing in the flowery meads of Paradise, and the Holy Lamb anointed by the Dove and crowned by the Father, with the sheep and goats on either hand. These may have been worked in mosaic.

There is abundant evidence that the walls of civil and domestic buildings were also decorated with paintings, sometimes secular, sometimes religious. Those of the palace of Queen Theodelinda at Monza have been already referred to. Sidonius Apollinaris describes the villa of his friend Pontius Leontius at Bourg, at the confluence of the Dordogne and Garonne, as profusely ornamented with wall-paintings, one series representing the Mithridatic campaign of Lucullus, another the early history of the Jewish nation, "recutitorum primordia Judaeorum." Sidonius expresses his astonishment at the lustre and durability of the colours (*Sid. Apoll. Carm.* xxii.). We learn from Ernandus Nigellus (*lib.* iv.) that the whole Scripture history was painted on the walls of Charlemagne's palace at Ingelheim. It is needless to say all these have perished.

*Authorities.*—Alt, *Heiligenbilder*; Bellermand, *Katakomben zu Neapel*; Bingham, *Origines*, bk. viii. c. 8; Boldetti, *Osservazioni*; Bosio, *Roma Sotterranea*; Bottari, *Sculture e pitture*; Ciampini, *Vetera Monumenta*; Kugler, *Hand-book of Painting*; Lindsay, Lord, *Sketches of Christian Art*; Munter, *Sinnbilder*; Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotterranea*; Parker, J. H., *Photographs*; Perret, *Les Catacombes de Rome*; Piper, *Mythol. u. Symbol. der Christlich. Kunst*; Raoul Rochette, *Tableau des Catacombes*; *Discours*; Rio, *Art Chrétienne*; Rossi, De', *Roma Sotterranea*; Seroux d'Agincourt, *L'Histoire de l'Art par les monuments*; Tyrwhitt, *Art Teaching of the Primitive Church*. [E. V.]

FRIDAY, GOOD. [GOOD FRIDAY.]

FRIULI, COUNCIL OF (*Forojuliense concilium*), held at Friuli, A.D. 796, not 791, as Pagi shews (*Mansi* xiii. 854) under Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileia, whose letter to Charlemagne, formerly misconnected with the synod of Altino, A.D. 802 (*ibid.* p. 827), assigns three causes for its meeting: (1) the orthodox faith; (2) ecclesiastical discipline, and (3) recent outrages, probably by the Huns. The first of these is explained in his speech, which is an elaborate apology for the reception into the Western creed of the "Filioque," which Charlemagne had attacked, and the pope vindicated, the 2nd Nicene council two years before for not having in theirs: Paulinus himself endeavouring to prove both right. The resemblance between parts of this speech and the Athanasian creed has been remarked and is very close. Besides which it is observable

that all priests are required to commit to memory the entire exposition of "the Catholic faith," with which he concludes: while, for everybody else, the learning by heart of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer is prescribed. Of the canons, the 1st threatens simony; the 2nd drunkenness; the 4th and 5th deprecate secular employments and amusements for the clergy. By the 10th divorced couples are forbidden to remarry till one of the two dies; and by the 13th all are inhibited from working on Sundays and holidays (Mansi xiii. 830 and seq.).

[E. S. Ff.]

#### FRUITS, OFFERING AND BENEDICTION OF. I. *The Eastern Rite.*—In the so-called *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii. 29) the duty is inculcated of giving to the priests the first-fruits of the press and of the floor, of honey, grapes, shell-fruits, &c., and the firstlings of the flock and herd, that the stores of the giver and the produce of his land may be blessed (εὐλογηθῶσιν).

As this precept or exhortation comes in the midst of others relating to the Holy Communion, we might, perhaps, infer from it alone that in the East those things were offered and blessed during the celebration of that sacrament. They were at least brought to the altar, and at that time; for the third (or, as in some editions, the second) apostolical canon forbids anything but ears of new corn and grapes in their seasons, oil for the lamps, and frankincense, to be "brought to the altar at the time of the holy sacrifice." At a later period they certainly were blessed during the liturgy; for the council in Trullo (A.D. 691) found that in some churches the grapes brought to the altar were "joined to the unbloody sacrifice of the oblation, and both distributed together to the people;" whereupon it decreed that "the priests should bless the grape separately" (*Can.* xxviii.). In book viii. c. xl. of the *Constitutions* is a thanksgiving for first-fruits offered. In the book it follows the "morning laying on of hands;" but as it comes after the dismissal, it is clearly independent of that. It might, for aught that appears, be used, when occasion required, at the celebration or any other service. It begins thus, "We give Thee thanks, O Lord Almighty, Creator and Provider of all things, through Thine only begotten Son Jesus Christ our Lord, not as we ought, but as we can, for the first-fruits offered unto Thee." The whole form, which is rather long, is a thanksgiving in this strain. Later forms, though apparently of very great antiquity, are conceived in a different spirit, and appropriately entitled, "Prayers on behalf of those who offer first-fruits" (*Euchologion*, pp. 655, 656, ed. Goar). They are, with one exception, rather petitions for a benefit, than ascriptions of praise. They are used at the benediction of "grapes, figs, pomegranates, olives, apples, peaches, plums." Grapes, if ripe, were blessed in the Greek church on the 6th of August (*Euchologion*, p. 695).

II. *The Western Rite.*—One proof of the great antiquity of the benediction of grapes is that it took place in the West (as a rule) on the 6th of August, as well as among the Greeks (*Sacram. Gregor. in Lit. Rom. Vet.*; Muratori, tom. ii. col. 109). The earliest extant forms are in the Gelasian sacramentary, the substance of which is at least as old as the fifth century. There,

among the *Orationes et Preces* for Ascension Day, we find this rubric and prayer: "Then a little before the end of the canon thou shalt bless the new fruits (*fruges novas*). The Benediction follows: Bless, O Lord, these new fruits of the bean, which Thou, O Lord, hast vouchsafed to ripen, &c., in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom Thou, O Lord, dost alway create all these good things, &c. *Finis the Canon*" (Muratori, tom. i. col. 588). Elsewhere, in the same sacramentary, the prayer occurs again slightly altered, and with the alternatives, "grape or bean" (*Ibid.* col. 746). It is here followed by another benediction of first-fruits of any kind (*primitias creaturæ Tuæ*), and by a "Benediction of Apples." From some MSS. of the later Gregorian sacramentary, we learn that apples were blessed on the viii. Kal. Aug., i.e., on St. James' Day (Martene, *De Antiq. Eccl. Rit.* L. iv. c. xxxiii. § xi.). The prayer from which we have quoted above is preserved in the last-named sacramentary as a *Benedictio Uvæ* (Muratori, tom. ii. col. 109). The oldest MS. of the Gelasian does not reach beyond the eighth century, nor that of the Gregorian beyond the ninth; but we have proof that the custom was known in the West before the eighth century, and therefore that the recognition of it in the Roman sacramentaries was not an interpolation of that period. The prayer above cited from the Gelasian occurs with the title, *Benedictio omni (sic) creaturæ (sic) Pomorum*, in the manuscript Gallican sacramentary, written in the seventh century, if not earlier, found by Mabillon in the monastery at Bobio, in Italy, and probably carried thither from Luxeuil by its founder, St. Columbanus, A.D. 613, or by one of his followers (see the *Musacum Italicum*, tom. i. p. 390; or Muratori, u. s. tom. ii. col. 959). In the *Lectiary* of Luxeuil, another happy discovery of Mabillon, we find the Eucharistic lessons *Ad Missam de novis Fructus (sic)*. The prophecy is taken from Joel ii. 21–27; the epistle from 1 Cor. ix. 7–15; and the gospel from St. John, vi. 49–52 (*De Liturgiâ Gallicanâ*, p. 161). From this coming after the *Legenda* of the Passion of St. John the Baptist, Sept. 24 (*Liturg. Gall.* p. 458), and from the internal evidence of the lessons, we infer that it is the benediction of the new corn for which provision is here made. The rite was probably carried by our countryman Boniface (Winfred), A.D. 723, with the common Roman offices, to his converts in Germany; for we find the Gelasian benedictions of fruit, &c., with certain others, among the *Monumenta Veteris Liturgiae Alemannicæ*, published by Gerbert (Part I. p. 307). A very brief example peculiar to this collection may be given:—"Bless, O Lord, this fruit of new trees, that they who use thereof may be sanctified; through, &c." It is interesting to add that similar benedictions were practised in our own country. In the pontifical of Egbert, who became archbishop of York in 732, are the six following formularies:—(i.) *Benedictio ad omnia quæ sunt coherens*; (ii.) *Benedictio ad Fruges novas*; (iii.) *Benedictio Pomorum*; (iv.) *Alia*; (v.) *Benedictio Panis novi*; (vi.) *Alia*. There is, of course, no mention of grapes, nor is the Gelasian prayer that we have cited given with any other application. Of the above, ii. and v. are not in the Roman sacramentaries. The last runs thus: "Bless, O Lord,



this creature of bread, as Thou didst bless the five loaves in the wilderness, that all who taste thereof may receive health both of body and of soul; through, &c." (*Pontificals Egberti*, p. 115; ed. Surtees Society, 1854).

It will be perceived that in the West, as well as East, the offering of first-fruits as a token of gratitude to the Giver of All soon degenerated into a mode of asking for a blessing on the consumption of His gifts. It should be understood, also, that both in the East and West the first-fruits brought to be blessed were left for the use of the priests. "It is becoming and expedient," says Origen, A.D. 230, "that the first-fruits be offered also to the priests of the Gospel." "For if one believed that the fruits of the earth were given to him by God, he would surely know how to honour God from His gifts and benefits by giving thereof to the priests" (*Rom. xi. in Num. § 2*, tom. x. pp. 105, 106; ed. Lommatsch). Similarly St. Jerome, commenting on Ezekiel xlv. 30: "The first-fruits of our sheaves are offered to the priests; that we may taste nothing of the new fruits, before the priest has tasted them. For we do this, that the priest may lay up a blessing and our offering in his house; so that the Lord may bless our houses at his prayer."

We have already quoted a rubric from the Gelasian sacramentary, which orders that the benediction of fruits shall take place "a little before the end of the canon." The prayer was inserted immediately after the words, "not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences" (now in our first Post-Communion Collect), and immediately before the concluding clause, "through Jesus Christ our Lord." This clause (altered in this manner, "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ") was thus made to close the benediction. After it the priest added, "Per quem hæc omnia, Domine, semper bona crura, sanctificas, vivificas, benedixisti at præstas nobis, Per ipsum," &c. These words are now a permanent part of the canon; but they do not seem to belong to it. The words, "hæc omnia" cannot with any propriety be applied to the eucharistic elements alone. Hence some ritualists, as e.g. Granelas (*Anciennes Liturgies*, p. 657), and De Vert (*Explic. des Cérémon.* tom. iv. Remarque xxx.), &c., suppose that this doxology was at first only used when other things were offered to be blessed, and formed no part of the service of the mass. Le Brun (*Explication*, p. iv. art. xvi.), Bonn (*Rev. Lit.* l. 2, c. xiv. § 7.), D'Achery (*Spicil.* tom. iv. Præf.), and others, maintain that it was a constant part of the liturgy, but that when there was a benediction of fruits, it applied to them as well as to the elements. [W. E. S.]

**FRONTAL** (*Frontalis* or *Frontalis*) is defined by Lindwood to be "apparatus pendens in fronte altaris, qui alias dicitur *Pala*." [*ALTAR-CLOTH*; *ANTEPENDIUM*.] The word is not uncommon in ancient documents. Thus, for instance, a charter of Chindasvinta, king of the Goths, of the year 645 A.D. (quoted by Ducange, a. v.) runs: "offerimus . . . vestimenta altaris omnia ad plenum, sive *frontalia*, sive *principalia* . . ." A later charter, quoted by the same authority, speaks of "quatuor *frontales* de serico." [C.]

**FRONTO**. (1) Abbot, martyr at Alexandria;

commemorated April 14 (*Mart. Hieron., Adria., Usuardi*).

(2) [FELIX (5).]

(3) Bishop at Petragurum; commemorated Oct. 25 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FRUCTUOSA**. [DOXATOS (3).]

**FRUCTUOSUS**, bishop, martyr at Tarragona with Augurinus and Eulogius, deacon, in the time of Gallienus; commemorated Jan. 21 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**FRUCTUS MEDII TEMPORIS**. [VACANT.]

**FRUMENTIUS**. (1) Martyr in Africa with Victorinus and another Frumentius, under Hunericus; commemorated March 23 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) or Salama; commemorated Maskarrum 23 = Sept. 20 (*Cal. Ethiop.*) [SALAMA]. [W. F. G.]

**FUGITIVES** (from a monastery). Monastic codes shew that their framers had to guard on the one hand against a leniency which might encourage desertion on the part of monks tired of their seclusion and eager for the world, and on the other against a severity which might close the door too fast against deserters wishing to be readmitted. The rule of Benedict, as always, is very lenient on this point. A monk who escapes from a monastery, like one who is expelled, is to be received again if he vows amendment, even after three desertions (*Reg. Ben. c. 28*, cf. *Reg. Cuj. ad Verc. c. 31*), but only into the lowest grade (*Reg. Ben. ib. cf. Reg. Pasch. c. 79*, *Reg. Præf. c. 20*, *Reg. Cuj. ib.*). Some commentators, indeed, take this rule as implying, that the abbot may readmit even after a fourth desertion, though the culprit has no right to require it (*Martens, Reg. Comment. in loc.*). But later commentators (e.g. Menard, *Hæfies*) interpret it more strictly (*Martens, Reg. Comm. ib.*). The first council of Orleans, A.D. 511, censures abbots lenient to fugitive monks, or who receive monks from other monasteries (*Conc. Aurel. i. c. 19*). The second council of Tours, A.D. 567, allows fugitives to be re-admitted on doing penance.

In the same spirit of wise tolerance Benedict is silent as to the steps to be taken to bring back the fugitive, apparently judging it best to leave him alone, if without any desire to return (*Mart. Reg. Comm. ib.*). But Ferrolus prescribes that the fugitive is to be recalled (*Reg. Ferr. c. 20*), and Fructuosus forbids him to be admitted into another monastery; and orders him to be brought back, by force if necessary, as a criminal, with hands tied behind his back (*Reg. Præf. c. 30*). It was enacted by Justinian that a monk returning to the secular life should be degraded by the bishop and governor of the province from his civil position, and be sent back with his worldly goods to his monastery; if he deserted again, he was to be drafted into the army (*Novell. 125*). A similar decree was passed by the seventh council of Toledo, A.D. 645 (*Conc. Tolet. c. 5*). The second council of Constantinople, A.D. 553, sentenced an abbot who should be remiss in seeking to bring back the stray sheep into the monastic fold to deprivation.

Later enactments are very severe against fugi-

tives. The Clisterian rule forbids the reception even into the lowest rank of a monk who has deserted twice, or has stayed away more than eleven days. The renegade is in any case to wear a distinctive dress, as badge of his disgrace, and to be excluded from the choir; the abbat who fails to enforce this rule is to do penance. The original statutes of the Carthusians unrook the renegade; the modern compel him to resume the dress of his order. The Augustinian rule tempers severity with mercy. The renegade is to live outside the monastery itself, but under the care of the bishop, and the abbat is to shew kindness to him, if penitent (*Mart. Reg. Comm.* in loc. cit.). [L. G. S.]

**FULGENTIUS**, bishop in Africa; commemorated Jan. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vat.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**FUNERAL**. [BURIAL OF THE DEAD; OMBQUINE.]

**FUNERAL-PEAST**. [CATACOMBS, p. 312; CELLA MEMORIAE.]

**FUNERAL-SERMONS** (*Epitaphia*, λόγοι θανάτου). Christians followed the old custom of many of the heathen nations, of holding an oration over the remains of famous men departed [BURIAL OF THE DEAD, p. 253]. To say nothing of the discourses—triumphal rather than sorrowing—delivered over the remains of martyrs, Gregory of Nyssa held funeral orations on the death of the empress Pulcheria and Placilla, and of bishop Meletius. On the death of Constantine the Great, several bishops celebrated his praises, conspicuous among whom was Eusebius of Caesarea. Gregory of Nazianzen exercised his pathetic eloquence over the bier of his brother Caesarius, of his father and his sister, and over that of Basil the Great; Ambrose preached on the death of his brother Satyrus, of Valentinian, and of Theodosius.\* The tone of these orations is, for the most, eulogistic of the "famous men" through whom "the Lord hath wrought great glory" (*Ecclus.* xlii. 1, 2).

Jerome (*Epist. ad Heliod.* c. 1) says that the old custom was for sons to speak the funeral orations over parents. He alludes here probably to a pagan custom, of which there are many examples (*Kirchmann, De Fam. Rom.* lib. ii. c. 28); but Christianity also (as we have seen) furnishes examples of a similar practice. Nor were the clergy the only orators in such cases; Constantine himself did not disdain to pronounce a funeral oration on one of his court, in which, says Eusebius (*Vita Const.* iv. 55) he spoke of the immortality of the soul, of the blessings of the righteous, and the misery of the wicked.

Funeral sermons were not always delivered at the time of the burial, though some—as several of Gregory Nazianzen's—contain indications that they were so delivered. Eusebius (*Vita Const.* iv. 71) gives us to understand that the funeral orations over Constantine were delivered while the remains of the departed lay in state on a lofty bier [FUNERUM]. Ambrose evidently delivered his sermon over Satyrus (see § 78) while the body was yet waiting to be carried to the grave. His oration on Valentinian, on the con-

trary, was delivered two months (see *Opera*, B 1176, ed. Bened.), that on Theodosius forty days, after the death of the person commemorated. The death of bishop Meletius was the occasion of sermons everywhere (Theodoret, *H.E.* v. 8); that of Gregory of Nyssa was probably delivered on the day when the remains of Meletius, brought from Constantinople, were received at Antioch. That of Chrysostom on the same bishop, was delivered on the fifth anniversary of his death. The oration of Gregory Nazianzen on Basil was delivered over his tomb on the first anniversary of his death, in the presence (it is said) of 150 bishops.

When the sermon took place at the time of a commemorative service for the dead, it probably took place at the point in the liturgy where the sermon was ordinarily introduced. The Pseudo-Dionysius (*Hierarch. Eccl.* c. 7) speaks of the funeral-sermon being delivered after the catechumens had departed, but while the penitents remained. The eulogy of Hilary of Arles on Honoratus (quoted by Binterim, vi. lii. 442), which proves incidentally that the corpse was carried uncovered, and that the people pressed round to kiss the face, or the coffin of the illustrious dead—was probably delivered at the end of some office. The orations over the remains of Constantine were clearly delivered after the funeral service (*Euseb. a. s.* iv. 71; Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vi. lii. 435, ff.). [C.]

**FURNACE**. In Bottari (clxxvi. 6) the three Hebrew brethren are represented standing in something like a kiln or smelting furnace (see woodcut); also cxcv. and perhaps cxlii. In: also in Parker's photographs from the catacomb of St. Marcellinus. The furnace is literally insisted on, in a way which, as it appears to the



author, may possibly have been adopted from one of the ostrica (or ac) used for cremation in Rome. One of these, or its remains or traces, the author believes he saw in Pompeii, Christmas 1859. See Murray's *Handbook for South Italy*, p. 327.

[R. St. J. T.]

**FURSEAS**, bishop, confessor at Perouse; commemorated Jan. 16 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

[W. F. G.]

**FUSCIANUS**, martyr at Amiens; commemorated Dec. 11 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

[W. F. G.]

**FUSCOLUS**. (1) Bishop, martyr at Orleans; commemorated Feb. 2 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) [DONATIANUS (2)]

[W. F. G.]

\* We might almost include in funeral orations Jerome's *Epitaphium Nepotiani*, though it is in form a letter to Heliodorus.

## G

**GABALUM, COUNCIL OF** (*Gabulitum concilium*), at which the wife of the count of Auvergne was condemned for adultery, says Sir H. Nicolas (*Chron.* p. 222), A.D. 590. Gabalum, where it was held, was not far from Mende, on the river Lot (*Uall. Christ.* i. 93). [E. S. Yf.]

**GABATHA or GABATA.** A name of pen-  
sile lamps suspended in churches. The word is of  
uncertain orthography and etymology. We find  
the forms *Grubata*, *Gavata*, and *Curata*, which last  
points to the derivation given by Isidore His-  
palensis (*Etymol. lib. xx. c. 4*) from *carus*  
"hollow." The original meaning of the word is  
"a dish" or "bowl;" in which sense it is used  
by Martial (*Epigr.* vii. 47; xi. 32), and of which  
the Glossary of Ducange furnishes abundant ex-  
amples. From its shape it came to be employed  
for a lamp, which is its most usual ecclesiastical  
signification. The annexed woodcut from Macri



Gabatha, from Macri.

shows one of two bowl-shaped *gabathas* preserved  
in the pontifical chapel of the Lateran, in which  
in his time a wax light was always burning  
before the sacrament. *Gabathas* frequently occur  
in the catalogues of papal gifts to the churches  
of Rome contained in Anastasius. Thus Leo III.  
(A.D. 795-816) gave to the basilica of St. Peter's  
15 *gabathas* of purest gold set with gems, to  
hang on the screen (*pergula*) before the altar  
(§ 382), and 6 of silver with an appended cross  
to hang before the Arch of Triumph, 3 on each  
side (§ 389). These *gabathas* were of different  
metals, gold, silver, brass, and electrum. They  
were frequently embossed (*maglyphis* § 392,  
&c.), or decorated in bas-relief (*interrantes*), and  
ornamented with lilies (*lilutae*) heads of gry-  
phons (§ 368) or lions (as in the woodcut), or  
even fashioned in the form of that animal "in  
modum leonia." Like the *coronas* used for light-  
ing, they very often had crosses attached to  
them (*signochristas*, § 418, &c.). The epithet  
*filipices* is frequently applied to *gabathas* in  
Anastasius, and would seem, from a comparison  
with the expression *puri filo* (Lucr. ii. 341), to  
signify of equal size or thickness. The epithet  
*auriculae* or *aurumae* is interpreted by Ducange  
to mean of Saxon workmanship; but this inter-  
pretation is precarious. [E. V.]

**GABINIUS.** (1) Presbyter, and martyr at  
Rome in the time of Diocletian; commemorated  
Feb. 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr in Sardinia with Crispulus, under  
Adrian; commemorated May 30 (*ib.*) [W. F. G.]

CHIEVE, ART.

**GABRA.** (1) Mantu Kodus (*i. e.* servant of  
the Holy Spirit), saint of Ethiopia; commemo-  
rated Magabit 5 = March 1 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(2) Maskal (*i. e.* servant of the Cross), king of  
the Ethiopians; commemorated Hedra 30 = Nov.  
24 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [W. F. G.]

### GABRIEL, IN ART. [ANGEL]

**GABRIEL**, the archangel: commemorated  
March 26 and July 13 (*Cal. Byzant.*); Magabit  
30 = March 26, Senne 13 = June 7, Texas 19 =  
Dec. 15 (*Cal. Ethiop.*); also with John, July 12  
(*Cal. Georg.*), and with Michael and All Angels,  
Nov. 8 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

**GAIANA**, and companions, virgin-martyrs;  
commemorated June 4 (*Cal. Armen.*) [W. F. G.]

**GAIVS**, saint at Bologna; commemorated  
with Aggeus and Hermes, Jan. 4 (*Mart. Usa-*  
ardi). See CAIVS. [W. F. G.]

### GALACTION. [EPISTEME.]

**GALATA**, martyr at Militana in Armenia,  
with Aristonicus, Caina, Expeditus, Hermogenes,  
Rufus; commemorated April 19 (*Mart. Rom.*  
*Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

### GALILAEAL [FAITHFUL.]


### GALILEE. [NARTHEX.]

**GALNABIS** (also *Galnape*, *Galnapes* [*Isid.*  
*Hispal. Etym.* xix. 25], *Gunnape*). This is a kind  
of rough blanket or rug, forming part of the  
furniture of a monk's couch, which according to  
the *Rule* of St. Isidore is to include "storea et  
stragulum, pellesque lanatae donec, galnabis  
quoque et facistergium, geminacque ad caput  
pavillus" (*Regula S. Isidori*, c. 14; in Hol-  
stenius, *Codes Regularum*, part 2, p. 127, ed.  
Paris, 1663). Similarly the *Rule* of Fructuosus,  
bishop of Bracara in Spain, speaks of "calinaes  
villatus" (c. 4; *op. cit.* part 2, p. 139). The  
*galnabis* was apparently used sometimes as an  
article of personal dress, for in the testament  
of Caesarius, bishop of Arles, we read "simul  
cum casula villosa et tunica vel galnape, quod  
melius dimisero" (*Patrol.* lxxvii. 1140).

The etymology of the word is doubtful: we  
may perhaps connect it with the word *gaunacum*,  
used by Varro, and possibly also with the Greek  
*γαινάριον*, *γαινάριον*, which is defined by Hesychius  
(under the latter spelling) *στρώματι*, § *ἐπι-*  
*βάσει* *ἐντρομαλῇ*. Another derivation has  
been suggested, connecting the word with *galba-*  
*nus*, and making it descriptive of the colour,  
but this is very improbable. For further refer-  
ences, see Ducange's *Glossarium* s. v. [R. S.]

**GALLERIES.** The only galleries known in  
early ecclesiastical architecture were construc-  
tional integral parts of the building, not additions  
to it. In this they corresponded to the tribuna  
of mediaeval churches, which in their original  
idea were galleries for the reception of worship-  
pers or auditors, for which purpose they are  
still used in Germany, and where they exist in  
Italy (*e.g.* St. Ambrogio at Milan), and to some  
extent in England. The first Christian churches  
in the West were either basilicas, or buildings  
erected on the basilican plan, and they naturally  
retained the upper gallery, running entirely  
round the building above the principal colonnade,

for the accommodation of spectators, men on the side and women on the other, which we know to have formed an essential portion of the basilican arrangement (Vitruv. v. 1). Like them



No. 1. Section of the Basilica of St. Agnes, Rome.

the church galleries were reached by an outside staircase, and were protected towards the nave by a low wall or balustrade (*pilae*). The only Roman basilican churches that exhibit this arrangement are those of St. Agnes (fig. 1),



No. 2. Section of St. Michele, Pavia.

St. Laurence, in its more ancient portion, and the church of the Quattro Santi Coronati, on the Coelian. A similar upper gallery occurs also in the Lateran baptistery of Constantine. The passion for mosaic pictures of sacred subjects led to the abolition of this gallery in the basilican churches, the space it should have occupied being devoted to pictorial representations, as at St. Maria Maggiore, St. Paul's, and the old St. Peter's, at Rome (see illustrations on pages 370, 371), and S. Apollinare in Classe, and St. Apollinare Nuovo, at Ravenna. But it reappeared in the early Lombard churches, as at S. Ambrogio at Milan, and S. Michele at Pavia (fig. 2), where there are well developed triflorial galleries. But the arrangement never took root in Italy, and was soon lost.


In the East, when the "dromic" or basilican form was adopted, it carried with it the upper gallery above the side aisles. Of this we have an example in the church of St. John at Constantinople (A.D. 463), illustrated in Salsenburg's work. The domical church of the lesser Santa

Sophia, (or SS. Sergius and Basilina,) erected by Justinian (fig. 3), also exhibits a gallery or upper story running all round it. In the churches, in what is commonly known as the Byzantine style, of which St. Sophia is the most magnificent example, the side gallery played a very important part. There is a good example in the church of St. Vitale, at Ravenna (see woodcut, p. 376).

Its usual designation was *gymnecōnitis*, from being the place where the women were accommodated. It was also called the *catechismarion*, because the women assembled there to listen to instruction (Leo. *Norvell*. 73, apud Ducange *Constantinopol. Christ.*), or simply "the upper chambers," *ὑψηλὰ* (Paul. Silent. i. 256). These galleries ran along the side of the *trapeza* or nave, sometimes quite up to the sanctuary or *bema*. The Pseudo-Amphilochius records that St. Basil, having detected a woman making signs to the deacon attending upon him at the altar, gave orders that curtains should be hung over the gallery to prevent such indecorum.

The women's galleries at St. Sophia are of vast size (fig. 4), ranged to the north and south

of the central area, occupying the upper story of the transeptal space. Each gallery is supported by four monolithic columns of Egyptian granite, and is itself faced by an arcade of six smaller



No. 3. Section of the Church of SS. Sergius and Basilina, Constantinople.

pillars. The galleries are vaulted and parged with marble, and protected towards the church by a low marble wall, four feet high, shaped



like a desk, on which, according to Paul the Silentary, the women reposed their arms.

*"Εἰς καθίσματα*

*ἀρσενόεσσιν ἀγίασμα ἐνταπεινωτο γυναικῶν.—i. 262.*

of the cupola. On the same level as the women's galleries, further east, were two large vaulted apartments to the right and left of the bema, in one of which the empress had her position with




FIG. 4. Section of St. Sophia, Constantinople.

These galleries were approached by external staircases contained in the immense buttresses | her ladies at the time of divine service. In the Eastern church the women's gallery by degrees

2 2 2

became disused, the *marthex* serving its purpose. (Ducange, *Constantinopol. Christ.* lib. iii. c. 38-40; Willis, *Arch. of the Middle Ages*, p. 109, sqq.; Neale, *Eastern Church*, art. i.; Evag. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 31; Paul. *Silentiar.* i. 256-263; ii. 125.) [E. V.]

**GALLICAN COUNCILS**; councils known to have been celebrated in France, but at some place unknown.

1. A.D. 355. At Poitiers or Toulouse possibly: where St. Hilary, writing to the Easterns A.D. 360, says he five years before then with the bishops of France withdrew from the communion of the Arian bishops Ursacius and Valens, and of Saturninus of Arles, who had espoused their cause. The opening chapters of his work addressed to Constantius are thought, in short, to have emanated from this council (Mansi, iii. 251).

2. A.D. 376. At least there seems a reference to one such in a law of that year, dated Treves, in B. xvi. tit. ii. § 23, of the Theodosian code; but it is not known where or for what object (Mansi, iii. 499).

3. A.D. 444, in which Hilary of Arles presided, and Chelidonius of Besançon, where this council may have met therefore, was accused of being husband of a widow and deposed. On appealing however to St. Leo he was restored; as having been condemned on a false charge. Both their letter to him and his answer are preserved among his epistles (*Ep.* xcix. and cii.; comp. Mansi, vii. 873).

4. A.D. 678, at some place unknown: when St. Leodegar or Leger bishop of Autun was degraded as having been accessory to the death of king Childeric II. five years before (Sirmond, *Conc. Gall.* i. 510; comp. Mansi, xi. 173 and 1095).

5. A.D. 678 or 679, against the Monothelites: as appears from the reference made to it by the Gallican bishops subscribing to the Roman synod under pope Agatho, preserved in the 4th act of the 6th council (Mansi, xi. 175 and 306), but they do not say where.

6. A.D. 796, at Tours possibly, where Joseph, bishop of Mans and a suffragan of Tours, was deposed for cruelty (Mansi, xiii. 991).

7. Three more councils may be grouped under this head, usually called councils of Auvergne, but this name is misleading, as it means the town formerly so called, not the province. When, however, the town changed its name to Clermont, councils held there subsequently were styled by its new name, while the earlier retained its old. We may save confusion, therefore, by classing them under Gallican. Of these the first met 8th November, A.D. 535, in the second year of king Theodebert, and passed sixteen canons, to which fifteen bishops, headed by Honoratus, metropolitan of Bourges, subscribed: his suffragan of Auvergne subscribing second. Their canons deprecate lay influences in the appointment of bishops, and lay interference between bishops and clergy. No furniture belonging to the church may be used for private funerals or marriages. The appointment of Jews as judges, and marriages between Jews and Christians are denounced. Presbyters and deacons marrying are to be deposed. In a collective note to king Theodebert, the bishops entreat that neither the clergy, nor others,

living in his dominions may be robbed of their rightful possessions, and in their fifth canon they declare all spoliations of church property null and void, and the spoilers excommunicate, wherever it occurs. Several other canons are given to this council by Burchard (Mansi, viii. 859-67).

The second, A.D. 549, was attended by ten bishops, but only to receive the canons passed at the 5th council of Orleans (Mansi, ix. 141-4).

The third, A.D. 588, was occupied solely with a dispute between the bishops of Rhodes and Cahors (Mansi, ix. 973). [E. S. Ff.]

**GALLICANUS**, martyr at Alexandria under Julian; commemorated June 25 (*Mart.* Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**GALLICIA COUNCIL OF**, held A.D. 447 or 448, in the province of that name in Spain on the north-west against the Priscillianists: in consequence perhaps of the letter of St. Leo to Turribius, bishop of Asturia, who had appealed to him for advice (*Ep.* xv.; comp. Mansi, vi. 491); but is that letter genuine? [E. S. Ff.]

**GALLUS**, presbyter and confessor in Germany; commemorated Feb. 20 (*Mart.* Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**GAMALIEL**, invention of his relics at Jerusalem, Aug. 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

#### GAMING. [DICE.]

**GAMING-TABLE** (*Tabula lusoria*, *παιζοθήριον*). Besides the natural feeling which led the survivors to place in the tombs articles dear to the deceased in his lifetime, the comparison of the life of man to a game of chance was a familiar thought to the ancients. We may trace it through all their literature, whether Greek or Roman (see Raoul-Rochette, *Mém. de l'Académie des inscript.* tom. xiii. p. 634). Hence astragali and dice occur more frequently in the Greek and Roman tombs of the Campagna than playthings of any other description, though the amusements of every age and condition are there represented. The dice (*tali*, *tesserae*,) are usually made of ivory, occasionally of bone; the dice-box (*fritillus*, *turricula*) is generally of ivory, and the gaming-table marble.

Five of these gaming-tables have come down to our times with inscriptions which leave no doubt of their use. It is a curious circumstance that in several Christian cemeteries in Rome sepulchral niches have been found closed with



these marble gaming-tables, as occasionally with other incised marbles. One of the tables taken from the cemetery of Basilla may be seen in the Kircher museum, and was first described by Lupi (*Dissert. in nuper invent. Severae epitaph.* p. 57, tab. ix. n. 6). An engraving of it is given above

The inscription, which was turned inside the tomb, is easily read: VICTVS LIBERTVS | LYDERVS  
MIRIS | DA LYBORI LOCV |

Boldetti (*Osservazioni*, p. 449) gives a second from the cemetery of St. Agnes bearing the following inscription: DOMINE FRATER  
|| ILARVS SEMPER || LYDERVS  
TABVLA |—; also a dice-box found elsewhere, used for the same game. The interior of the box is here shown, divided into three sections as a security against fraud in throwing; two dice are lying at the bottom.



A third table of the same kind from the Capponi museum is reproduced in Muratori's collection (I. DCCLII 3), and bears an inscription almost identical with the foregoing: SEMPER IN RANC | TABVLA HILARE  
| LYDAMVS AMICI |. The fourth table, from the cemetery of Calixtus, is given by Marangoni (*Acta S. Victorini* in append. p. 140). The words of the inscription, though evidently relating to play, are difficult of interpretation. Of the remaining table the place of discovery is uncertain. Cardinal Passolunghi (*Insor. Ant. appendit.*, p. 176) transcribes a gaming-table inscription which Roesch-Rochette quotes as an additional example, but it appears more likely to be that of the Kircher museum incorrectly copied.

These having all been discovered in Christian sepulchres, it seems natural to suppose that they were in use amongst Christians. Nothing in the gaming-tables themselves, nor in their inscriptions militates against such a supposition; and in fact it is well known that the business of making dice, and articles of a similar nature, was one followed by Christians. Boldetti, for instance, gives (p. 416) a Christian sepulchral inscription over an ARTIFEX ARTIS TIBICINARIE, who is generally considered to have been a maker of dice. (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chréti.*, s. v. "Jeu, Table de.") See DICE. [C.]

**GAMMADIA** (γαμμαδία, or γαμμαδία). A cruciform ornament, embroidered on the borders or woven into the texture of ecclesiastical vestments, both in the West and East. It takes its name from being composed of four capital gammas (Γ) placed back to back, thus forming a voided

Greek cross. The gammas were also sometimes placed face to face, so as to constitute a hollow square, in the centre of which a cross was inscribed. Vestments so decorated were known by the name of *poly-stauron* (πολυσταύρος). St. Nicholas and St. Basil are depicted in robes (thus termed of crosses) in the illustrations to Ducange (*Gloss. Græc.* fig. vii.). Balsamon assigns, among other marks of the patriarchal dignity, the "robe distinguished by gamma," *ἐν γαμμαδίων περιβόλον* (*de Patriarch.* p. 446). These crosses were peculiar to the white eucharistic vestments, those of a purple colour being destitute of them (Ducange, s. v. *πολυσταύρος*). In the Western church the word *gamma* is of frequent occurrence in the later papal biographies in Anastasius, in the lists of offerings made to the basilicas and churches, e.g., Leo III., among

gifts to the church of St. Simeon, gave a purple vestment, "*habentem in medio arcum de chrysoclaue, . . . atque gammaδίων in (pau) arcu chrysoclaue quatuor*" (§ 386), and Leo IV. to the church of St. Mary at Anagni, "*vestem . . . cum gammaδίων aure textis*" (§ 536). These gammaδία were of gold, others were of silver (§ 397), or of Tyrian velvet (§ 462), (cf. Geor. *Eucholog.* p. 315, col. 2). Not gamma alone but other letters also are frequently seen embroidered on the borders of the robes of the sacred personages represented in early Christian mosaics and frescoes, especially H. I. T. X. The precise meaning of these marks has not been satisfactorily determined (cf. Bosio, *Rom. Selt.* c. xxviii. p. 636). [LETTERS ON VESTMENTS.] [E. V.]

**GANGRA (COUNCIL OF)**, for which widely different dates have been assigned; some placing it before that of Nicaea, some not long after; others indefinitely, between it and that of Antioch, A.D. 341 (see the notes of Valens and Reading on Soc. II. 43, and Manal. II. 1085): all which discrepancies may be traced to the fact that one of the Latin versions of the synodical letter addressed by the assembled bishops to their colleagues in Armenia contains the name of Hosius of Corduba amongst the former. But the episcopate of Hosius, as Cave shews (*Hist. Lit.* l. v.), extends over a period of seventy years, ending with A.D. 361: accordingly Pagi finds it possible to place this council as late as A.D. 358 and admit Hosius to have been there, on his way back to Spain. And this was unquestionably the year of the council, as we shall see from other considerations, so that the absence of his name in the Greek heading of the letter need not be pressed. His presence was always coveted by the Easterns; but as his name occurs among the last on the list, we may assume that he attended in no other capacity than that of a simple bishop. The object of holding the council is stated in its synodical epistle to have been to condemn the errors of Eustathius—otherwise written Eustasius or Eustachius—and his followers; and him Socrates and Sozomen are doubtless correct in making identical with Eustathius bishop of Sebaste in Armenia Minor—else why should the bishops of either Armenia have been addressed on the subject? The father of bishop Eustathius was Eulalius bishop of Caesarea, or rather Neo-Caesarea, in Pontus, and it was at a council held there under his own father this same year, according to Pagi, that he was first deposed. Sozomen indeed seems to say that he had been already condemned as a prebiter by his father; if so, this would account for the severity of the new sentence passed upon him, particularly had he been propagating his errors as bishop in his father's see. Then, on his resisting this sentence, as there seems fair reason for supposing he would, his father would naturally have recourse to the provincial synod, which we may assume to have met on this occasion at Gangra, as the first bishop on the list is Eusebius, clearly the metropolitan of Caesarea in Cappadocia, whom St. Basil succeeded, and in whose jurisdiction Gangra lay, while the name of Eulalius occurs further on. Dios (probably Dianius, the predecessor of Eusebius, is intended) whom the *Liberellus synod-*

few asserts to have presided, is not found in either version. Gangra therefore was held to confirm what had passed at Neo-Cæsarea respecting Eustathius. The similarity of names seems to have led Sozomen to assert that he was first deposed by Eusebius of Constantinople, who died as far back as A.D. 342; and Socrates, who says in one place (ii. 43) that the synod of Gangra was subsequent to the Constantinopolitan synod of A.D. 360, contradicts himself in the very next chapter by telling us that Meletius succeeded Eustathius at Sebaste, and then either as bishop of Sebaste or Berœa—it does not much matter which—attended the council of Seleucia, which we know met A.D. 359, and in so doing fixes the true date of the synod of Gangra, namely, midway between it and that of Neo-Cæsarea the year before. These places were not remote from each other; and it would appear that there had been synods held at Antioch, that, for instance, of A.D. 358 under Eudoxius, and at Melitene in Armenia, unfavourable to Eustathius, whose judgments he had set at naught equally with that of Neo-Cæsarea. Hence the greater solemnity with which that of Gangra was convened, far enhanced however by the weight which has attached to it ever since; Pope Symmachus in a Roman synod A.D. 504 going so far as to say that its canons had been framed by apostolic authority, meaning that of his see—in other words, that his predecessors had received and approved them (Pagi ad Baron. A.D. 318, n. v.). If there there are twenty in number, and almost all in condemnation of the errors ascribed to Eustathius and his followers in the synodical letter before mentioned, "forbidding to marry, commanding to abstain from meats," and so forth. Their reception by Rome lends additional interest to canon 4, which says: "Should any separate himself from a presbyter that has married—as though it were not right to partake of the oblation when he is celebrant—let him be anathema." And the epilogue, reckoned in some collections as a 21st canon, is worth transcribing, not only for "the admirable temper and good sense" which distinguishes it, as Mr. Johnson remarks (*Vind. Mæcum*, ii. 86), but because it may well be thought to account for their having been incorporated into the code of the universal church. The rulings of fifteen, or, if Hosius was there, sixteen bishops only, must have owed their place there to some great intrinsic excellence. "We commit these canons to writing," so they terminate, "not as if we would cut off those who exercise themselves in works of severity and mortification in the church of God according to the Scriptures; but those, who under pretence of such exercise, do insult those who live in a more plain and simple manner, and would bring in innovations contrary to the Scriptures and the canons of the church. We therefore admire virginity, if attended with humility and a regard for continence, if accompanied with true piety and gravity, and a retreat from worldly business, with a modest humble temper. But at the same time we honour honest marriage, nor do we despise riches when employed in good works and in doing justice. We commend a plain and coarse habit, without art or gaudiness, and have an aversion to all luxurious ostentation of apparel. We honour the houses of God, and affectionately embrace

the assemblies made therein as holy and beneficial; not as if we confined religion within those houses, but as having a respect to every place that is built to the name of the Lord, and approve of the church assemblies as being for the public good; and pronounce a benediction upon signal acts of charity done to our brethren, as being done to the poor of the church according to tradition; and to my all in a word, we cannot but wish that all things may be done in the church according to the traditions of Holy Scripture and the apostles." [E. S. FL.]

GARLANDS. [BAPTISM, p. 164; CROW, p. 511; FLOWERS.]

GARDEN OF EDEN. Represented by trees in various bas-reliefs of the Fall of Man, as on the tomb of Junius Bassus (Bottari, tav. xv. *Ac. Sc.*). A most ancient M.S. picture of the Garden of Eden occurs in the *Vernon MS.* of the Book of Genesis which is given by D'Agincourt. Professor Westwood has shown the present writer an extraordinary representation of the Fall of Man, from a Greek M.S. of the Old Testament now in the Vatican of the 7th or 8th century, where the garden is much dwelt on. There is a quadruped serpent or dragon looking up at the tree of knowledge. These pictures were brought to this country in facsimile by bishop Furber. [R. St. J. T.]

GARDEN OF GETHSEMANE. During the first four centuries and a half at least the subject of our Lord's passion seems to have been approached, but not entered upon—as by representations of the betrayal, the scene before Pilate, &c. In No. 90 of Professor Westwood's ivory carvings, he is brought before Pilate and Herod together, or perhaps Anna and Caiaphas. This is a part of the great casket of the Biblioteca Quiriniana at Braccia, and is referred to the 5th or 6th century, to the period immediately preceding that of the Rabula M.S. when the crucifixion began to be represented (see CRUCIFIX). The Garden of Gethsemane is one of the earliest of these approaches to actual delineation of our Lord's sufferings. The *M.S. Gospel of St. Augustine*, very possibly made use of by the bishop himself, contains a most interesting picture of the betrayal in the garden, which is represented not only by trees, but by a curious serpentine representation of the brook Kedron, bursting out of a rock like the Barada at Ain Fift, or the Jordan at Tell-el-Khady. This subject is carried on the casket of the Braccian library (Westwood, *Ivory casts*, No. 90), dating from the 5th or 6th century.

Indications of a garden occur in various Greek representations of the crucifixion combined with the resurrection. See crucifixion in the *Rabula M.S.* in Assmanni, *Bibl. Lat.-vnt. Catalogus*, where olive-trees are certainly intended.

In later MSS. it occurs in the *Bible of Akroth*, and in a M.S. given by count Bastard, which belonged to Drogon, grandson of Charlemagne.

[R. St. J. T.]

GATES OF CHURCHES. Our Lord's designation of Himself as "the Door" of His church (John x. 7, 9) impressed a deep religious significance in the minds of the early Christians on the entrances to their sacred buildings, which they evidenced by the care displayed in their construction and the richness of their ornaments—



them. As a rule the actual gates (anfores) of churches were of wood of the most excellent and durable kind. The doors of the basilica of St. Paul at Rome were, until its destruction by fire in 1823, of wood, roughly chiselled, and were reported to have been brought from Constantinople. The doors of the church of St. Sabina on the Aventine are of cypress wood, carved in relief with subjects from the Old and New Testaments. They are of great antiquity, though Mamachi, the annalist of the Dominican order, gives them too early a date in placing them before the 7th century. The church of the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai retains the ancient richly-carved doors of cypress wood erected by the emperor Justinian, stated by Mr. Carson to be as perfect as when first set up (Neale, *Hist. of East. Ch. Introd.* p. 258). Doors of wood were very commonly overlaid with plates of the precious metals and inlaid with ivory (Hieron. *Ep. ad Demetr.* viii.), for the purpose of decoration. These plates were frequently richly sculptured with scriptural subjects in relief. Thus Paulinus of Nola speaks of "aurea limina" (*Poem.* xiv. 98), and commends the piety of those who covered the doors of the church of St. Felix with metal plates—

"Hinc itaque praeclara obtinent limina lamina."  
(*Poem.* xviii. 34).

The papal memoirs of Anastasius supply requested references to this mode of ornamentation. [Doorn, § 3, p. 574.] The "portae argenteae" of St. Peter's are often mentioned. These were overlaid by pope Hadrian (A.D. 772-795) with silver-gilt plates embossed with the effigy of our Lord and others (Anastas. § 332). Pope Hilary (A.D. 461-467) erected silver gates at the Confessio of the basilica of Holy Cross, and gates of bronze inlaid with silver at the oratory of St. John Latejan (*It.* § 69). This last is an early example of those doors of bronze of which we have in later times so many magnificent examples, bearing representations of Biblical events in high relief, which reached their artistic climax in the western doors of the cathedral of Pisa and those of the baptistery, "le porte del Paradiso" at Florence. We have another early example in the gates of the "exo-narthex" of St. Sophia. These are of bronze exquisitely embossed with floriated crosses set in doorcases of marble. The great central doorway has above it an image of Christ in the act of giving benediction to a kneeling emperor with the virgin and St. John the Baptist on either hand. The chief entrance of the cathedral of Novgorod has bronze doors of very early date. They are described by Adelung (*Die Kirsun'schen Thüren zu Novgorod*) as 11 feet high by 3 feet broad, divided into 24 compartments containing scriptural reliefs.

Church doors were often furnished with inscriptions either upon or above them. These included texts of Scripture, doxologies, prayers, pious aphorisms, &c. Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.* xxxii. § 12) gives the following inscription placed by him over the principal entrance of the basilica of St. Felix:—

"Pax tibi est quicumque Dei penetralia Christi  
Pectore pacifico candidus ingrederis."

Above the entrance, he informs us, was a crowned cross with these lines:—

"Crux evocatum Deum super astra Christi  
Stare crucem daret respondentem orbi labori  
Praemia. Tolle crucem qui via astra evocasti."

The door of the outer basilica, which was entered through a garden or orchard, he also tells us, has these inscriptions on the outer face:—

"Corlastra intrate vias per amena viros  
Christicolae: et laetis ducet hinc ingressus ab hoste  
Unde sacrum meritum datur exitus in paradisum."

And this on the inner:—

"Quinquaginta ab anno Dei perfectis ordine votis  
Ingredieris, rursus corpora, corde manet."

Church doors were also often inscribed with the names of the builders and the date of the building. [E. V.]

**GATIANUS**, bishop and confessor in Toulouse; commemorated Dec. 18 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**GAUDENTIA**, virgin, saint at Rome; commemorated Aug. 30 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**GAUGERICUS**, bishop and confessor at Cambrai (†619 A.D.); commemorated Aug. 11 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**GAZA** is **PALENTINE** (COUNCIL OF), A.D. 541, to which Pelagius the first pope of that name, then a deacon and envoy from Rome, came by order of the Emperor Justinian, with letters ordering the deposition of Paul bishop of Alexandria, which was accordingly carried out (Maasi, ix. 708). [E. S. F.]

**GAZOPHYLACIUM**. The treasury or storehouse attached to a church, for the reception of the offerings of the faithful, made either in bread and wine, or in money, for the service of the altar, the sustentation of the ministers, or distribution among the poor (Possid. *Vit. S. Augustin.* c. 24). These oblations were deposited in the gazophylacium either after having been offered on the altar, or until enquiry had been made by the deacons whether the offerers were orthodox and persons of good life, that the table of the Lord might not be profaned by the gifts of the unbelly (Binus in *Can. iv. Apost. Labbe* i. 53). By the 93rd canon of the fourth council of Carthage, A.D. 399, the reception before enquiry even into "the gazophylacium or sacristarium" (the modern sacristy) was forbidden. Chrysostom (*Homil. 22 de Eleemos.*) speaks of treasures in the churches, *τὰ τοσφύλακα καὶ τὰ θησαυροφυλάκια*; Augustine appears to recognize their existence "quid est gazophylacium? Area Dei ubi colligebantur ea quae ad indigentiam servorum Dei mittebantur" (*Homil. in Ps. 63*); and Possidius in his life of that father (n. a.) records his having warned his hearers, as Ambrose had also done, of the neglect of the "gazophylacium and secretarium, from which the necessaries for the altar are brought into the church." Cyprian refers to the place of offering as *corbona* (*de Op. et Eleemos.* c. 5), and Paulinus of Nola, as *mensa*, which he complices stood too often for sight rather than use, "visui tantum non usui" (*Serm. de Gazophyl. Ep. 34*). [E. V.]

**GELASIUS**, martyr at Rome with Aquilinus, Donatus, Geminus, Magnus; commemorated Feb. 4 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**GEMELLIONES.** Among the vessels to be borne before the pope in the great Easter procession are mentioned (*Ordo Rom. I. c. 3*) "gemelliones argentei." The purpose of these is uncertain, but it seems probable that (like the "urceola argentea" mentioned elsewhere) they were water-vessels (Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, iv. i. 184). [C.]

**GEMINIANUS**, martyr at Rome with Lucia under Diocletian; commemorated Sept. 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi).

[W. F. G.]

**GEMINUS.** (1) Martyr in Africa with Aquilinus, Eugenius, Martianus, Quintus, Theodotus, Tripho; commemorated Jan. 4 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) [GELASIUS.]

[W. F. G.]

**GEMS** were employed in very early times for a great variety of ecclesiastical purposes, some articles being made wholly of stones more or less precious, and others being decorated therewith. Thus **CHALICES** and other sacred vessels were occasionally made of precious stones, but more frequently ornamented with them; and little crystal **FISH**, probably used as hospitable emblems, have been found in the catacombs of Rome. The walls, the **ALTARS**, the **ALTAR-CLOTHS**, the service-books [**LITURGICAL BOOKS**], and other furniture of churches were from the fourth century onward often ornamented with gold, silver, and precious stones, as were also **CROSSES** and the **CROWNS** and diadems of Christian sovereigns. In the following article, however, account will be taken of such gems only as are engraved, and these were mostly used as ornamental or signet rings, more rarely for other purposes.

The following passage of Clemens Alexandrinus (*Paed. ig. iii. 11*, p. 246D) is the *locus classicus* relating to Christian signet gems:—"A man should not wear the ring on the finger joint, for this is effeminate, but upon the little finger, as low down as possible; for the hand will thus be most free for action, and the seal least likely to slip off, as being guarded by the larger joint. But let our signet devices be a dove or a fish, or a ship coursing against the sky, or a musical lyre, which Polycrates employed, or a ship's anchor, which was the seal of Seleucus, or if it be a fisherman, it will remind us of an apostle and of boys saved from water." Subjects derived from heathen mythology or representations of weapons and drinking vessels he condemns as unfit for Christians. A little before he allows Christians only one ring as a signet, saying that all other rings should be eschewed: a wife also may have a gold signet ring for the safe keeping of her husband's goods.

The number of engraved stones which can be securely referred to the early Christian centuries is not very considerable, but their rarity has perhaps been somewhat exaggerated.\*

\* "Intagli representing purely Christian subjects are of the rarest possible occurrence, that is in works of indubitable antiquity" (King, *Antique Gems*, p. 352, London, 1860). Some that have been published are now known to be false (Martigny, *Dict.* p. 39). The Christian gems bearing Greek inscriptions have been published by Kirchhoff in Böckh's *Corp. Inscr. Græc.* ii. 9077-9109.

The principal subjects of extant works of this kind, including all those mentioned by Clement, are as follows; various specimens of each type are described at length, others more briefly.

(i.) *Christ as the Good Shepherd*.—This type, though not mentioned by Clement, deserves to hold the first place, being so often found in very early Christian works of art of different kinds. Mr. Fortnum, who observes that forgeries of this subject are frequent, describes and figures a red jasper in his own possession (purchased at Rome) in its original octagonal bronze setting: the shepherd is standing on his left leg, the right leg being bent; he supports himself by a staff in his hand, and holds out a branch (perhaps of olive, as a symbol of peace) to two sheep at his feet. Behind him is an olive (?) tree. Christian work of the third or fourth century (*Archaeological Journal*, xxvi. 141 [1869]; xxviii. 275 [1871]). The British Museum has seven intagli in which the Good Shepherd bears a lamb on his shoulders. In one of them (a tiny onyx) he stands between two fish, or rather perhaps between a fish and a palm-branch; in two others (red and brown jaspers) he holds a staff, having a dog at his feet, which looks up at him, a tree being behind; in a fourth (cornelian) are two dogs at his feet, looking up, and an obscure and barbarous legend, which has been read **ESIVKEV** (Hertz, *Cat. n. 2344*; King, *Ancient Gems*, p. 353), "in which the name of Jesus appears to be intended, together with some other appellation or title," perhaps *Lord* (**Κύριε**) *Jesus* (King, *Gnostics*, p. 142), or *Jesus, Son of God* (**ΙΕΣΣΥ ΒΕ ΤΕΥ**, Greek in Latin letters and barbarised); another of the same type (niccolo) has no legend: the sixth has only the shepherd bearing the lamb, but is inscribed **IH. XP.** (plasma); in the seventh (red jasper) he is accompanied by sheep and a dove on a tree. One in the Bibliothèque Impériale, in niccolo, set in a silver

Among them are several which may be referred with little or no doubt to a period later than that with which we are concerned; and as nothing is said about the probable antiquity of almost all of them, it has been necessary to employ the work with some caution. Possibly the books referred to under the particular gems may give some information upon this point. In the British Museum are contained upwards of twenty early Christian gems seen by the writer, and there may probably at this time (1874) be more. In various private collections in this country (as of Messrs. Fortnum, King, and Lewis) are contained a fair number of others. The Bibliothèque Impériale at Paris contained, in 1858, only eight purely Christian engraved stones, excluding Byzantine camei (Chaboullier, *Catal. pp. 191, 282*, who says that Christian intagli are "d'une grande rareté"). About fifty casts of Christian gems have been received from Signor Saulini, Via Babuino, Rome, some of which are in the Vatican, others in the Museo Vettori, now acquired for the Vatican; but the general absence of indication either of the collection or the kind of stone employed greatly detracts from their value: fourteen of them give the Good Shepherd, eight have an anchor (with or without accompaniments), three have a boat or ship, five bear a dove, others have fish (written in Greek, or depicted), the chrism, or the Cross. Others which are of large size, exhibiting the Crucifixion, or the figure of Christ or the Virgin, are probably later than 800 A.D. Among some casts from gems in Rome, received from Signor Odelli of Rome, are a few which are evidently Christian, the most remarkable being an intaglio representing the raising of Lazarus in a style of art like that which we have in the catacombs, where the same subject is represented.

ring, has the Good Shepherd as before bearing a sheep on his shoulders, with two other sheep at his feet (Chabouillet, *Cat.* p. 282, n. 2166). Another example, in red jasper, represents the shepherd still as before, having two dogs,



The Good Shepherd (King)

or rather perhaps having one dog and one sheep, at his feet and a star and crescent in the field, with retrograde legend IAMN, perhaps for *Jah* is his name. This fine gem is considered by Mr. King, who possesses it, to be a work of about the end of the second century. He considers "the Sun and Moon conjoined" as "emblems of

the Divine presence" (*Precious Stones*, pp. 160, 431); they may, however, be indications of astral genii, and if so, the gem may be the work of a Christian Gnostic. "The most interesting of all examples of this type," however, he observes (*Ant. Gems and Rings*, vol. ii. p. 30, London, 1872), "occurs on a large cornelian brought recently from the North of India (Col. Pearse), on which the Good Shepherd stands, bearing his lost and found lamb across his shoulders, surrounded by the mystic letters I.X.Θ.T.C., the reverse engraved with XPICTE CωZE KAPPIANON AEPOTE (sic): 'O Christ, save Carpianus for ever.' This is cut in exactly the same coarse lettering and similarly arranged in consecutive lines as the Gnostic legends of the fourth century." Three others are mentioned in Böckh's *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* One (n. 9084) figured by Perret (*Catac. de Rome*, iv. t. xvi. n. 12), where the shepherd bears a lamb accompanied by a dove and branch, and by an anchor and fishes, with legend IXΘTC; another (n. 9098), figured by Paciaudi (*De Baln. Christ.* on the title-page) in a square hematite, having on one side the Good Shepherd with two crosses, and a legend on the other, seemingly meant for 'Αγάθωα βοήθη; and a third (n. 9107), figured by Le Blant (*Bull. de l'Athén. Franç.* Feb. 1856, t. 1, n. 10), on plasma, where the Good Shepherd is accompanied by the legend AOTKI[OT], the owner of the gem. There are several other gems on which this subject is represented slightly differing from the preceding. (See note at the beginning.)

(ii.) The following five types are mentioned by

Clement; of which *Christ as the Fish* occurs perhaps more frequently than any other. The examples here given may suffice, but the enumeration might be extended. One on some burnt stone, figured by Mr. King, is of good early work, repre-



Fish. (King.)

senting some large-headed fish, and reads *bou-strophedon* HA EIC | 9X HI, i.e. *Jesus Christ is one God (El)*; see his ingenious remarks in *Ant. Gems and Rings*, ii. 27. A similar fish, accompanied by a crook and palm branch is on a sard preserved in the British Museum, which also contains the following intagli: A fish on which rests a cross; a dove on each limb IHCOTC above and


below, in a broken cornelian: <sup>b</sup> a fish upon which is a dove, a sprig behind her; to the left is the chrisma (✠) to the right the owner's name, RVFI, in cornelian: also

a fish well engraved, in an emerald set in a massive gold ring of angular form; on the opposite side, a dove seated on a branch between the letters AE | MI | LIA, cut on the bezel itself. An intaglio, the stone is not particularised, in the Kircherian Museum at Rome bears the engraving IXΘTC MT "around an anchor in

the loop between its lower arms, which are recurved, and upon the stem of which a fish is placed" (*Archaeol. Journ.* xxviii. 288 [1871]). A sard published by Le Blant has a representation of a fish, with IXΘTC (retrograde)

below it: the Copenhagen Museum possesses a gem having the same type and legend, but written in the usual way: and the legend only, the X being converted


into the chrisma, is found on a gem in the Vatican (Böckh, nos. 9083, 9085, 9086). The legend IXΘTC inclosed in a wreath is inscribed on a cornelian in the British Museum. A sard, figured by Ficoroni (*Gemm. litt.* t. xi.), has IXΘTC only. A very curious ancient gem, which is best mentioned in this place, is figured by Martigny (*Dict.* p. 546). It represents an



Fish supporting a Cross: Dove on each limb. (Brit. Museum.)



Fish, Dove, and Chrisma, inscribed RVFI. (Brit. Museum.)



Episcopal Chair. (Martigny.)

episcopal chair with legend IXΘ (for IXΘTC) inscribed upon it, besides a monogram on either side, as being the chair of Christ, in which the bishop sits. The same chalcedony is figured by Passeri, who has a dissertation upon it (*Thes. Gemm. Astrif.* iii. 221), and is now, having undergone various fortunes, in the Berlin Museum (Böckh, n. 9080).

Other gems which are of this type, but without any suggestive adjuncts, are either known or suspected to be Christian. Mr. King (*Gnostics*, pl. v. n. 3) figures a fish neatly engraved on a nic-

<sup>b</sup> Badly figured by Perret, u. s. n. 26, and misdescribed in Böckh, *C. J. G.* 9039.

culo, bearing the owner's name, T. ACI. AGLAVE, whom he regards as a Christian. The Uzielli Collection (Robinson's *Catal.* n. 393 [277]\*) had an intaglio of bloodstone in its original bronze setting, bearing a dolphin, which is considered to be "probably early Christian;" and Signor Castellani possesses a fine amethyst cameo<sup>1</sup> about 1½ inch by ½, presumed to be Christian, from one side of which, the more convex, a fish of the form of a carp projects boldly, the other side bearing the name of the possessor, VALENIAE, in incised letters. But the most interesting example of this kind is the episcopal ring of Arnulphus, consecrated bishop of Metz in A.D. 614, now preserved in the cathedral treasury; it is set with "an opaque milk-white cornelian," about half an inch in diameter, representing a fish whose head appears above the containing basket, on either side of which is a smaller fish: the work is presumed to be earlier than the fourth century. This is regarded by Cav. de Rossi as a curious illustration of a passage in Tertullian (*De Bapt.* c. 1): "Nos pisci-ouli secundum Piscem nostrum in aquis nascimur, nec nisi in aquis permanendo salvi sumus" (Pitra, *Spicil. Solesm.* tom. iii. p. 576, tab. iii. n. 4. Paris, 1855. Waterton in *Arch. Journ.* xx. 237 [1863]; Fortnum, *ibid.* xviii. 274 [1871]; Marriott, *Test. of Catac.* p. 123 [with a figure], Lond. 1870). This type occurs also in subordination to that of the anchor, about to be mentioned. Besides the gems of the fish type here enumerated, the writer is acquainted with the casts of some others, and would also direct the reader to Didron, *Christ. Icon.* p. 345 (Millington's transl. in *Bohn's Scient. Libr.*); Perret, n. a.; Martigny, *Dict. a. v.* "Poisson"; and Fortnum, *Arch. Journ.* xviii. 274, for further information and references. "De Rossi alone" [in his *De Christ. monum.* IXOTN exhib. in *Spicil. Solesm.* iii. 555, 576, 577; see Pitra's *Auct.* 578, Paris, 1855], says the last-named author, "describes about



Christianized Gryllus. (On the Collection of the writer.)

thirty genuine gems on which the fish and variations of the word IXOTC occur. Some others have since been found. . . . It is moreover," he tells us, "more frequently forged than perhaps any other." A remarkable sard intaglio, in the possession of the writer, may be mentioned as a kind of postscript.

The device is a fan-

\* The number in the brackets is that of the sale catalogue (compiled from Mr. Robinson's privately printed catalogue), London, 1901.


<sup>1</sup> A drawing has been sent by the Rev. C. W. Jones. With the exception of late Byzantine works Christian enamel are very rare. Signor Saulini sends a cast of a cameo (?) gem, stone not specified, of a still larger size, representing two similar fishes, looking opposite ways, the lower inverted; it is also figured by Perret, n. a.

would seem, to christianise such a heathen production. See IXOTC.

(iii.) *Anchor*.—The anchor, originally as Clement observes, the signet of Seleucus (see Eckhel, *Doct. Num.* Vet. iii. 212), and frequently occurring on the coins of the Seleucidae, whence it passed over to the Jewish money, was frequently employed as a gem type by the Christians, and so much the more readily from its resemblance to the cross; whence the motto, *Cruz mea anchora*. This type occurs both in connection with the preceding and also independently of it. Of the former sort the British Museum contains the four following examples, all probably of Christian work: anchor between two fish, around it the letters APF, in black jasper; another with dolphin twisted round it, like the modern Aldine device, about it the preceptive legend ENITTXANOT (*Lay hold*) in red jasper; anchor between two fishes, in niccolo; another between two branches and two fishes, on whose arms two doves are seated, in chalcedony. But the following are more important and unquestionably Christian. A sard figured by Muntz (*Antiq. Abhandl.* 1816, p. 57, t. i. n. 3), of an octagonal form, gives an anchor with two fishes and the legend IHCOTC (Böckh, n. 9090). The Berlin Museum has recently acquired a gem bearing an anchor and a sheep and the legend IXOTC: upon



Anchor and Dolphin. (British Museum.)



IXOTC and Anchor. (Martigny.)

the anchor sits a dove with an olive branch in its mouth (Böckh, n. 9081). Passeri (*Proc. Gemm. Astrif.* iii. 278) figures a ring cameo in the Vettori Museum, inscribed IHCOTC above, XPEICTOS below, having between the words an anchor, with a fish hanging from each end of the stock. An opal in the same museum, figured by Martigny (*Dict.* p. 545), has on one side a cruciform anchor, on the other, enclosed in an ornamented border, the legend IXOTC written *καρπός*. The Berlin Museum has a red jasper having the word IXOTC and the letters MT. perhaps the owner's initials, disposed around an anchor (Böckh, n. 9079). But the anchor has also other accompanying symbols. Thus another gem in the same museum (Böckh, n. 9082) has around the figure of an anchor the boustrophedon legend IH | IX (*Jesus Christ*), and also the accompanying symbols of a tree, a sheep, doves, a palm, and a human hand. (For others see above under the Good Shepherd.) There are also gems, presumed to be Christian, of which casts have been received from Signor Saulini, in which the anchor is figured by itself alone



(iv.) *Dove*.—This type, usually symbolical of the Holy Spirit, has been already mentioned as occurring on gems in conjunction with other Christian types. Besides these, Passeri (*Thes. Gemm. Austrif.* iii. 235) describes and figures, after Mamachi, a gem in which occurs the dove on a palm branch, a star above, and the chrisma (✠) on the left. The British Museum has a garnet with the same device, but no chrisma; and also a portion of a cornelian ring, on the flat bezel of which is engraved a dove holding a branch, considered by Mr. Fortnum to be Christian work of the second or third century (*Arch. Journ.* 1869, p. 140). A sapphire in the same collection bears the same device. The French collection contains a cornelian, the work of which appears to be of the sixth century, on which is engraved a dove, a palm, and a crown, with a monogram of Veranus (?), in style resembling those of the Ostrogothic kings of Italy (Chabouillet, *Catal.* n. 2187). The dove occurs also on Christian gems found in Rome or preserved in the Roman collections, in most cases accompanied by the chrisma (Saulini, *Perleb*). A pale sard<sup>a</sup> intaglio in the possession of Mr. Ready has two rudely-engraved doves with a cross between them. "One of the prettiest devices of the class that has come to my knowledge," says Mr. King (*Ant. Gems and Rings*, vol. ii. p. 26, note), "shows the dove with olive twig in beak, perched upon a wheat-sheaf, apt emblem of the



Dove and Sheaf. (K. & G.)

Church, having for supporters a lion and serpent. It pictorially embodies the precept to be wise as serpents and harmless as doves. (In possession of F. Taylor.) The British Museum, in fine, has a gem of large size and late work, reading in minuscule letters *ANAGNOS. + tau theta nu*; below the legend is a sheaf of corn, and two doves with olive branches below, indicating that the ingathering of the harvest of souls will be in peace. Other examples are named by Martigny, u. s.

(v.) *Fisherman*.—The type alludes to the Saviour and the apostles as fishers of men. It is rarely found on Christian gems, but we have a few examples. M. de Belloc, in his work entitled *La Vierge au Poisson de Raphael* (Lyon, 1811), figures an engraved cornelian, which he considers to be Christian, upon which is a fisherman holding a basket in one hand, and in the other a line from which a fish is suspended; the word *IXΘΥΣ* is written near the fish (Didron, *Christum. Iconogr.* pp. 343, 364 in Bohn's *Illustr. Libr.*). This would seem to be a different gem from a cornelian mentioned by Vallarsi in his notes on St. Jerome (i. 18), of the same type with the same inscription (Didron, u. s. p. 349); Martigny speaks of it as excellent in workmanship and probably of great antiquity; he regards the fisherman as the Saviour (*Dict.* p. 518; Garrucci,

<sup>a</sup> [This proves to be a paste, and belongs to class, § III. c. 3.]

*Ensigns*, p. 111). A sard intaglio, regarded by Mr. King as "purely Christian," in his own collection is figured in his *Gnostica*, pl. x. n. 7; it gives two winged figures, probably Cupids, in a boat, one fishing, the other steering; "the mast with the yard, making a true cross, forms a significant and conspicuous feature in the design" (p. 224). Its Christianity, however, seems rather questionable.<sup>b</sup>

(vi.) *Boat or Ship*.—These occur on Christian gems, as being typical of the church, and then sometimes resting on a fish, or of the voyage of the soul to the harbour of eternal rest. Mr. Fortnum describes and figures a fragment of a ring of dark green jasper, probably of the second or third century, purchased in Rome, on the bezel of which is engraved a boat bearing a bird and a branch, probably a cock and palm branch. The boat is supposed to be the church, and the victory of the soul over the world to be indicated by the other types (*Arch. Journ.* 1869, p. 140). Alexander (*Narr. Eccles. Ref. Symh.* p. 18, Rom. 1826) figures a ring-stone; and Ficoroni gives another (*Gemmae Antiq.* p. 105, t. xi. 8), on which the ship seems to rest on a fish. A ring figured by cardinal Borgia (*De Cruce Velis*, p. 213) is set with an antique jasper intaglio, the subject of which is a ship, having six rowers on one side, which, supplying the corresponding six on the other, would represent the twelve apostles; there is also a pilot, or helmsman, and the name *INCOY* inscribed on the reverse (Fortnum in *Arch. Journ.* 1871, pp. 274, 275; Mart. *Dict.* p. 432). A cornelian in the British Museum (intaglio) has a ship with mast and yard-arm in the form of a cross, bearing also a cross at the prow. A fine black jasper intaglio, in the possession of Rev. S. S. Lewis, shows a boat with a



Boat with Cross. (British Museum.)

Greek cross in the centre. A cornelian, belonging to count Marcolini, an impression of which is published by Lippert (iii. 361), bears a trirème with the labarum, on which is the chrisma and two palm trees; the prow is in the form of a bird's head; the vessel enters into port, and the sea is marked by a fish; in the field are two stars and the unexplained letters E. T. R. A.; below, VGBP. (Raspe's *Cat. of Tassie's Engraved Gems*, n. 2715). Other gems, whose



Boat with Orthodox Mast. (In the Collection of Rev. S. S. Lewis.)

<sup>b</sup> The gem reproduced by Martigny (u. s.) from Cassandri, showing a fish in human form holding a basket, which Polidori interprets to be the Saviour, is, rather, to judge by the figure, an Assyrian or Babylonian gem, representing Dagon (see Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. i. p. 361).

<sup>c</sup> With this may be compared an antique paste in the Herts Collection (No. 2523), having a ship with cock-shaped prow, rowed by four branches of cypresses, a butterfly above. The allusion to the immortality of the soul can hardly be doubted, but the emblem is pagan rather than Christian.

<sup>d</sup> This gem is more fully described below, § III.

impressions have been sent from Rome, bear a boat with the chrisme, or the chrisme accompanied by a palm above. A sard (intaglio) with the same type is set in a ring in the Naples Museum (*Arch. Journ.* 1871, p. 200).

It will now be seen that we have examples of all the types mentioned by Clemens Alexandrinus, the lyre only excepted, occurring on gems which are either certainly known or reasonably presumed to be Christian. This type also occurs, but it is uncertain whether any gem on which it is found is to be considered of Christian work.

(vii.) *Lyre*.—Employed probably as the type of harmony and concord. The only example known to Martigny (*Des Annales des premiers Chrétiens*, Mémo., 1858) which he could regard as Christian is one in the Royal Library of Turin, of very indifferent work, in a style like many Christian gems, figured by Perrot, *Catécumènes* (vol. iv, pl. xvi. n. 60). Nor can he add another in his *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, written seven years later (p. 40).<sup>a</sup>

The following types are not mentioned by Clemens; the first three of them have been already indicated in connection with those gems which have been described; but they occur on other gems also.

(viii.) *Palm*.—This symbol of victory, among Pagans, Jews, and Christians, occurs frequently on engraved stones and metal rings, and it is sometimes difficult to decide whether a given engraving is to be considered Pagan or Christian (*Arch. Journ.* 1871, pp. 275, 276, 280, 282). It has already been noticed that the palm occurs as an accessory type on some of the Christian gems above described; it occurs also in other combinations. On a cornelian in the British Museum a hand holds a palm branch erect, the chrisme is above and MNEMONETE below. In the same museum is a cornelian, presumably of Christian work, on which is a palm branch placed vertically, inclosed in a wreath of laurel; on opposite sides of the branch are the proper names ΖΕΤΙΚΟΣ and ΤΕΡΤΙΑΑΑ, who may possibly have been



Palm, and Chrisme above (British Museum).

martyrs. A sard in the Rev. C. W. King's collection bears a palm branch placed horizontally, and below it the acclamation (probably Christian), SVLE VIVE (letters partly inverted). The palm branch occurs also by itself or accompanied by inscriptions on various other gems and rings, which are reasonably supposed or suspected to be of Christian work, which is distinguished, in Mr. Waterton's opinion, by the rude manner of the representation, more truly figuring the natural object

<sup>a</sup> Among those bearing this type described by Hagen (see Nos. 3633-3644), or recorded in the Herz Collection (Nos. 1004-1007), there is not one which can safely be pronounced to be Christian, but there are two antique papyrus in the latter (Nos. 1004, 1005) in which the sides of the lyre are formed of dolphins or fishes. The sounding-board of one of these has the form of a sleeping animal. The original, as it would seem, of this, a papyrus intaglio, is in the collection of the Rev. S. B. Lewis. The occurrence of fish in this connection suggests that the gems may be Christian, but as the dolphin is connected with Apollo the inference is hazardous.

(*Arch. Journ.* 1871, p. 276). For some of them see King's *Out. of Lucie's Gems in Fitzwilliam Museum*, Cambridge, p. 8. Fortnum in *Arch. Journ.* 1869, p. 142; and 1871, p. 276.


(ix.) *Cross*.—This type, in connection with the dove, or in a disguised form as yard and mast, has been more than once described above. But it occurs on other gems without diagrams.<sup>1</sup> A Greek cross in conjunction with a lion, supposed to allude to the church of St. Mark at Alexandria, occurs on an onyx intaglio in the possession of Mr. Fortnum (*Arch. Journ.* 1869, p. 147). An iron ring, set with a cornelian intaglio (burat), is contained in the British Museum; the device is a cross, accompanied by some animal very rudely engraved (Fortnum, *Arch. Journ.* 1869, p. 146). Beger (*Thes. Pald.*) figures a gem, having a tall Latin cross, from the arms of which hang two fishes.<sup>2</sup> Garrucci (*Summ. Constantia*, p. 261, (at the end of his *Vetri Ornati*, Rom. 1864) mentions other gems with the cross type, three of which are in the possession of M. Van den Bergha. Mr. Fortnum describes a massive gold ring in the Castellani collection, embossed with figures of doves in the shoulders, which is set with a garnet, on the face of which is engraved a draped figure seated between two Greek crosses potent (*Arch. Journ.* 1871, p. 281). It is now in the British Museum, and seems late work. The Museum has also a burnt cornelian inscribed TATPINOQ, where a female holds a cross. A gem is figured by Garrucci (*Hypoglypha*, proof. p. v.), where a Greek cross is prefixed to the acclamation VIVAS IN (DIO, &c.), Martigny, in fine, observes that on several gems (one is figured by Perrot, vol. iv, pl. xvi. n. 74), some of which appear to be considerably older than Constantine, we have engraved representations of the cross<sup>3</sup> (*Dict.* p. 185). See also § xvii.

(x.) *Chrisme, or Monogram of Christ*.—This emblem (✝), which is thought by high authorities to be earlier than Constantine (Mart. *Dict.* p. 416), is found either by itself or in various combinations upon a considerable number of gems, and somewhat varying in form. A fine spherical sapphire, "where the preciousness of the material attests the rank, perhaps patriarchal, of

<sup>1</sup> De Certe (*Synag. de Annulid.* p. 126, Anst. 1708) thinks that Eusebius (*Document. Evangel.* vi. 25) speaks of an universal custom of Christians wearing the life-giving sign (i.e. the cross) on their rings. "Substant signa pro simulacris vestitis." This is taken from the Latin version of V. Vigor; the Greek, however, has *εὐαγγελιστήριον*; and the allusion seems rather to belong to the practice of signing themselves with the cross.

<sup>2</sup> Referred to by King (*Quæstio*, p. 147).

<sup>3</sup> It may perhaps just be worth mentioning here that certain large pieces of crystal bearing the figure of the cross may be as early as the period embraced in the present work. Douglas (*Mon. Brit.* t. x. f. 11) figures a crystal exhibited in 1764 in a treasure near Leontide along with coins of Avitus (A.D. 456) and other money of the Lower Empire, now in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. It is a boat-shaped plate (1 × 1½ in.), on which is engraved in intaglio a Latin cross potent. It may probably be of the Saxon period, and it looks as if it might once have been inserted in a liturgical book cover or in the lid of a box. But it is not easy to speak of the date of these crystals and other stones, some of which, engraved or plain, have been also found as freestone (Valleury, *Cat. de Rob. Marn.* vol. iv pl. II. n. 12; Wilm. *cat. of Mus. of Roy. Irish Acad.* pp. 122, 123). Most of them appear to have been antiques.

the possessor" (King, *Antique Gems and Rings*, II. 26), as the British Museum gives the monogram, having a straight line at right angles to the P on its summit () which forms a Tau, allusive to the cross. This is also the case with a crystal signet ring, "annulus vetustissimus," formerly in cardinal Barberini's museum (its resting-place being now unknown, Fortnum, in *Arch. Journ.* 1871, p. 272), figured by De Cotte (*Syntax de Ann.* p. 120), where a serpent, pecked by two cocks, entwines itself about the base of the Tau: on either side of the upper part are the letters A and M, and the stone is also inscribed beneath the base with the word SALVE.

Mr Fortnum has a ring of excellent workmanship, purchased at Athens, of massive gold, set with an onyx intaglio bearing the chrisme, "the P being crossed with the third stroke" (*Arch. Journ.* 1869, p. 142). Mr. King (*Gnostica*, p. 142) mentions a ring cut out of crystal, bearing the chrisme alone, on the face of an oblong tablet, said to have been found in Provence. The same author (*l. c.* p. 141) mentions an elegant device given to Gerl. *Dactyl.* 211, where the sacred monogram, cut on the face of a solid crystal ring, rests upon the head of a Cupid (or angel?) on each side of whom stands a dove. This style he considers to have been derived from the Sassanian stone rings. Passeri (*Thes. Græc. Astrif.* vol. II. p. 220, t. 2c.) figures a gem on which the chrisme is surmounted by a star, the X being formed by two branches of palm. This symbol is also sometimes accompanied by inscriptions both Greek and Latin. Martigny (*Dict.* p. 418) mentions a cornelian given by Macarius (*Hieroglyphica*, p. 235, ed. Gar.), inscribed with the word IXOTC, the X being combined with a P to express the chrisme; possibly the same gem as that described above under § II. The Berlin Museum has a heliotrope in which the chrisme is accompanied by a fruit-bearing tree and the following inscription: *ἑλισσομένη ἱεροῦ Χριστοῦ Ναφάρου Παρίνα*. . . (Böckh, n. 9094; the fragment is here given in part only and in minuscules). The British Museum contains a cornelian bearing the acclamation, *ΔΕΥΘΕΚΟΥΤΙ ΒΙΒΑΣ ΙΝ ΔΝΟ*, to the right of which is the chrisme, and to the left a small wreath. Mr. King figures a gem in the Vernon Collection (*Antique Gems and Rings*, II. 26, 37) where the chrisme of a not quite usual form appears in the middle of an olive-earrings, with the name



Chrisme. (King.)

of the possessor, *ΘΟΙΣΙΕΙΟΝ*, Phœbion (like Hephæstion, from Hephæstus), of which the work is unusually fine. The sacred monogram under various forms is found, as Mr. Fortnum observes (*Arch. Journ.* 1871, p. 271), "more frequently than any other on Christian rings. . . We find it alone and accompanied by almost all the other emblems, with inscriptions and monograms."

\* Various impressions of gems bearing the chrisme, which are more or less similar to those described above,

(21.) *Animals*.—It has been already noticed that "a lion," which Mr. Fortnum connects with St. Mark, occurs on an onyx accompanied by a Greek cross. Eusebius, bishop of Pavia about 511, has an epigram, *De annulo Firmiani*, from which we learn that it bore a lion:

"Gastulus manibus ex-vitæ loc."

Whether the lion was intended to have any Christian significance is uncertain. The phenix occurs on an engraved stone in conjunction with the palm, a combination which occurs on other monuments which are indubitably Christian, Perret (vol. IV. pl. xvi. 68; Martigny, *Dict.* p. 534). In the British Museum are more than one gem bearing sheep, from the collection of the abbé Hamilton, of Rome, which are presumed to be Christian. On one are two sheep, on each side a dolphin; on another are two sheep and palm branches. It might not be difficult to increase the enumeration of these ambiguous types; but they are scarcely worthy of a more extended notice.

Before proceeding further we may observe that the British Museum contains a large pale sard in which the pastor, the chrisme, dove and branch, fish, dolphin, ship, and various adjuncts are combined; another, of smaller size, in two compartments, has the pastor, dove, anchor, fishes, with other figures and animals; they were formerly in the Hamilton Collection, and are figured (with several others from the same collection, which is now in the British Museum) by Perret (*l. c.* pl. xvi. figs. 5, 8).

The following subjects appear to have been introduced upon gems at a later period than the types already mentioned.\*

have been sent from Rome by Signor Sallusti: on one the X is formed of two fishes, one holding a wreath (crown of thorns?) the other having a dove on its tail; palm on either side of the monogram.

\* Mr. King (*Antique Gems and Rings*, II. p. 26) mentions that the frog, whose body passes through an onyx chrisme, was employed for a Christian signet as an emblem of the Resurrection; he does not however refer to any authority for this. In *Rampe's Catalogue of Fossils* (No. 12,344) is a gem bearing a frog with a palm and a serpent; these adjuncts rather suggest that the work may be Christian. See GLASS.

\* The first place would be due to representations of God the Father, if such really existed in the period embraced in this work, aberrant as such images may appear to many. Mr. King (*Antique Gems and Rings*, II. 26) mentions "a large stone in an antique heavy gold ring, engraved with the Heavenly Father enthroned amidst the twelve patriarchs, the work carefully finished and well drawn." This gem, which he saw in the possession of the late Mr. Forrest, appeared to him to date from the time of the Western Empire. But there seems to be some error here. "During the first centuries of Christianity," says Didron (*Christian Iconography* p. 261, English trans.), "even as late as the 13th century, no portraits of God the Father are to be seen." The head seems to have been the only permitted symbol. Either, therefore, the work is likely to be later than the 13th century, or (more probably) the interpretation of the group is erroneous. One might suspect the reverse and the apostle to be intended. Upon a cornelian formerly in the possession of Dr. Nott, the Saviour is represented on a column, with extended arms, having six figures on each side, in the attitude of sheep: in the field and engraving ENCO (i.e. for IHCOTC) XPECTOC. It is obvious that these are the twelve apostles, but the Jewish and Gentile churches, as symbolized by them, are most probably intended. See p. xiii. and GLASS. (A cast sent from Rome by Signor Sallusti.)

(xii.) *The Saviour*.—In the earlier gems the Saviour appears only in the form of emblems, as the Good Shepherd and the Fish, and (more rarely) as the Fisherman; but from about the fourth century onwards the representations become more realistic. Le Blant has a sardonyx, bearing a dead Christ, with the inscription, SALVS RESTITVTA, ascribed to the fourth century (Martigny, *Des anneaux chez les prem. Christ.* p. 36). An ancient onyx, figured by Perret (iv. pl. xvi. 85), exhibits the Saviour reaching out his hand to St. Peter as he is about to sink in the waves; their names (in an abbreviated form) are written near them in Greek characters: IHC. PET.; the boat is seen tossed by a storm, a fish just below (Mart. *Dict.* p. 539. See also Alexander, *u. s.*; Mamachi, *O. v. et Antiq. Christ.* t. iv. p. 260, ed. Matr., and Garrucci in *Memorias, Hagiologica*, p. 337). A green jasper intaglio in the British Museum, considered by Mr. King to belong most probably to the date of the Western empire, exhibits Christ's entry into Jerusalem, the Saviour being accompanied by three figures, one bearing a palm (*Gnost.* p. 140). When the coffin of bishop Agilbert, of Paris (seventh century) was opened, de Saunay, who was present, saw on his finger a gold ring with a jewel, on which was a likeness of our Lord and St. Jerome (Marriott, *Vestiar. Christ.* p. 222, London, 1868). A cameo in agate, probably early mediæval Italian work of uncertain date, represents the Saviour teaching the three favoured disciples, one by his side, the others frosting him; two angels behind: the disciples are bearded, the Saviour beardless; in the Bibl. Impériale (Chabouillet, n. 294; King, *Antique Gems and Rings*, ii. 35, 36). With the exception of Byzantine cameos, and of one or two gems presumed to be Gnostic, "no ancient portraits of the Saviour exist on gems" (King's *Gnostics*, p. 137).<sup>9</sup> Among the earlier Byzantine camel is to be mentioned a fine oval plaque of lapis-lazuli, probably the gift of the emperor Heraclius to king Dagobert (A.D. 628-638), which remained in the Treasury of St. Denis for a thousand years: on one side was the bust of the Saviour, on the other that of his mother (King, *Handbook*, p. 104; id. in *Arch. Journ.* 1870, p. 185).

The French collection contains several Byzantine camel bearing portraits of Christ. Some of these on amethyst and jasper, with legend, IC XC. (i.e. Ἰησοῦς Χριστός), represent Him with a cruciform nimbus, in a long robe, holding the gospels in the left hand, and giving the benediction with the right (Chabouillet, *Cat. nos.* 258-260). These remind us of the coins of Justinian II. (A.D. 685-711), and may perhaps

<sup>9</sup> For the *Miraculous Draught of Fishes* (now lost), said to preserve a true likeness of the Saviour, executed by command of Tiberius, which Augustus II gave to pope Innocent VIII. about A.D. 1488, see C. W. King in *Arch. Journ.* 1878, pp. 181-190, and A. Way in *Arch. Journ.* 1875, pp. 109-110. The gem was probably a plaque of the early Byzantine school. Paintings copied from the Verdic in the 16th century exist; and also engravings, presumably copies of the same gem, from which photographs have been made which are now everywhere in circulation. But the engraving is in fact a mere reproduction of the Saviour's head in Raphael's cartoon of the *Miraculous Draught of Fishes*, which, however, may have been influenced by these paintings.

be earlier than A.D. 800. So much one hardly be said of a large bloodstone in the British Museum, which represents the bust of the Saviour in high relief; the style rather resembles that of the age of John Zimiscus (tenth century), (King's *Gnostics*, p. 141). A chalcedony in the same museum, representing the Saviour, half-length, holding a book, and in the act of blessing (1½ x ½ inches) appears to be earlier.

(xiii.) *Christ as the Lamb of God*.—Garrucci (in *Macar. Hag.* pp. 232, 244; Martigny, *Dict.* p. 226, with figure) has published an annular engraved stone, representing the Lamb of God surrounded by a nimbus which includes the chrism, standing on a column, the symbol of



The Lamb of God. Garrucci.

the church; twelve gems (Rev. xxi.) on it represent the twelve apostles; at the base of the column on either side are two lambs, the Jewish and Gentile believers, looking up at Him: around is the acclamation, IANVARI VIVAS. For the same subject see GLAM.

(xiv.) *The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin*.—The British Museum has a small sardonyx cameo of black and white strata (from the Hertz collection, n. 1825), of very neat Byzantine work, and possibly of very high antiquity,<sup>10</sup> representing the Annunciation. The Virgin stands inclined towards the winged Cupid-like angel; above is the legend, O XAIPE TICMOC, and the names of the figures, FAFINA and MP. ΘΥ. (μήτηρ Θεοῦ, i.e. mother of God) are written near them. The British Museum, the Hertz collection (n. 1824), and the Paris collection (Chabouillet, nos. 262, 263), have other larger camel on sardonyx (an inch or more wide), representing the same subject, bearing the barbarous legend, XAIPE (or XEPE), KEKAPITOMENH (or KAIKAPITOMENH), O KC. META COT (Luke i. 28). The second of these is referred to "the oldest Christian period" (Hertz, *Catalogue*, p. 125);

<sup>10</sup> Mr. King (*Ant. Gems and Rings*, ii. 31) thinks that it may probably date as far back as Constantine's reign. But it may be doubted whether the title, μήτηρ Θεοῦ, goes so far back. See Pearson, *On the Cross*, Art. III. With regard to the style of the gem itself, the writer is inclined to put it considerably later than the fourth century.

<sup>11</sup> This gem passed into the Usher Collection (Rabbin's Cat. No. 1119 [244, n. 2]), where it is called "Byzantine Greek work of uncertain period."



the others are considered by Chabouillet to be of the fifth century. Perhaps they may be rather regarded as early mediæval (see King's *Handbook*, p. 111).

(xv.) *The Virgin and Child*.—An intaglio in the British Museum, green jasper, of very rude workmanship, "executed with the peculiar technique of Gnostic work," and, if this be admitted, apparently about the fourth century\* (see King, *Antique Gems and Rings*, ii. 31), represents the Virgin and Child seated, with an angel on each side, two others hovering overhead. The Madonna and child in her arms (both with nimbus), accompanied by their names, IC, XC, and MP. ΘΥ., is represented on a Byzantine cameo of red jasper, in the Paris collection (Chabouillet, n. 263). A similar one on bloodstone (1½ x 1½ inches) is in the British Museum. These may perhaps be early mediæval.

In the Uselli collection (n. 284 [300]) was an intaglio on cornelian (¾ by ½ of an inch), with the Virgin and Child, with XAIPE and MP. ΘΥ., which Mr. J. C. Robinson calls "Byzantine or mediæval Greek work of uncertain date." A gem, published by Olerico, gives the Virgin and Child with legend, MP. ΘΥ. Η ΠΑΡΜΗ, i.e. the image of the Madonna in the church of the Fountain, erected at Constantinople by Justinian, but this gem may be of much later date (Böckh, *C. I. G.* n. 9109). It is probable that this general type would be engraved on Byzantine gems during a great part of the middle ages, from the sixth or seventh century onwards.

(xvi.) *Saints or persons unknown*.—Bosio and Mamachi (*Dei costumi dei primil. Crist. Prefas.*)



Martyrdom of a Saint.  
(King.)

figure a cornelian, on which are engraved the heads of St. Peter and St. Paul (Mart. Dict. pp. 40, 519). A red jasper intaglio, a graceful new year's gift, exhibits a female saint, perhaps St. Agnes, kneeling before an executioner, who is about to cut off her hand with a great razorlike sword; before her a dove holds a branch; above is the

chrism, to declare the presence of her Redeemer in the hour of trial; in the field are the letters ANFT (*Annum novum felicem tibi*): good work, probably about the age of Constantine† (King, *Ant. Gems*, pp. 352, 353, figured).

A cameo in the British Museum, cut in a beautiful sardonyx, possibly as early as the fourth century,‡ gives a full-length figure of St. John the Baptist with his name (King, *Antique Gems and Rings*, ii. 31). The same saint is represented on a cornelian, published by Vettori (pars ii. c. 12.). The Berlin Museum has a black jasper intaglio, reading EIC ΘΕΟC, and having rudely engraved upon it a female with

hands uplifted in prayer (Böckh, *C. I. G.* n. 9103). The British Museum has a Virgin, half-length, with circular nimbus, and uplifted hands, a cameo on bloodstone, with the legend MP. ΘΥ. which may perhaps be early mediæval. Besides these examples still existing, we have the following literary notices of rings bearing similar types being worn by bishops and others.

St. Chrysostom tells us that in his time many Christians of Antioch wore in their rings the likeness of St. Meletius (who died A.D. 381), and impressed it on their seals (*Hom. de S. Melet.* t. ii. p. 519, ed. Venet. 1734). St. Augustine writing to bishop Victorinus, says that his epistle is sealed "anulo qui exprimit faciem hominis attentius in latere" (*Epist.* 59 [217]). Eusebius, bishop of Meaux in 660, wore in his ring an intaglio representing St. Paul, the first hermit, on his knees before a crucifix, and above his head the cross, by which he was miraculously fed (*Annal. S. Benedict.* t. i. p. 456; Waterton in *Arch. Journ.* 1863, p. 225).§

To the above should perhaps be added a Byzantine cameo, nearly two inches in diameter, of streaked jasper, representing St. John the Evangelist, with the nimbus, seated, and holding the gospel in his hand. In the field O A (ὁ ἄγιος) is O ΘΕΟC ΘΕΟC; in the Bibliothèque Impériale (Chabouillet, *Cat.* n. 266). This gem may possibly fall within our period, and is claimed near to some that probably do so; but the difficulty of fixing the particular age of mediæval Byzantine camei is almost insuperable. The greater part of them, in Mr. King's skilled judgment, belong to the age of the Comneni (*Ant. Gems and Rings*, i. 307).

(xvii.) *Imperial or Royal Personages with Christian Accessories*.—The art of cameo-engraving, which had fallen into complete abeyance from the time of Septimius Severus, who has bequeathed to posterity many fine cameo-portraits of himself and his family, sprang into a new but short life under Constantine. Cameo portraits of himself and his sons, "admirable for the material, and by no means despicable for the execution," are found in various private and public collections, on sardonyx stones of large, sometimes very large, dimensions (King, *Ant. Gems and Rings*, i. 304). One fine gem, at least, marks the change of the imperial religion; it is not however exactly a cameo, but a solid

\* In this case also it seems possible that the date may be much later.

† In his latest work (*Antique Gems and Rings*, ii. 38) Mr. King thinks that it can hardly be placed lower than the age of Theodosius, whose best coins it certainly resembles both in style and workmanship.

‡ It seems, however, that it may, with at least equal probability, be assigned to about the tenth century.

§ A sardonyx, published by P. Vettori, has on the obverse a portrait of the Virgin with the usual letters MP. ΘΥ., and on the reverse a cross with contracted legend ΚΕΕ. (for Κύρια ἑξέστη), ΑΕΘΥ ΔΕΘΥΟΤ, i.e. O Lord! help Lord Leo! Conjecturally referred to Leo (the Wise) A.D. 820-811, but without sufficient reason; it is just possible that the gem may have been executed within the period embraced in this work. See Böckh, *C. I. G.* n. 9103. A very interesting gem is inscribed in a silver plate (gilt) of the age of Justinian the great martyr (sardonyx) Demetrios is inscribed on a medallion with God (αὐτοκρατορ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) to aid Justinian, "king of the Romans upon earth," and in the midst of the plate, just above a picture of St. Demetrios, "sore temptator," is "συνεχόμενος ἡμετέρας, more carnosae facie imberbi." This may probably be meant for Demetrios also, but as IC XC (Jesus Christ) ΝΙΚΑ (νικᾷ) occurs higher up, it is not very clear whether it may not be a portrait of the Emperor. The inscription is given at length in Böckh's *C. I. G.* n. 9042, from Marini's papers, published by Mal. (*Suppl. Vol. Nov. Coll.* v. 26, no figure.)

best. As agate, measuring nearly four inches, in the Bibliothèque Impériale, shows his bust with the paludamentum and cuirass, on the latter is a cross. His head is naked, and his eyes are raised to heaven, as on some of his coins. Formerly the ornament of the extremity of the choir-staff (15th-century work) in La Sainte-Chapelle (Chabouillet, *Cat. n. 287*, who refers to Morand's *Hist. de la Sainte Chapelle du Palais*, (p. 56) for a figure of the gem incorporated with the baton.) Besides this noble piece we have several others also, but of inferior execution.

Pascoli describes and figures a gem, preserved at Venice, representing a horseman spearing a dragon with a long lance terminating in a cross above: he regards it as a representation of a Christian emperor, conquering his enemies with the cross; a star, an emblem of Divine providence, in his judgment, is seen above (*Thes. Gemm. Austr.*, t. 2, pp. 289-297). This interpretation is somewhat confirmed by the types of certain coins of the fourth century, to which age this coin may probably be assigned.

The Merleau-Schauffhausen collection possessed an agate intaglio, which passed into the Leturcq cabinet, exhibiting a full-faced bust of the emperor Mauritius, wearing the imperial crown of the lower empire, and holding a globe, on which rests a Greek cross inscribed, D. N. MAVRITIUS P. P. A. Supposed to be a work of the sixth century, Leturcq, *Cat. n. 2107*. The Leturcq collection contained also a green jasper intaglio, giving full-faced portraits of Constantine II. (crowned) and of his son Constantine IV. (Pogonatus), both bearded, with a Greek cross between their busts, having a scorpion engraved on the back in the rude style of the so-called Gnostic gems (n. 211). The same collection in fine had an agate intaglio bearing busts of Leo IV. and his son Constantine VI. (Flavus), inscribed, D. N. LEO ET CONSTANTINVS P. P. A., both full-faced and crowned, and holding between them a double-banded cross (n. 212). These rare portraits of the Byzantine Caesars, of the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, appear to be in the same general style as those which appear on their money (see Sabatier, *Mém. Hys. pl.* xxiv. xxv. xli.).

There is one more gem of this class, which falls a few years later than the chronological limits of this work, but which ought hardly to be passed over here in consequence of its extreme interest in helping to fix the limits of gem-engraving in the West before the age of the Renaissance. The magnificent gold cross of king Lotharius, said to be of about the date 823, now preserved in the treasury of the cathedral of Aix-la-Chapelle, is remarkable for the variety of gems, rubies, sapphires, amethysts, and emeralds with which its surface is studded. At the intersection of the arms is inserted a very fine onyx cameo of Augustus, probably a contemporary work, and just below this an oval intaglio of rock crystal, of Frankish work and of very tolerable execution, two inches long and an inch and a half wide, giving the bust of Lotharius,

\* Mr. King, however, has some doubt about its genuineness (*Antique Gems*, pp. 163, 164). The Leturcq Cabinet was sold by Messrs. Sotheby, Wilkinson, and Haeger, in 1874, the accompanying catalogue by the owner being in French and English.

"his head covered with a close-fitting helmet, with a slightly-projecting frontlet, like those of the latest Roman period; around the bust is the legend, in well-formed Roman letters, + XP̄S ADIVVA HIOΘAPIVM REG." (figured in *Cahier et Martin, Mém. d'Arch.* vol. I. pl. 1121; King's *Ant. Gems*, p. 305; King's *Handbook of Engraved Gems*, p. 116).

There still remains to be considered some ancient gems bearing manifest traces of Christianity, which may be separately classed, viz., the Gnostic and the Sassanian.

*Gnostic Gems.*—A Gnostic origin has been hesitatingly assigned to one or two gems already mentioned, and a great number of gems called Gnostic have been described in Chabouillet's *Catalogue*. (See also ABRAXAS in the DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY.) Of these, a considerable number bear the word ABPACAE, more rarely (in the Greek) ABPAHAC, (variously written in Latin); and this in itself, in the judgment of some, proves a Gnostic origin. Assuming that Basilides, a Christian Gnostic of the second century, be the inventor of the word,\* as St. Jerome evidently thought and as several other Christian writers appear to intimate (see the authorities collected by Jablonski, *Opusc.* t. iv. pp. 82-86, and Sellermann, *Ueber die Gemmen der Alten mit dem Abraxas-Bilde*, *Erst Stück*, pp. 10-28), the numerous stones on which the word is written must either be looked on as Gnostic or else as derived through Gnosticism to other forms of faith or superstition. The latter view seems on the whole to be the more probable; for there is no doubt that the word, as transformed into the magical *Abraxadabra*, passed over to the pagans, and was even employed in Christian times until quite lately as a charm against various forms of disease (Pascoli, *De gemm. Basilid.* in *Thes. Gemm. Austr.* vol. II. p. 236, sqq.; King in *Ar. A. Journ.* 1869, p. 33; Halliwell, *Dict. of Archaic Words*, s. v. *Abraxadabra*). We have Abraxas occurring in connection with the names, ΙΑΩ (Jehovah), CABAΘ, AΔΩΝΑΙ, and with the titles or representations of Harpocrates, Mithras, Mercury, &c. (see Pascoli, v. s. &c.), but in no single instance known to the writer, though very possibly such may exist, does this word occur on any engraved stone in any connection which can be safely counted upon as Christian. These stones consequently, as well as all others which have been called Gnostic, but shew no manifest sign of Christianity are passed over in this article. Very few of them, if any, can be fixed to any particular Gnostic sect or to Gnosticism gene-

\* Some, as Mosheim (*De Rel. Christ. ante Constant.* p. 260) have thought that the word is probably older than Basilides on what grounds we know not. This matter deserves a searching examination.

\* A very few monuments, which must needs be Christian, bear the word ABPACAE. A large ivory ring, found at Arles, bears the monogram of Christ between A and Ω (as it appears on the coins of Constantine II. &c. of the fourth century), but accompanied by the title ABPACAE, "a sufficient proof of the identity of the two personages in the estimation of its owner" (King's *Antique Gems*, p. 356). A copper amulet found at Eell (near Vancres), which is very distinctly Christian, contains the same word apparently, but in a corrupt form (PASCACA), the inscription.

rally; by much the greater part appear to have been charms. The following very scanty list, however, of unmistakably Christian gems may be with some reason looked on as Gnostic:—

(1.) A portrait of Christ, beardless, to the right; XPICTOY above, a fish underneath. Figured by Raoul-Rochette (*Tableaux des Gnostiques de Rome*, frontispiece, Paris, 1853) who regards it as Gnostic (p. 265) from the original in the possession of the marquis de Fortia d'Urban, formerly in the Lajard collection. The stone is white chalcedony, the form is oval; ascribed to the second or third century (Mart. Dict. p. 40).



Portrait of Christ. (Raoul Rochette.)

(2.) Another portrait with the same types and legend, on a truncated cone of white chalcedony, in the Bibliothèque Impériale (Chabouillet, n. 1374). This gem, probably of Eastern fabric, is considered to be not later than the middle of the fourth century, and "presents the combination of the ancient Oriental form and of Greek decoration in the same monument" (King, *Gnostics*, p. 143). Figured by Perret, u. s. a. 47; very similar to the preceding.

Epiphanius makes it a charge against the Carpocratians that they kept painted portraits and images in gold and silver, and other materials, which they pretended to be portraits of Jesus (*Hæres.* c. 27, § 6). These gems, therefore, may probably be the work of some Gnostic sect.\*

\* The seven vowels, the "Music of the Spheres" occur frequently in this class of stones, and are also mentioned in the lately discovered Gnostic work entitled *Pléthe, Nephis*, but their veneration or magical use can hardly be regarded as exclusively Marcionite or Gnostic (see Walsh, *Essay on Ancient Coins, Medals, and Gems*, pp. 48-51; King's *Gnostics*, p. 92; King in *Arch. Journ.* 1884, pp. 108-107). From the names of the angels mentioned Matter (*Hist. Crit. du Gnost.* 2<sup>e</sup> p. 16, s. l. E. 8) thinks that a gem which he figures after Chifflet (fig. 34) may belong to the sect of the Ophites. One of the very few gems which really appear to favour of the Gnostic philosophy is a card, of which an impression has been sent by the Rev W. F. T. Drake; reading a line narrow rose, a daga, rap, vronpa, clamo, clamo; i. e. Aklâm; there was also an inscription round the edge which has been a good deal broken: in the field are meander or meiotic characters. The letters may be of the third or fourth century.

If indeed we could with Böhrenstein (*Gewissen aus dem Abraxas-Bilde*, III. pp. 11, 12) interpret the letters GEMEC EIAAM (misread by him) occurring on gems with the ABFACAE legend or figure, to mean, *This is the Messiah of God*, מָשִׁיחַ אֱלֹהִים, the number of Gnostic gems might be increased considerably; but in truth the words signify in Hebrew Eternal Son (Matter, u. s. p. 17, 20, s. l. F. 1; King, *Gnostics*, p. 76).

\* The numerous portraits of the Saviour which existed in St. Augustine's time differed much from each other; so that his four "innumerabiles cogitationum distinctate variator et Regitor, quæ tantum una erat, quæcumque erat" (*Aus. De Fide* viii. 1). A portrait quite different from the above is rudely engraved, apparently by a much later hand, on the back of a tiny ancient cornelian in the possession of M. Forget, which bears on the other side a fish only. It is figured by La Blanch, *Jour. Christ. de la Gaul.* vol. i. p. 371. The realistic representation is here, as in both the preceding gems, combined with the symbol.

CHRIST ART

(3.) The sun between two stars, ECVVC. XPACTVZ. TABPIE[A.] ANANIA. AMI[N.] in two lines (Paseur, *Thes. Gnom. Acty.* II. p. 277, who does not name the stone). The names of angels, as planetary or astral genii, were invoked by the Ophites, and probably by other Gnostic sects; Gabriel presided over the serpent (King, *Gnostics*, p. 88). This gem (n. 155 in the Cappello Museum), which is doubtless magical, may well have been produced by some Christian Gnostic, perhaps of the fourth century, when similar barbarous orthography occurs.

(4.) Four-winged deity, standing on a circle formed by a serpent, holding two sceptres; legend obliterated. E The chrisme in the midst of a circle formed by a serpent biting its tail. Hematite, in the Bibliothèque Impériale (Chabouillet, n. 2178). The figure is a good deal similar to one on another gem, bearing the inscription ABFAEAC (Chabouillet, n. 2176); the reverse shows it to be the work of a Christian, perhaps of a later Basilidian.

(5.) Iao (Jehovah) under the form of a four-winged mummy, which has the hands of a jackal, a vulture, and a hawk; in the field three stars, legend effaced; below on a cartouche, IAO. E. Trophy between a monogram made up of I and N (possibly for Jesus of Nazareth) and the chrisme; at the base of the trophy is another chrisme. In the Bibliothèque Impériale; serpentine (Chabouillet, n. 2220).

Chabouillet regards the trophy as a figure of the cross triumphant, and thinks the gem belongs to one of the Gnostic sects, who especially revered the Saviour.

*Later Persian and Sassanid Gems.*—This is a class of engraved stones, which may best be treated separately as being of a different form, conical or hemispherical, to those already named; and bearing legends, when legends are present, in the Pehlvi character. The following meagre list consists wholly of intagli; those in the French collection are thought by Chabouillet to be earlier than the middle of the fourth century; but some appear to be later.

(1.) *The Sacrifice of Abraham.*—The patriarch holds the knife to slay his son lying on an altar (shaped like a Persian fire-altar); he turns back and sees the angel pointing out the ram; striped sardonyx. Bibl. Impériale (Chabouillet, n. 1350). Another gem, of which Mr. King sends an impression, represents an aged Jew, in the field a child; whether this be the same subject or not, is uncertain.

(2.) *The Visitation of the Virgin.*—St. Elizabeth



The Visitation. (King.)

the Virgin standing, joining hands; star rescent (sun and moon) between them; legend, characters connected; cornelian; in collection (Chabouillet, n. 1332). Same probably, but without legend; long cross between the figures; sard (King, *Antique Gems and Rings*, ii. p. 45, pl. iv. n. 13). The latter is supposed by Mr. King, its owner, to be a signet of some Nestorian Christian."

*The Virgin and Child.*—The Virgin Mary, holding the infant Saviour: Pehlevi legend; Bibliothèque Impériale (Chabouillet, n. 1331). The cursive form of the Pehlevi character indicates a late age, i.e. that it is probably of Nestorian work (King, *Handbook*, p. 107).

*The Fish.*—Fish placed in the middle of a Christian monogram, which is formed of the letters IX (Jesus Christ). Annular seal; cornelian; same collection (Chabouillet, n. 1333).

*The Cross.*—An elegant cross patée, engraved on a seal, accompanied by a Pehlevi legend in the latest character (E. Thomas, *Notes on Sassanian mint-marks and Gems*, with a figure; *Gnostics*, p. 144).

Before bringing this account of Christian gems to a close, it remains to be mentioned that some of them bear inscriptions only, both Greek and Latin, and these may better be named here than under the article INSCRIPTIONS.

*Greek Inscriptions.*—A red jasper in the Copenhagen Museum, in an antique gold setting of wire, is inscribed, ΘΕΟC ΘΕΟΤΥΙΟC, i.e. O God, Son of God, guard me! A gem figured by Ficoroni, has ΧΡΙCΤΟC, sc. Christ (Böckh, *C. I. G.* n. 9091). On a sard, published by Le Blant, we read — ΧΡΙCΤΟC ΙΗCΟΥC ΜΕΤ ΕΜΟΙ, i.e. Jesus Christ be with me! (*Id.* n. 9096). A broken gem in the Copenhagen Museum, reads more or less to the same effect (*Id.* 9095). An inscription on a gem published by Quaranta, at Rome, whose date, though uncertain, may be supposed to be late, very possibly later than the time embraced by this work, reads, ΙΩΗC ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟC ΕΥΧΕΤΑΙ ΕΜΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΙC ΕΡΕΒΕΝΟΙC ΜΟΙ ΧΑΡΙΝ, i.e. O Lord, aid me and my works, and grant me grace! (Quaranta, *Opusculum*, p. 109). A few other unimportant gems bear inscriptions, sometimes in raised letters, which are probably Christian, such as ΜΑΡΙΑ ΕΥΧΕΤΑΙ ΕΜΟΙ ΕΤΕCΙΝ, and the like (see *Id.* nos. 9104–9106).

*Latin Inscriptions.*—The acclamation VIVAS IN DEO occurs (varied) on several engraved stones, figured by Ficoroni (*Gemm. Lit. tabb.* vii. xi.; Martigny, *Dict.* p. 8); we have also MAXSENTI VIVAS TVIS FELICITER. (Perret, vol. iv. t. xvi. p. 10; Martigny, u. s.)<sup>a</sup> On a cameo sard found at a Christian grave we read ROXANE D. B (bene), QVESQVAS (quiescas), (Buonaparte, *Vetr. Cimit.* p. 170, t. 24). Occasionally an inscription is figured in metal round the gem, as in a gold ring inscribed VIVAS IN DEO, found in the Soane, the stone of which is supposed to be of the third or fourth

This gem bears three heads, doubtless those of Christ and his family: it does not strictly fall under this section, but is placed here to accompany the similar acclamations.

century (Le Blant, *Inscr. Chret. de la Gaule*, tom. i. p. 64, pl. n. 6). It was not uncommon from the sixth century onwards for signet rings, both in stone and metal, to be marked with the owner's name in monogram. Avitus, bishop of Vienne, had such a signet in iron; and a red jasper of the Lower empire, in the Bosanquet collection, reads, ANTONINVS, in monogram, which may not improbably be Christian (King, *Handbook*, p. 107). One of the earliest episcopal gems extant is probably one which was found at Villaverde in Spain, set in a bronze ring, inscribed FEBRVARIVS | EPISCOPVS (the stone is not specified); it may in all likelihood be referred to the Visigothic period (Hubner, *Inscr. Hispan. Chret.* n. 205). The series may fitly close with a red cameo gem, preserved in the public library at Madrid, reading in three lines, the text of Joh. xix. 36. OS NON COMINVEAIS ES (sic) EO. (Hubner, u. s. n. 208).

The preceding enumeration, though professing to be incomplete, is more full, it is believed, than any hitherto published; the great rarity of Christian gems renders an apology for a detailed catalogue unnecessary. A few words in conclusion on the materials and the style of art and uses of these gems. The most usual material is the sard, of which the cornelian\* is only an inferior form, and the allied stones, the onyx, sardonyx, and chalcedony; next to these in point of number may be placed other kindred stones, the jaspers, whether red, green, or black. Sometimes the stone is heliotrope (or bloodstone), niccolo, crystal, amethyst, plasma, emerald, opal, lapis lazuli, serpentine, and, very rarely, sapphire. Garnet is occasionally found, a stone in which the Sassanian gem-engravings are often formed, and among these we have a Christian example. The hematite is especially the material on which the syncretistic designs, commonly called Gnostic, are engraved; and one of the few Christian gems of that class in this enumeration is of that material.

In engravings which range in all likelihood from the second to the ninth century<sup>f</sup> (and some of those here mentioned, being of uncertain date, may be later even than that), we must expect that there will be a considerable amount of variation in the style and excellence of the workmanship. When the work is fine, the fact has been recorded, if known to the writer. Much more commonly the work is mediocre. "The

\* These are not well distinguished in the preceding enumeration; the nomenclature here adopted is that of the author who names the gem; and this remark must be extended to the other stones mentioned. For much information in a small space on the materials of gems Prof. Story Maskelyne's *Introduction to the Marlborough Gems* (pp. xxvii.–xxxvi. 1870), may be consulted; as well as Mr. King's elaborate work on *Precious Stones and Gems*, London, 1865.

<sup>f</sup> It is but rarely that anything save the work of the stone itself supplies date for conjecturing its age. However the fine emerald bearing a fish, described above, is enclosed in an hexagonal gold setting, which Mr. King calls "a pattern announcing for date the early years of the third century" (*Antique Gems and Rings*, ii. 29). De Rossi admits the great difficulty of fixing the age of Christian gems, but thinks that a good many of those which bear the fish (type or legend) and anchor are of the fourth and fifth centuries, none being later (in *Pira's Spicil. Solesm.* iii. 555, 556).



art exhibited in early Christian gems is almost invariably of a low order," observes Mr. Fortnum; "they were for the most part the production of a period of decadence. The greater number have been cut by means of the wheel. Hence arises an additional difficulty in distinguishing the genuine from the false. Their rude workmanship is easy to copy with the same instrument as that with which they were cut; antique stones are abundant at hand, and Roman artists are apt and facile in imitation" (*Arch. Journ.* 1871, p. 292).

By much the greater part of the gems mentioned were used for finger-rings, those in intaglio being also employed as seals. Others, however, especially the Gnostic, were amulets, and carried about the person, suspended or otherwise, as charms. The larger camei, of the Byzantine period, appear to have been made for the purpose of decorating church plate or other ecclesiastical objects. (Martigny, *Des anneaux chez les premiers Chrétiens et de l'anneau épiscopal en particulier*, Mâcon, 1858; Fortnum in *Arch. Journ.* 1869 and 1871; *Early Christian Finger-rings*; and King, *Antique Gems and Rings*, vol. ii. pp. 24-37 (*Early Christian Glyptic Art*), Lond. 1872, as well as his earlier books referred to above. Much information also is to be gleaned from various catalogues of gems and other books, to which reference is made in the above works and in this paper.) [C. B.]

GENERALIS. [VICTOR (14).]

GENEROsa. [SCILLITA.]

GENEROSUS. [SCILLITA.]

GENESIUS. (1) Martyr at Rome in the time of Diocletian; commemorated Aug. 25 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi); Aug. 24 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Cal. Allatii et Frontonis).

(2) Martyr, of Arles (circa A.D. 303); commemorated Aug. 25 (*Mart. Hieron.*, *Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

GENETHLIA. [CALENDAR; FESTIVAL.]

GENETHLIACI, says Augustine, who condemns all such arts (*De Doc. Christ.* ii. 21), were so called on account of their founding their predictions on the planets which ruled a man's birthday (*γενέθλια*); a more common name was *Mathematici* [ASTROLOGERS; DIVINATION]. He again refers, in the *Confessions* (iv. 3; vii. 6), to the folly and impiety of supposing that a man's vices were attributable to the fact that the planets Venus, Mars, or Saturn presided over his birth. The passage relating to this matter given in the Decree of Gratian (causa 26, qu. 4, c. 1) as from Augustine, is in fact from Rabanus Maurus *De Mag. Præstigiis*, and was by him compiled mainly from Augustine and Isidore. In another passage of Augustine (*Conf.* iv. 3, quoted in *De ret. can.* 26. qu. 2, c. 8) Gratian seems to have read "planetarios" for the "planos" of recent editions. All augurs, aruspices, mathematici, and other impostors of that kind were condemned by a law of Con-

stantius, A.D. 357 (*Code*, lib. v.; *De Maleficis et Mathematicis*, in Van Espen, *Jus Ecclesiasticum*, p. iii. tit. iv. cc. 12-14). [C.]

GENIUS OF THE EMPEROR. In the early centuries of the church, one of the tests by which Christians were detected was, to require them to make oath "by the genius or the fortune of the emperor;" an oath which the Christians, however willing to pray for kings, constantly refused as savouring of idolatry. Thus Polycarp (*Euseb. H. E.* iv. 15, § 18) was required to swear by the fortune (*τύχη*) of Caesar. And Saturninus (*Acta Martt. Scillit.* c. 1, in Ruinart, p. 86, 2nd ed.) adjured Speratus, one of the martyrs of Scillita, "tantum jura per genium regis nostri;" to which he replied "Ego imperatoris mundi genium nescio."

Minucius Felix (*Octavius*, c. 29) reprobates the deification of the emperor, and the heathen practice of swearing by his "genius" or "daemon;" and Tertullian (*Apol.* c. 32) says that, although Christians did not swear by the genius of the Caesars, they swore by a more august oath, "per salutem eorum." We do not, says Origen (c. *Celsum*, bk. 8, p. 421, Spencer), swear by the emperor's fortune (*τύχη βασιλέως*), any more than by other reputed deities; for (as some at least think) they who swear by his fortune swear by his daemon, and Christians would die rather than take such an oath (Bingham's *Antiquities*, xvi. vii. 7). [C.]

GENII. [FRESCO, p. 693.]

GENOFEVA or GENOVEFA, virgin-saint, of Paris († circa 514 A.D.); commemorated Jan. 3 (*Mart. Bedae*, Adonis, Usuardi); translation Oct. 28 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

GENTILLY, COUNCIL OF (*Gentiliacense Concilium*), held A.D. 767, at Gentilly, near Paris, but authentic records of its proceedings are wanting. Annalists of the next age say that it was assembled by Pepin to consider a twofold question that had arisen between the Eastern and Western churches respecting the Trinity and the images of the saints (*Pertz*, i. 144). Quite possibly the iconoclastic council of Constantinople, A.D. 754, may have been discussed there, but there is no proof that the dispute between the two churches on the procession of the Holy Ghost had commenced as yet. The letter of pope Paul to Pepin (*Mansi*, xii. 614) is much too vague to be relied on, and what embassies are recorded to have come from the east in his reign are still less to the purpose (*Ibid.* p. 677; comp. Pagi, *ad Baron.* A.D. 766, n. 3). [E. S. Ff.]

GENUFLECTENTES. [PENITENTS.]

GENUFLEXION, PROSTRATION, ETC.

The early Christians used five different postures in their worship. They stood upright, or with the head and back bent forward, they knelt on both knees, and they prostrated themselves at length (*prostrato omni corpore in terrâ*; said of penitents at their reconciliation, *Sacram. Gelas.* lib. i. nn. xvi. xxxviii. in *Liturg. Rom. Vet.* Murat. tom. i. coll. 504, 550).

Standing had been the more common posture in prayer among the Jews (*Neh.* ix. 2-4; *St. Matt.* vi. 5; *St. Luke* xviii. 11, 13); but they knelt (2 *Chron.* vi. 13; *Dan.* vi. 10; *Ezra* ix. 5) and prostrated themselves also (*Num.* xiv. 5;

\* To the last-named author the writer is deeply indebted for impressions of several gems and for the loan of his beautiful plates for the present article: they are drawn, like all the others (when not copied from other books), to twice the diameter of the originals.

Josh. v. 14; 1 Kings xviii. 39, &c.); and the first converts to the gospel imported their former customs into the church. Thus Stephen knelt in his last prayer (Acts vii. 60); St. Peter knelt when he besought God for the life of Dorcas (ix. 40); St. Paul, when at Ephesus he prayed for the elders (xx. 36); the brethren at Tyre and their wives and children knelt with him on the shore, when he left them to go to Jerusalem (xxi. 5). In the language of the same apostle, "bowing the knee" to God is synonymous with "praying" to him (Eph. iii. 14). The Christian knelt in prayer more than the unconverted Jew; and this was natural, for the greater knowledge of God produced a stronger sense of unworthiness, and thus led to more marked and frequent expressions of humility in drawing nigh to him. "The bending of the knees is as a token of penitence and sorrow" (Cassian. *Coll.* xxi. c. xx. p. 795). This was the recognized principle, and it ruled the occasions on which the posture was employed. "The knee," says St. Ambrose, "is made flexible, by which, beyond other members, the offence of the Lord is mitigated, wrath appeased, grace called forth" (*Hexameron*, lib. vi. c. ix. n. 74).

Before we proceed it should be explained that the early church made no distinction in language between "kneeling" and "prostration." It is evident that men did not kneel upright, but threw themselves more or less forward, so that the posture might have either name. Sometimes indeed they so supported themselves by putting their hands or arms on the ground, that "kneeling" was a position of rest compared with standing. Thus Cassian complains that some western monks, when prostrate on the ground, "often wished that same bowing of the limbs (which he expressly calls *genu flectere*) to be prolonged, not so much for the sake of prayer as of refreshment" (*Instit.* lib. ii. c. 7). The same inference may be drawn from the fact that the third class of public penitents were indifferently called kneelers or prostrators, were said either *γόνυ κλίνειν*, *genu flectere*, or *ὑποκλίπτειν*, *se substernere*. Thus in a canon made at Neocaesarea in Pontus about A.D. 314, we read, can. v., "Let a catechumen . . . who has fallen into sin, if he be a kneeler (*γόνυ κλίνων*), become a hearer." Similarly the eighty-second canon of the so-called fourth council of Carthage held in 398: "Let penitents (the prostrators were especially so called) kneel even on days of relaxation." But the same class were far more frequently described as prostrators. For example, in the eleventh canon of Nicaea, A.D. 325, it is decreed that certain offenders "shall be prostrators (*ὑποπροσκύπται*) for seven years." (Compare can. xii.; *Conc. An. gr.* cann. iv. v. &c.; Greg. Thaum. viii. ix.; Basil. *ad Amphilocho.* lvi. lvii. &c.; and many others.) A more direct piece of evidence comes from the 7th century. Pseudo-Dionysius (*De Eccles. Hierarch.* c. v. sed. iii. § 2, tom. i. p. 364) says that "the approach to the Divine altar and the *prostration* (of candidates for holy orders) intimates to all who are admitted to priestly functions that they must entirely submit their personal life to God, from whom their consecration comes," &c.; whereupon his scholiast Maximus, A.D. 645, explains "prostration" to mean "kneeling" (p. 375). So in the West, as late as the 9th century, in the same canon, "fixis in terram

genibus" and "humiliter in terram prosternai" (*Conc. Turon.* A.D. 813, can. 37) are employed to describe the same posture. Other indications of similar usage will be observed in some passages below.

Kneeling or prostration was probably the general posture of the early Christians in prayer not regulated by public authority. Thus Clemens Romanus, in a general exhortation, "Let us fall down before the Lord, and beseech Him with tears," &c. (*Epist.* i. *ad Cor.* c. 48). When St. Ignatius prayed for the churches before his martyrdom, it was "cum genuflexione omnium fratrum" (*Martyrium S. Ign.* c. vi.). Hermas represents himself, before his first vision, "kneeling down and beginning to pray to God and confess his sins" (lib. i. vis. i. § 1). Hegesippus, A.D. 170, relates that St. James the Just "used to enter the temple alone, and to be found lying on his knees (*κείμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς γόνασι*)" (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. xxiii.). He adds that his knees from continual kneeling became callous like those of a camel. When Eusebius relates the story of the Melitine legion in the Marcomannic war, about 174, he says of the Christian soldiers, "They put their knees on the ground, as our custom is in prayer" (*Ibid.* lib. v. c. v.). Tertullian, having referred to the same event some sixteen years after its occurrence, asks, "When have not even droughts been driven away by our kneelings and fastings?" (*Ad Scapulam*, c. iv.). We read in the Life of St. Cyprian, by Pontius his deacon, that on his way to death he "knelt on the earth, and prostrated himself in prayer to God" (*Vita Opp.* praefixa). Eusebius tells us that Constantine the Great used "at stated times every day, shutting himself up in secret closets of his palace, there to converse alone with God, and falling on his knees to ask importunately for the things whereof he had need" (*Vita Constant.* lib. iv. c. xxii.). In his last illness, "kneeling on the ground, he was a suppliant to God," &c. (*Ibid.* c. lxi.). Gregory Nazianzen, speaking of his sister's habits of devotion, mentions "the bowing of her knees become callous, and as it were grown to the ground" (*Orat.* viii. § 13. Compare St. Jerome in *Epist. ad Marcellum de Asellâ*). Augustine, relating a miraculous answer to prayer in the healing of a sick person, says, "While we were fixing our knees and laying ourselves on the ground (*terrae incumbentes*) in the usual manner, he flung himself forward, as if thrown heavily down by some one pushing him, and began to pray," &c. (*De Civ. Dei*, lib. xxii. c. viii. § 2). Elsewhere the same father, speaking of private prayer, says, "They who pray do with the members of their body that which befits suppliants, when they fix their knees, stretch forth their hands, or even prostrate themselves on the ground" (*De Cura pro Mortuis*, c. v.). Only in this last passage, it will be observed, are kneeling and prostration distinguished from each other.

But the early Christians knelt or prostrated themselves as each chose, in the stated common worship of the church also. Thus Arnobius:—"To Him (i. e. Christ) we all by custom prostrate ourselves: Him with united (*collatis*) prayers we adore" (*Adv. Gent.* lib. i. c. 27). Epiphanius: "The church commands us to send up prayers to God without ceasing, with all frequency, and earnest supplications, and kneeling on the ap-

ointed days, by night and in the day, and in some places they celebrate *synaxes* even on the sabbath," &c. (*De Fide*, § 24). St. Jerome says that it is according to "ecclesiastical custom to bend the knee to Christ" (*Comm. in Isai.* c. xlv. v. 23). St. Chrysostom (*Hom.* xviii. in 2 Cor. viii. 24), of the celebration of the Holy Communion:—"Again, after we have shut out from the sacred precincts those who cannot partake of the Holy Table, there must be another kind of prayer, and we all in like manner lie on the floor (*ὁμολίας ἐπ' ἑδάφους κείμεθα*), and all in like manner rise up." We understand this better on a reference to the liturgy in the so-called *Apostolical Constitutions*. There we find (lib. viii. c. ix. Cotelier. tom. i. p. 396) that the "first prayer of the faithful" was said by all kneeling, the deacon crying out, "Let us, the faithful, all kneel." During the rest of the liturgy all stood.

At other times of service the rule was for all to kneel in prayer, except on Sundays and between Easter and Whitsuntide. Few customs are more frequently mentioned by early writers, and none perhaps more frequently said to be derived from the age of the apostles. The earliest witness is Irenaeus, in a fragment of his work on Easter preserved in the "Questions and Answers to the Orthodox," *Quaest.* 115, ascribed to Justin Martyr. Irenaeus traced it to the apostles. In answer to a question respecting the reason and origin of the custom, the latter writer says, "Since it behoved us always to remember both our own fall into sins and the grace of our Christ through which we have arisen from the fall, therefore our kneeling on the six days is a sign of our fall into sins, but our not kneeling on the Lord's day is a sign of the rising again, through which, by the grace of Christ, we have been delivered from our sins and from death, their due, now itself put to death." *Ibid.* Other witnesses are Tertullian, speaking both of Sunday and the paschal season (*De Cor. Mil.* c. iii.; similarly, *De Orat.* c. xxiii.); Peter of Alexandria, A.D. 301, can. xv. of Sunday only. The council of Nicaea, 325, both of Sunday and the days of Pentecost, can. xx.; St. Hilary, also of the "Week of Weeks" and the Lord's day both (*Prolog. in Psalm.* § 12), who refers it to the apostles. His expression is, "No one worships with his body prostrated on the ground." Epiphanius, also of both (*De Fide*, § 22). St. Basil, of both, as an apostolical tradition (*De Spiritu Sancto*, c. lxvi., al. xxvii.). St. Jerome, likewise of both (*Diul. contr. Luciferianos*, c. iv.); and again, of the fifty days, in *Proem. in Ep. ad Eph.*, "We neither bend the knee nor bow ourselves to the ground." St. Augustine, after giving the Scriptural reason, says, "On this account both are fasts relaxed [during the paschal quinquagesima] and we pray standing, which is a sign of the resurrection, whence also the same is observed at the altar on all Lord's days." (*Ep. lv. ad Januar.* c. xv. n. 28. Compare c. xvii. n. 32.) From St. Maximus of Turin, A.D. 422, we learn the same facts and the reason (*Hom. iii. De Pentec.*). Cassian, A.D. 424, mentions the restriction on kneeling at those times (*Instit.* lib. ii. c. xviii.; *Collat.* xxi. c. xx.). In the collection of canons put forth by Martin, a Pannonian by birth, but bishop of Bracara in Spain, A.D. 560, the same prohibition occurs, borrowed from a Greek or oriental source (can.

lvii.) His words are, "non prostrati, nec humiliati." The 90th canon of the Trullan council, held at Constantinople in 691, forbids kneeling "from the evening entrance of the priests to the altar on Saturday until the next evening on the Lord's day." The council does not mention the longer period, and its object seems to have been merely to settle the hours at which the observance should begin and end.

From the fact that the 20th canon of Nicaea is not found in the abridgement of canons by Ruffinus (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. x. c. v.), nor in an ancient codex supposed to be the authorised collection of the church of Rome, Quesnel (*Diss.* xii., at the end of St. Leo's Works, c. v.) supposed that the custom of not kneeling on Sunday, &c. was never received at Rome. See Routh, *Opuscula*, tom. ii. p. 444, or *Reliquiae Sacrae*, tom. iv. p. 75, ed. 2. We find, however, that the prohibition was enforced in the dominions of the Frankish princes after they had imposed the Roman office on their subjects. Those times were excepted from the general order for kneeling at prayer made by the third council of Tours, A.D. 813, can. 37. It was forbidden by a capitulary of Louis the Godly, A.D. 817 (*Capit. Reg. Franc.* tom. ii. col. 586, cap. li.) during "the Pentecost week." Rabanus Maurus, also, at Mentz, A.D. 847, says, as if vouching for a present fact, "On those days the knees are not bent in prayer." "On the Lord's day we pray standing" (*De Instit. Cler.* lib. ii. cc. 41-2). It is very improbable, therefore, that the custom was not known and observed at Rome.

In all the ancient liturgies except the Roman, if, indeed, that be an exception (see Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 579), the bishop gave a blessing before the communion. In all but the Clementine this was preceded by a monition from the deacon: e.g., in St. James and St. Basil, "Let us bow down our heads unto the Lord;" in St. Chrysostom, "Bow down your heads unto the Lord" (*Liturg. PP.*, pp. 32, 66, 102); in St. Mark, "Bow your heads to Jesus Christ" (Renaud. tom. i. p. 160); in the Mozarabic, "Humiliate vos benedictioni" (*Missale*, Leslie, pp. 6, 246); in a Roman Ordo, early, but of uncertain date, "Humiliate vos ad benedictionem" (Ord. vi. § 11, *Mus. Ital.* tom. ii. p. 75). Several liturgies had a benediction after the communion also, for which the people bowed themselves. In some, indeed, the deacon here repeated his direction. See St. James (*Lit. PP.* p. 39); the Greek Alexandrine of St. Basil and of St. Cyril (Renaud. tom. i. pp. 85, 125). In Egypt, for this reason, benedictions were usually called "Prayers of Inclination," or "Of Bowing the Head" (Renaud. u. s. pp. 35, 36, 50, 77, &c.). The same gesture, similarly bidden by the deacon, was employed in other parts of the service. See St. James, u. s. p. 9, and Renaud. u. s. pp. 77, 79, 105, &c. In particular, the catechumens bowed while the prayer proper to them was said before their dismissal. Thus the deacon, in St. Basil and in St. Chrysostom: "Ye catechumens, bow down your heads unto the Lord" (*Lit. PP.*, pp. 48, 87). The Malabar: "Incline your heads for the laying on of hands, and receive the blessing" (*Hist. Eccl. Malab.* Raulin, p. 304).

Two sermons of Caesarius, bishop of Arles, A.D. 602, illustrate our subject, as regards the habits of the people, in a graphic manner:—"I

intreat and admonish you, dearest brethren, that as often as prayer is said by the clergy at the altar, or prayer is bidden by the deacon, ye faithfully bow, not your hearts only, but your bodies also; for when I often, as I ought, and heedfully take notice, as the deacon cries, 'Let us bend our knees,' I see the greater part standing like upright columns." "Let it not be grievous to him, who from some weakness cannot bend his knees, either to bow his back or incline his head." Again: "In like manner I admonish you of this, dearest brethren, that as often as the deacon shall proclaim that ye ought to bow yourselves for the benediction, ye faithfully incline both bodies and heads; because the benediction, though given to you through man, is yet not given from man." (*Serm. Caes.* lxxxv. §§ 1, 5; *Sim.* lxxxiv. §§ 1, 2.)

The priest himself often inclined his head during the prayers. (See *St. James*, u. s. pp. 7, 13, 17, &c., and *St. Mark*, u. s. pp. 150, 153.) Many observances of this kind are lost to us from the want of rubrics in the ancient liturgies, or from their incompleteness. This is especially the case with those of the West; but there is one Ordo of the age of Charlemagne in which the priest is directed to say the prayer *In spiritu humilitatis* "bowed before the altar." (Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* lib. i. c. iv. art. xii. ord. v.) We might here also cite the Mozarabic and Milanese missals, if the antiquity of their rubrics were not generally uncertain.

From pseudo-Dionysius we learn that while bishops and priests at their ordination knelt on both knees, deacons knelt on one only (*De Eccl. Hier.* c. v. § ii. tom. i. p. 364). [W. E. S.]

#### GEOGRAPHY, ECCLESIASTICAL. [NOTITIA.]

**GEORGIUS.** (1) Chozebita, Holy Father, A.D. 820; commemorated with Aemilianus, Jan. 8 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Of Malaeum, Holy Father, (saec. v. vi.); commemorated April 4 (*Ib.*).

(3) Bishop of Mitylene († circa 816), Holy Father; commemorated April 7 (*Ib.*).

(4) Deacon, martyr at Cordova with Aurelius, Felix, Nathalia, and Liliusa, A.D. 852; commemorated Aug. 27 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(5) Μεγαλομάρτυρ καὶ τροπαιοφόρος, A.D. 296; commemorated April 23 (*Cal. Byzant.*); "Natale," April 23 (*Mart. Bedae*); the dedication (ἐγκαίνια) of his church in Lydia is commemorated on Nov. 3 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(6) De monte Atho; commemorated June 27 (*Cal. Georg.*).

(7) Victoriosus; commemorated Sept. 28 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

**GERASIMUS**, Holy Father, ὁ ἐν Ἰερδάνῃ, in the time of Constantine Pogonatus; commemorated March 4 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**GEREON**, martyr with 318 others at Cologne under Maximian; commemorated Oct. 10 (*Mart. Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**GERMANICA CONCILIA**, councils celebrated in Germany, but at places unknown.

1. A.D. 743, probably, being the first of five said to have met under St. Boniface by his biographer, but great obscurity hangs over their date, number, and canons, to say the least.

Mansi really settles nothing (xii. 355 and seq.), and the Oxford editors of Wilkins still less (iii. 382, note). Again, in the preface to this council it is Carloman, mayor of the palace who speaks, and its seven canons, besides running in his name form the first of his capitularies (Mansi, *ib.* 366, and App. 104). Certainly, the first of them constituting Boniface archbishop over the bishops of his dominions cannot have been decreed but by him. True, there is a letter from Boniface to pope Zachary requesting leave for holding a synod of this kind, which was at once given (Mansi, *ib.* 312-19), and in another, purporting to be from Boniface to archbishop Cuthbert (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 376), three sets of canons are quoted as having been decreed by the writer, of which these form the second. Still, even so, when and where were the other two sets passed? What Mansi prints (xii. 383) as "statutes of St. Boniface" in one place, were probably the work of a later hand, as he says in another (*ib.* 362).

2. A.D. 745, at Mayence possibly, where Aldebert and Clement were pronounced heretics, and Gervilion of Mayence deposed to be succeeded by Boniface (Mansi, *ib.* 371).

3. A.D. 747, at which the first four general councils were ordered to be received. Possibly the tenth of the letters of pope Zachary may relate to this (Mansi, *ib.* 409 and 342).

4. A.D. 759, at which Othmar, abbot of St. Gall, was unjustly condemned (Mansi, *ib.* 660). [E. S. Ff.]

**GERMANICUS**, martyr at Smyrna under Marcus Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius; commemorated Jan. 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**GERMANUS.** (1) Bishop of Paris and confessor († 576 A.D.); commemorated May 28 (*Mart. Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*); translation (*deposition*, Ado) July 25 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Bishop of Auxerre and confessor; "transitus" commemorated July 31 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*); Aug. 1 (*Mart. Bedae*); translation (*natalis*, Ado) Oct. 1 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) [DONATIANUS (2).]

(4) Martyr in Spain with Servandus; commemorated Oct. 23 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(5) Martyr at Caesarea in Cappadocia, with Caesarius, Theophilus, and Vitalis, under Decius; commemorated Nov. 3 (*Ib.*).

(6) Of Constantinople, A.D. 730; commemorated May 12 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**GERONA, COUNCIL OF** (*Gerundense concilium*), held A.D. 517, at Gerona in Catalonia, and passed ten canons on discipline, to which seven of the ten bishops present at the synod of Tarragona the year before subscribed. By the first the order laid down for celebrating mass and saying the psalter and ministering in general throughout the province of Tarragona is to be that of the metropolitan church. By the last the Lord's prayer is to be said on all days after matins and vespers by the priest. By the second and third rogation days are to be kept with abstinence twice a year: viz., the three last days of Whitsun week, and the first three days in November; or, one of them being a Sunday, the



three last days of the week following (Mansi, viii. 547 and seq.) [E. S. Ff.]

GERONTIUS, bishop of Sevilla la Vieja in Spain (saec. I.); commemorated Aug. 25 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

GERTRUDIS, virgin, martyr in Ireland; commemorated March 17 (*Mart. Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

GERUNDENSE CONCILIUM. [GERONA, COUNCIL OF.]

GERVASIUS, martyr at Milan with Protasius, his brother, under Nero; commemorated June 19 (*Mart. Bedae, Hieron., Cal. Carthag., Cal. et Sacrament. Frontonis, Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*); also with Nazarius, and Celsus, June 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*), and Oct. 14 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

GERVASIUS AND PROTASIUS, SS., IN ART. The basilica of St. Ambrose in Milan was dedicated by him, June 19th 387, to these martyrs, whose bones he transferred to it. The name of the church has, however, been derived by posterity from that of its founder. The author may refer to the personal testimony of Father Ambrose St. John of the Oratory, as to a late discovery of bones in the Basilica of St. Ambrose, which seems strongly to confirm the tradition of the burial of actually martyred persons among its foundations.\*

St. Gervasius appears repeatedly in the paintings of the Ambrosian basilica, especially in the great mosaic of the apse (Sommerard, *Album des Arts*, pl. xix. 9 série). St. Protasius is with him, as in other parts of the church. This mosaic cannot be later than the 9th century, and may probably be of the same date as that in the great church of St. Apollinaris in Classe at Ravenna, 7th century. (See Ciampini *l'et. Monumenta*, tom. ii. pl. xxv. No. 11, and p. 95 in text.) Two portrait medallions of these saints are to be seen in the church of St. Vitale in the same city. [R. St. J. T.]

GETULIUS, martyr at Rome with Aman-tius, Cerealis, and Primitivus, in the time of Adrian (circa 124 A.D.); "passio," June 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

GIDEON or GEDEON, the prophet; commemorated with Joshua, Sept. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

GIFTS. [ARRHAE; ELEMENTS, p. 600.]

GILBERTUS, "in territorio Parisiacensi, vico Christoilo;" commemorated with Agoadus, and innumerable others of both sexes, June 24 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

GILDARDUS, bishop of Rouen († post 508); "natalis" June 8 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

GILDING. A frequent mode of decorating the interiors of churches was by gilding. The earliest reference we have to it is in the letter of the emperor Constantine to Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, relating to the church of the Holy Sepulchre, which he was about to have built, consulting him, among other points, as to the

character of the ceiling he wished to have constructed. The emperor evidently inclined to ceiling divided into panels (*λακωνάρια, laqueata*), inasmuch as it could be decorated with gold (Euseb *Vit. Const.* iii. c. 32). This plan was carried out on the most magnificent scale, and, "by means of compartments, stretched its vast expanse over the whole basilica, covered throughout with resplendent gold, so as to make the whole temple dazzling as with a blaze of light" (*Ib.* c. 36). The beams of the roof of the basilica of St. Paul at Rome were originally, A.D. 386, covered with gold-leaf.

"Bracteolas trabibus sublevit. ut omnis auralenta  
Lux esset intus. ceu jubar sub ortu."

(Petron. *l'assio Beat. Apost.*)

The church built by St. Paulinus at Nola had also a panelled ceiling, "alto et lacunato culmine" (Paulin. *Epist.* xxvii. 12), but gilding is not expressly mentioned. References to these ceilings of gilded panelling are frequent in Jerome, who speaks of "the *laquearia* and roofs gleaming with gold," "the gilded ceilings," and the like, with some expression of regret that so much that might have been devoted to Christ's poor was lavished on architectural decoration (Hieron. lib. ii. in *Zach.* viii. ; *Epist.* ii. ad *Nepot.* ; *Epist.* viii. ad *Demetriad.*). From the last-quoted passage we learn that the capitals of the pillars were also gilt, and that the altars were ornamented with gold and jewels. In the more magnificent churches erected in Justinian's reign, the altars were often of silver plated with gold. The altar given by Pulcheria, A.D. 414, to the church at Constantinople was elaborately constructed of gold and precious stones (Soz. *H. E.* ix. 1). This was surpassed by the altar given by Justinian to St. Sophia, which was all of gold resplendent with gems (Ducange, *Constantinop. Christ.* lib. iii. p. 47). The altar at St. Ambrogio, at Milan, made A.D. 835, is covered with plates of gold and silver, with subjects in high relief [ALTAR, p. 64]. The domes which crowned the early churches in the East were often gilt externally. (Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* VIII. viii. 5; Neale, *Eastern Church*, Introd. p. 182.) [E. V.]

GIRDLE (*ζώνη; balteus, cingulum, zona*). Among nations who wore long flowing robes, it is obvious that the use of the girdle would be necessary for convenience in walking, or in active work. This very way, however, of using the girdle would cause it to be more or less hidden by the dress: and thus we are *a priori* prepared for the fact that, while in the early Christian centuries we continually meet with the girdle used as a matter of practical convenience, it is not till the eighth century that we find it recognized as an ecclesiastical vestment strictly so called. The use of it in these earlier times seems not unfrequently to have carried with it the idea of an imitation of the ancient Jewish prophets, and thus to have been worn by those who followed a monastic life, and those who professed, in reality or in seeming, to imitate their austerities. We find, for example, pope Celestinus I. (ob. 432 A.D.) finding fault with those who, by affecting this style of dress ("amicti pallio et lumbos praeciuncti"), seemed to claim for themselves a sanctity of life not rightly theirs (*Epist.* 4 ad *Episc. Vienn. et Narb.* c. 2; *Patrol.* i. 431). Salvianus (ob.

\* See note, p. 433, J. H. Newman's *Historical Sketches*, Pickering, 1872. A letter of the greatest interest, which seems to leave little room for doubt as to the authenticity of the bodies of St. Ambrose and the two martyrs.

circa 495 A.D.) refers to the same idea, in the words addressed to an unworthy monk, "licet fidem cingulo afferas" (*Adv. avaritiam* iv. 5; *Patrol.* liii. 232). See also Basil (*Epist.* 45 *ad monachum lapsum*; *Patrol. Gr.* xxxii. 366). To take an instance of a different type, Fulgentius (ob. 533 A.D.) on his elevation to the see of Ruspe, is said in his biography (formerly attributed to Ferrandus Diaconus) to have retained the girdle with the rest of the monastic habit—"pelliceo cingulo tanquam monachus utebatur" (c. 37; *Patrol.* lxxv. 136). The *Rule* of St. Benedict forbade the laying aside of the monastic girdle even at night; for the monks were to sleep "vestiti . . . et cincti cingulis aut funibus" (*Regula S. Benedicti*, c. 22: see also *Regula S. Donati*, c. 65).

It may further be remarked that the girdle was commonly worn as an ornament by sovereigns and nobles. Thus, in a homily once assigned to Chrysostom, but now generally believed to be a work of the sixth century, the girdle is spoken of as an ordinary ornament of kings, and with this royal use of it is compared the girdle of our Lord (*Hom. de Uno Legislatore*, c. 3; vol. vi. 409, ed. Montfaucon). It will readily be seen how important a bearing the above facts have on the main general question, to which we can only refer thus in passing, as to whether the dress of the early Christian ministry was derived from that of the Levitical priesthood. In this last, it will be remembered, the girdle was a very important element.

It has been said that it was not till the 8th century that we meet with the girdle as an ecclesiastical vestment in the strict sense of the word. It is true that we do meet with references to it at an earlier period, as to that worn by Gregory the Great, which later generations are said by his biographer to have regarded as a precious relic (*Joannis Diaconi Vita S. Greg. Magni*, iv. 80; *Patrol.* lxxv. 228). Still, it must be remembered, the use of an article of dress by ecclesiastics is a totally different thing from their use of it because they are ecclesiastics; and for instances of this latter we must pass on to a later period.

Perhaps the earliest reference of this kind is one by Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople (ob. 740 A.D.), in his description of the various priestly vestments (*Historia Ecclesiastica et Mystica Contemplatio*; *Patrol. Gr.* xcvi. 394), in which he also alludes to the napkin attached to the girdle worn by deacons (τὸ ἐγχερίδιον τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς ζώνης). Rabanus Maurus, in his treatise *de Institutione Clericorum* (i. 17; *Patrol.* cvii. 306), a work probably written about the year 819 A.D., refers to the girdle as one of the regular Christian vestments, and dwells on the symbolism of it at some length. A curious injunction, for which a curious reason is given, as to the wearing of the girdle, is found in one of the so-called Arabic canons of the council of Nicaea, edited by Abraham Ecchelensis (can. 66; Labbe ii. 335). According to this, the clergy are forbidden to wear a girdle during divine service.

In earlier times the girdle was often doubtlessly richly adorned: the reference we have already given to its regal use is illustrative of this, and we may further cite Chrysostom (*Hom. in Psal.* 48; vol. v. 521), where, inveighing

against various articles of luxury in dress, he speaks of golden girdles. Apparently, too, this state of things prevailed after the girdle became a recognized ecclesiastical vestment, the excessive ornamentation being, it would seem, viewed as a secular element in the ecclesiastical dress. Thus we find Durandus (ob. 1296 A.D.) speaking of the clergy in the time of the emperor Louis I., the son of Charlemagne, as laying aside "Cingula auro texta, exquisitas vestes, et alia secularia ornamenta" (*Rationale Div. Off.* iii. 1). A further illustration of this is furnished by the will of Riculphus, bishop of Helena (ob. 915 A.D.), in which he bequeaths, among other precious articles, "zonas quinque, una cum auro et gemmis pretiosis, et alias quattuor cum auro" (*Patrol.* cxxxii. 468).

Later liturgical writers [*e.g.* Honorius Augustodunensis (*Gemma Animae*, i. 206; *Patrol.* clxxii. 606), Innocent iii. (*de Sacro Altaris mysterio*, i. 52; *Patrol.* ccxvii. 793), and Durandus (*Rat. Div. Off.* iii. 4)] speak further of an under girdle (*subcingulum*, *subcinctorium*, *succinctorium*), and generally as a vestment peculiar to bishops. So in the ancient mass given by Menard (*Greg. Sacr.* col. 249) from the Cd. Ratoldi, the bishop puts on both a *cingulum* and a *balteus*, the former perhaps the unseen and simple primitive girdle, the latter the elaborate ornament of later times. This subject, however, falls beyond our limits; reference may be made to Bona *de Rebus Liturg.* i. 24. 15.

A brief remark may be made in passing as to the special significance of the girdle in reference to the bestowal or deprivation of office. Thus Gregory the Great congratulates a friend "prae-fecturae vos suscepisse cingula" (*Epist.* x. 37; *Patrol.* lxxvii. 1094). Atto, bishop of Vercellae (ob. circa 960 A.D.), writing to one bishop Azo, orders that a man who should contract a marriage within the prohibited degrees "cinguli sui patiatur amissionem" (*Epist.* 5; *Patrol.* cxxxiv. 107). Similar references are often found in the Theodosian code, and elsewhere (see *e.g.* *Cod. Theodos.* lib. viii. tit. i. l. 11; lib. x. tit. 26, l. 1), in a way that often suggests the belt of knighthood of later times.

For further references to the subject of the girdle in its different aspects, see Ducange's *Glossarium* s. vv.; Marriott's *Vestiarius Christianum*, p. 213, etc.; Hefele, *Die liturgischen Gewänder*, pp. 178 sqq.; Bock, *Geschichte der liturgischen Gewänder des Mittelalters*, ii. pp. 50 sqq. [R. S.]

**GLADIATORS.** A passion for gladiatorial combats had a strong hold upon the popular mind of pagan Rome; and under the empire magnificent amphitheatres were built for such exhibitions, and others of an almost equally barbarous nature, which seem to have presented a peculiarly fascinating attraction both to men and women in those times.

Augustine mentions a case in which even a Christian, having been induced to be present at one of these exhibitions, and having kept his eyes closed for a time—on opening them, at a sudden outcry which he heard, instead of being shocked or disgusted at the sight, was hurried along with the spirit of the assembled people—was overcome with a wild and savage delight at beholding the scene of bloodshed and death, and carried

way with him an insatiable desire to witness the same spectacles again (August. *Conf.* vi. 8).

Some pagan moralists expressed more or less strongly their disapprobation of the gladiatorial shows, as being inhuman and demoralizing (Seneca, *Ep.* vii. and Pliny, *Ep.* iv. 22); but they were too popular to be checked by such remonstrances; and nothing effectual was done to stop them until they were opposed and finally suppressed by the intervention of Christian principles and Christian heroism.

The church expressed its abhorrence of these barbarous games as soon as it came in contact with them, not only by discountenancing attendance at them, but by refusing to admit gladiators to Christian baptism (see *Constit. Apostol.* viii. 32). In this canon, charioteers, racers, and many others, are included in the same condemnation; probably because the public exhibitions in which they took a part were more or less connected with idolatry. And for the same reason such persons, if they had already been received into the church, were to be punished by excommunication (*Concil. Arriat.* i. 4).

The first imperial edict prohibiting the exhibition of gladiators was issued by Constantine in A.D. 325, just after the council of Nice had been convened (*Cod. Theod.* xv. 12, 1). Forty years later Valentinian forbade that any Christian criminals should be condemned to fight as gladiators; and in A.D. 367 he included in a similar exemption those who had been in the imperial service about the court (Palatine) (*Cod. Theod.* ix. 40, 8 and 11).

Honorius, at the end of this century, ordered that no slave, who had been a gladiator, should be taken into the service of a senator (*Cod. Theod.* xv. 12, 3).

All these edicts resulted from the operation of Christian principles and feelings, and they show the rise and growth of a more civilised opinion, which these imperial utterances also helped to promote; but they produced little or no direct effect in putting a stop to such exhibitions.

The decree of Constantine seems to have applied only to the province of Phœnicia—to the prefect of which it was addressed; or, at any rate, it very soon became a dead letter; for a few years later Libanius alludes to gladiatorial shows as still regularly exhibited in Syria (*Libanius, de vita sua*, 3). And although they were never seen in Constantinople—where a passion for chariot races seems to have supplied their place—yet at Rome and in the Western empire they continued unrestricted, except by some trifling regulations. Even Theodosius the Great, though in some things very submissive to church authorities, compelled his Sarmatian prisoners to fight as gladiators; for which he was applauded by Symmachus, as having imitated approved examples of older times, and having made them minister to the pleasure of the people, who had previously been their dread (*Symmachus, Ep.* x. 61).

Thus these sanguinary games held their place among the popular amusements, and afforded their savage gratification to the multitude until their suppression was at last effected by the courage and self-devotion of an individual Christian.

In the year 404, while a show of gladiators

was being exhibited at Rome in honour of the victories of Stilicho, an Asiatic monk named Telemachus, who had come to Rome for the purpose of endeavouring to stop this barbarous practice, rushed into the amphitheatre, and strove to separate the combatants. The spectators—enraged at his attempt to deprive them of their favourite amusement—stoned him to death. But a deep impression was produced. Telemachus was justly honoured as a martyr, and the emperor Honorius—taking advantage of the feeling which had been evoked—effectually put a stop to gladiatorial combats, which were never exhibited again (*Theodoret, H. E.* v. 26).

[G. A. J.]

**GLASS.** (1.) *Window glass.*—The use of glass in windows in Roman times was much more common than was formerly supposed, and examples of such glass have been met with not only in Pompeii, but in our own country in various places. It was also used by Christians in early times, though perhaps not very commonly, for the windows of their churches, and then it was sometimes coloured. Thus Prudentius, speaking of the Basilica of St. Paul, built by Constantine, says: "In the arched window ran (paces of) wonderfully variegated glass: it shone like a meadow decked with spring flowers."\* Glass, probably of the church destroyed A.D. 430, has been lately found at Trèves (*Archæol.* xi. 194). Venantius Fortunatus (circa 560) thus speaks (*lib. ii. poem. 11*) of the windows of the church in Paris:

"Prima caput radian vitreæ cœlestis fenestrix;  
Artificisque manu clausit in arce diam."

From Gaul artists in glass were first introduced into Britain (A.D. 675) by Benedict Biscop for the church windows at Wearmouth in Durham, "ad cancellandas ecclesiarum porticumque et coenaculorum ejus fenestras" (*Bed. Vit. S. Benedict.* § 5). Other early examples may be seen in Duncage, s. v. *Vitreae*, and Bentham's *Hist. and Antiq. of Ely*, p. 31 (ed. 2). Pope Leo III. (circa 795) adorned the windows of the apse of the basilica of the Lateran with glass of several colours, "ex vitro diversis coloribus" (*Anastasia Vitas Pontif.* p. 208, C. ed. Murst.); and this, as some think, "is the earliest instance of the kind that can be cited with confidence" (Winston, *Anc. Glass Paint.*, p. 2; Flourey, *H. E.* xlv. 30).

Painted glass belongs apparently to an age a little later than the present work embraces. "It is a fact," says M. Labarte, "acknowledged by all archaeologists, that we do not now know any painted glass to which can be assigned with certainty an earlier date than that of the 11th century" (Handbook, p. 68). The invention itself, however, may perhaps have been somewhat earlier.†

\* "Tum cœlestis hyalo tridini varie curvavit arcum.  
Sic præteritæ barthæ residet."

*Parvop. xii. 63, 64.*

The above interpretation, which is substantially that of Kinnicly David and Labarte, seems much preferable to that which makes Apollo mean summer (Labarte, *Handbook of Arts of Middle Ages*, c. ii. p. 68, Engl. trans.).

† Two examples only, belonging to 10th century, are figured by M. Labarte in his great work, *Manuel de la Peinture sur Verre*.

\* The art is described with many details by the monk Theophilus, whose age is unfortunately uncertain. Leading

(ii.) *Glass vessels*.—These were used by the Christians as well as by the heathen for interment with the dead, and the so-called lacrymatories, which are really unguent bottles, have been found in the catacombs of Rome (Seroux d'Agincourt, *Hist. de l'Art par ses Monum.* t. viii. f. 21, "Sculpture"), and elsewhere, as Todi, Villeja, and Sardinia: the vessels are of various kinds, and are sometimes ornamented with letters and sometimes with palm-branches (De Rossi, *Bull. Arch. Crist.* 1864, p. 89). Perret figures a long drinking-glass, copied here, ornamented with palms (incised), from the catacombs; at the bottom is some red substance: see below. The Slade Collection, recently acquired by the British Museum, contains a vessel of the same general form, of white glass, found at Cologne, probably of the 4th or 5th century, with incised figures of Adam and Eve, and of Moses striking the rock.



Glass Incised Cup. (Perret.)

The Sloane Collection in the same museum has a plain glass beaker from the catacombs embedded in the original plaster: likewise a glass ampulla marked with a cross and on each side, also from the catacombs. At the bottom of some of these small vessels has been found a dark crust, and it has been made a question whether this is the sediment of the blood of the martyr buried there or of some other substance. There are even some vessels inscribed SANGVIS, or SANG, or SA (Arlinghi, *Rom. Subt.* t. i. p. 499); but De Rossi, Garrucci, and Martigny (*Dict.* p. 592 q. r.) are agreed that they are forgeries. These, however, do not necessarily prove that the substance found in genuine glass vessels is never in any case blood; and according to Martigny, the chemical researches of Broglia in 1845,

supposed that he wrote in the 9th century; if this were so, the invention may have been before 800; but it is now generally admitted that his age must be later: Labarte thinks that he probably lived in the 12th century. His *Dictionnaire critique* Schedula does not speak of the art of glass as being a new invention. See Labarte *u. s.* pp. 42-61.


and others, have shown that at the bottom of glass vessels found in Christian tombs at Milan blood is still to be recognised. Without impugning the honesty or the correctness of these researches, although as regards the latter it would be satisfactory if some confirmatory evidence should be discovered, it is allowable to suppose that the usual unguents (or perhaps wine) may have been contained in other of these vessels. The early Christians also employed glass as one of the materials for chalices.<sup>4</sup> See CHALICE. Their most remarkable glass vessels, however, are those which have figures in gold leaf inside their flat bases; and these have hitherto been found almost exclusively in the Roman catacombs, and are generally considered to have been made in Rome alone. Of these some (about thirty) are in the British Museum, a smaller number in Paris, a few others in various Italian museums and in private continental and English collections, more particularly that of Mr. Wilshire; from which last the South Kensington Loan Court, and the Leeds Art Exhibition in 1868, having been largely enriched, these curious relics have become tolerably familiar to many of our countrymen. It is, however, in the Kircherian Museum and in that of the Propaganda, and above all, in the Vatican at Rome, that the greatest number are preserved. From these various sources, and from the works of Aringhi, Buonarrotti, Boldetti, &c., Padre Garrucci drew up his great work on the subject, entitled *Vasi ornati di figure in oro*, fol. with 42 plates, comprising figures of about 320 specimens,\* many, however, being quite fragmentary and of little value. The first edition appeared in Rome in 1853, the second (much enlarged) in 1864. As nearly all that is known of them is contained in this one work, which has been also used in illustration of various articles in this Dictionary, a somewhat slight notice may suffice for this place. The greater part of these glasses are manifestly the bottoms of drinking cups (the inscriptions on many of them implying as much), some few have been plates. "Their peculiarity," say Messrs. Northcote and Brownlow, "consists in a design having been executed in gold leaf on the flat bottom of the cup, in such a manner as that the figures and letters should be seen from the inside. . . . The gold leaf was protected by a plate of glass which was welded by fire, so as to form one solid mass with the cup. These cups, like the other articles found in the catacombs, were stuck into the still soft cement of the newly closed grave; and the double glass bottom imbedded in the plaster has resisted the action of time, while the thinner portion of the cup, exposed to accident and decay by standing out from the plaster, has in almost every instance perished. Boldetti informs us that he found two or three cups entire, and his representation of one of them is given in Padre Garrucci's work, t. xxxix. 7<sup>a</sup>, 7<sup>b</sup> (Rome *Sotterranea*, p. 276).

<sup>4</sup> The far-famed Sacro Catino of Genoa, taken by the Crusaders at Caesarea in 1101, made of glass (not, as formerly supposed, of a single emerald) has been fabled to be the dish used at the Saviour's Last Supper; but although it is undoubtedly very ancient, its history is quite unknown. Some account of it is given in Murray's *Hand-book of Northern Italy*, under "Genoa."

\* About twenty others are described only; the genuineness of some of them is suspected.



The cup, whose figure is referred to, is a species of cylix, with two small handles (their bases being recurved) at the sides, without a stem: upon its flat bottom are two three-quarter-length figures in a medallion, inscribed PETRVS, PAVLVS, the two apostles who, above all persons, are by far the most frequently represented in the glass of the catacombs. Garrucci figures a fragment of another vessel with channelled ribs, which must have been nearly of the shape of our tumblers (t. xxxviii. f. 9, 6). He thinks that others must have been in the form of a half-egg (*Pref.* p. vii.). Many of the medallions found in the catacombs are of very small size, little more than an inch in diameter; these were long supposed to be centres of the bottoms of small drinking-cups, but the discovery in 1864 and 1865 of two flat gilded glass plates at Cologne (both broken) has revealed their real character.



Glass Cylix, with Peter and Paul in gold leaf. (Garrucci, from Boldetti.)

On one of these plates, found near the church of St. Severinus,<sup>1</sup> about 10 inches in diameter, made of clear glass, were "inserted, while in a state of fusion, a number of small medallions of green glass exactly similar to those found in Rome, and which together form a series of scriptural subjects.<sup>2</sup> These medallions being of double glass

<sup>1</sup> "The patena found near the church of St. Ursula differs from the other discovered two years before, in having the subjects depicted in gold and colours on the surface of the glass instead of being within medallions of double glass. The drawing is also of a better style of art. It is now in the Slade Collection" (Brownlow and Northcote, u.s. pp. 277, 284; figured in *Catalogue of Slade Collection*, p. 50). The subjects represented on this glass are Moses at the Red Sea, Jonah, Daniel in the lions' den, the three children in the fiery furnace, the sacrifice of Isaac, the Nativity, and the healing of the man sick of the palsy.

<sup>2</sup> A figure of the two fragments of this plate is given by M<sup>rs</sup>. Brownlow and Northcote, u.s. p. 280. They

have resisted the ravages of time and accidents, which have destroyed the more thin and fragile glass of the *patena*. De Rossi has seen in the plaster of loculi in the catacombs the impression of large plates of this description, which have probably perished in the attempt to detach them from the cement" (Brownlow and Northcote, u.s. p. 281).

The cups, whose bottoms (or parts of them) now remain, were of various dimensions; the largest hitherto found have medallions of about five inches in diameter, others are about half that size: around the painted part there was a margin of plain glass. Sometimes, but very rarely as it would seem, the side of the cup as well as the bottom was ornamented with figures in gold leaf. Garrucci figures one fragment of such a side which is preserved in the Kircherian Museum<sup>3</sup> (t. xxxix. f. 9). The figures on the gold leaf were rendered more distinct by edging the outlines and other parts with dark lines; and other colours as green, white, and red of various tints were sparingly introduced: also on the outside of the glass bottoms various colours are found, especially azure, also green, violet, indigo, and crimson (Garrucci, *Pref.* p. vii.).<sup>4</sup>

The subjects represented on these glasses may now be considered. A few of them are taken from the classical mythology or represent secular subjects, whether games or trades, and these may probably not have been the works of Christian artists at all.<sup>5</sup> It is indeed an unexplained

contain twenty medallions. Eight of these have only a star in the centre. Three others appear to have the three children in the Babylonian furnace, one figure in each medallion. Four others have the history of Jonah in as many parts;—in the ship; under the gourd; swallowed by the whale; and vomited out by the same. Another gives Adam and Eve, the serpent round the tree being between them. The interpretation of the others is less certain. One has a figure holding a rod, which is supposed to be the Saviour; probably another medallion contained Lazarus. It is in the possession of Mr. P<sup>er</sup>reys of Cologne. See De Rossi, *Bull. Arch. Crist.* 1864, pp. 89-91, and a beautiful figure in gold and colour.

<sup>3</sup> He observes "d'unico esempio di figura dipinta intorno al corpo di una tazza e non sul fondo.... Rappresenta poi l'estremo lembo di un pallio orlato di una striscia di porpora, e notato ancora del segno X in color di porpora" p. 82.

<sup>4</sup> The figures in Garrucci's work are uncoloured, at least no coloured copy has been seen by the writer. In M<sup>rs</sup>. Brownlow and Northcote's work, so often laid under contribution, are two beautiful plates (xvii. and xviii.) shewing the pale bluish colour of the glass and the pencilling of the gold leaf with deep green. Martigny gives examples of the use of colour in the following specimens, figured by Perret, vol. iv. Purple in bands on the drapery (pl. xxxiii. 114); green in the sea-waves (xxxix. 76); flesh-colour in the face of Le Saviour (xxxiii. 102). Silver is occasionally used for white garments and the bandages of a corpse (Lazarus). In other cases we have gold or silver figures on an azure ground (*Dict.* p. 278).

<sup>5</sup> Garrucci and Wiseman consider this art to have been exercised by the Christians alone; but this is both *prima facie* improbable and does not very well accord with the existence of pagan types on some specimens "such as no Christian artist of the early ages would ever have thought of depicting," being wholly incapable of any Christian adaptation. See Brownlow and Northcote, u.s. p. 278. It must be confessed, however, that Garrucci (*pref.* p. xiv.) is able to refer to a silver cabinet bearing Christian emblems and also a triton and a nereid; as well as to *Sidonius*

difficulty how such glasses as represent Hercules, Minerva, Serapis, and the like should have been found in Christian catacombs at all; if indeed it be certain that they were found there.<sup>1</sup> It is beside the present purpose to say more of these.<sup>2</sup> The greater part of the designs, however, are connected with the Jewish or Christian religion; and, as has been already seen in part, subjects from the Old and New Testaments are sometimes grouped together on the same glass. A description of two perfect bottoms of cups, forming in each case a circular medallion, will show the mode of treatment.

(1) A bust draped in the centre, enclosed in a circle with legend ZESES (*Live! i.e. enjoy life!*). Around, without distinction into compartments, but with leaves and pellets interspersed, are: Jesus turning the water into wine; Tobit and the fish; Jesus ordering the man sick of the palsy to carry his bed; Jesus present with the Three Children in Nebuchadnezzar's furnace (Garrucci, t. i. f. 1).

(2) Two busts (a man and his wife?) draped in the centre, enclosed in a circle as before, with



Group of Scriptural subjects on bottom of a glass vessel. (Garrucci.)

legend PIE ZESES (*Drink! live!*). Around, in the same style as before, are the following sub-

Apollonius and Ennodius for examples of the same kind of thing; yet without dwelling on the fact that the monument no less than the authors very possibly belongs to a period when paganism had no longer any vigorous life (Visconti, *Opere Varie*, t. i. p. 312, thinks it is of the fourth or fifth century, the latter, to judge from the monument itself, which now reposes in the British Museum, seem at least as probable as the former), and might therefore, as now, afford subjects for Christian artists, yet the paganism on these glasses is more seriously pronounced: e.g. t. xxv. 1. "In nomine Herculis Acherontici (wrongly written Acherontici)... felices bitantes." See also t. xxv. 2.

<sup>1</sup> Menn. Brownlow and Northcote observe of the Vatican Collection of Christian Antiquities, that but very rarely has any account of the locality in which they have been discovered been preserved. It is to be suspected that some glasses with pagan subjects are from unknown localities and have been assumed to come from Christian catacombs where so many works of this fabric have been discovered.

<sup>2</sup> They are figured in Garrucci, t. xxiii.-xxvi, and are briefly noticed in Brownlow and Northcote, *o.c.* p. 378.

jects: Christ foretelling resurrection to Adam and Eve; the sacrifice of Isaac; Moses striking the rock; Jesus telling the sick man to carry his bed; Jesus raising Lazarus (cf. t. i. f. 3).

More usually, however, a single subject occupies the bottom of the glass. Thus we have on one (t. vi. f. 1) Christ as the Good Shepherd bear-



The Good Shepherd. (Garrucci.)

ing a lamb on his shoulders, with a sheep and two on each side, all enclosed in a circle; and the Greek legend enclosed in another circle outside. ΠΟΤΕ ΠΙΕ ΖΗΧΑΙC ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΚΑΘ' ΗΜΑΝΤΩΝ ΒΟΙΤ (for ΒΙΟΤ?), i.e. *Drink, Rufus, may you enjoy life with all yours! long life to you!* On another glass (t. vi. f. 9) occurs the same subject treated a little differently, with the nearly equivalent Latin legend: DIGNITAS AMICORVM VIVAS CVM TUIS FELICITER, i.e. *Here's to our worthy friends! may you live happily with all yours! Dignitas amicorum*, a frequently recurring acclamation on these glasses, is thought to be equivalent to *digni amici*, the form in



Christ turning Water into Wine. (Garrucci.)

which a Roman host drank his friends' health. On another (t. vi. f. 7), bearing the same subject enclosed in a square, we have the legend: BIVAS (doubtless for vivas) IN PACE DEI CONCORDI, a double border of dentels being enclosed in another outside square. On another, Christ is represented at full length in the midst of seven water-

pots (for the six of the Gospel are invariably changed into seven, probably from a symbolical feeling, and with a secret reference to the eucharist), surrounded by the legend DIGNITAS AMICORUM VIVAS IM (sic) PACE DEI ZESES: where *vitas* may either be taken for *bēbas*, or (which seems better) *zēses* may be regarded as a superfluous repetition of *vivas* (t. vii. f. 2).

It will now probably be thought sufficient to indicate briefly the subjects from the Old Testament including the Apocrypha and from the New, which can be recognised with certainty or probability upon these glasses, excluding those on the Cologne fragments. They are all contained in the first eight plates of Garrucci's work, but are here set down nearly in their Biblical order. Adam and Eve; Noah in the Ark; Sacrifice of Isaac; Joseph in the pit (?); Moses striking the rock; Moses lifting up the brazen serpent (?); the candlestick and other instruments of Mosaic worship; the Spies bearing the grapes of Canaan; Joshua commanding the Sun to stand still (?); Jonah's history (in several parts); the Three Children in Nebuchadnezzar's furnace; Daniel and the lions; Daniel destroying the Dragon; Susannah and the Elders (?); Tobit and the Fish.

The Wise Men offering gifts (?); Christ turning water into wine; Christ healing the sick of the palsy; Christ multiplying the seven loaves; Christ raising Lazarus; Christ as the Good Shepherd.

The chrisma or monogram of Christ is also of frequent occurrence, sometimes in connection with Saints, sometimes interposed between a husband and wife, sometimes between α and ω (tavv. i. vii. xi. xiv. xvii. xx. xxv. xxvi. xxix. xxxix.).

The only representation of the Crucifixion (t. xl. 1) is considered to be false.

"The Blessed Virgin is represented sometimes alone, with her name (MARIA) over her head, praying between two olive-trees, sometimes with the apostles Peter and Paul on either side of her; sometimes accompanied by the virgin martyr St. Agnes" (Brownlow and Northcote, u. s. p. 280). The apostles most frequently represented (on more than seventy glasses) are St. Peter and St. Paul, their names being added; sometimes singly, more often conjointly. "The two apostles are represented side by side, sometimes standing, sometimes seated. In some instances Christ is represented in the air . . . holding over the head of each a crown of victory; or in other instances a single crown is suspended between the two, as if to show that in their death they were not divided. This crown becomes sometimes a circle surrounding the labarum or chrisma, which is often supported on a pillar, thus symbolising 'the pillar and ground of the truth'" (Brownlow and Northcote, u. s. p. 285).<sup>a</sup> We have also single

<sup>a</sup> These learned writers try to persuade themselves that these glasses give us real portraits of the spouses, "excepting a few which are of very inferior execution." They rely principally on their resemblance to a bronze medal said to have been found in the cemetery of Domitilla, now in the Vatican, of which they give a beautiful figure (pl. xvii.), and which they say "has every appearance of having been executed in the time of the Flavian emperors, when Grecian art still flourished in Rome." De Rossi, who also figures this medal (*Bull. Arch. Crist.*

examples of the names of John, Thomas, Philip, and Jude, most probably the apostles; and two or three other names which occur in the New Testament, are also found: Lucas, Silvanus, Timotheus, Stephen (written Istephanus); these are probably the same persons whose names are mentioned in the New Testament. (For the glasses on which these names occur, see Garrucci's *Index*, p. 109.)

There are, besides the persons mentioned in Scripture, a good many others which are of note in ecclesiastical history. St. Agnes occurs more than a dozen times, St. Laurence seven times, and St. Hippolytus four times; the following among others occur less frequently, St. Callistus, St. Cyprian, and St. Marcellinus, the last of whom was martyred under Diocletian, A.D. 304 (see Garrucci's *Index*, as above). Besides these, many other proper names, probably of the possessors, occur either along with their miniatures or without them (see Garrucci's *Index*, as before). There is nothing which deserves to be called a real portrait in any of these representations, which are mostly, perhaps all, executed in the debased style of the 4th century; and as the saints have no emblems attached their figures have but little interest. We have also on these glasses scenes of domestic Christian life—married life, and family life. The occurrence of the chrisma makes their Christian character certain: where this or the name of Christ or God does not occur, it is rash to say anything definite (Garrucci, tavv. xxvi.—xxxix.).

A few more words may suffice for the inscriptions. The acclamations, of which several specimens have been given, are mostly of a convivial character, and either in Greek (rarely), or in Latin (most usually), or in a mixture of the two (not unfrequently):<sup>o</sup> none of them at all favour the supposition that they were used as chalices. Other acclamations, as VIVATIS IN DEO; and MARTVRA EPECTETE VIVATIS, express good wishes to the married couple (*id.* t. xxvi. 11, 12). On a very few of the glasses we have, as it appears, invocations of saints or legends which acknowledge their patronage. Thus a broken fragment has PETRVS PROTEG.; whether any letters followed, it is impossible to say: the word may either be *protegit* or *protegit* or even *protege* (*id.* t. x. f. 1). Another fine but meagre fragment exhibits the Saviour (apparently) with the chrisma and the α and ω, bearing a Latin cross with legend, . . . ANE (*Salviane*, or some other proper name) VIVAS IN CR[ISTO ET] LAVRENTIO (*id.* t. xx. f. 1). Another (u. s. f. 2), which is also broken, but slightly, has VITO (or perhaps VICTOR) [VIV]AS IN NOMINE LAVRETI (for *Laurenti*). The inscription PETRVS, written in two instances against Moses striking the rock (*id.* t. x.

Nov. 1864), thinks it is of the second or third century. Notwithstanding these high but somewhat discordant authorities, the writer ventures to express his own strong suspicion that the style of the medal bespeaks the age of the Renaissance: it is most probably of the 15th century or thereabouts.

<sup>o</sup> We give here two or three of this mixed character: CVM TVIS FELICITER ZESES (Garr. t. xii. 1); DIGNITAS AMICORVM PIZ ZESES CVM TVIS OMNIBVS BISK ET PROPINA (t. xii. 2). (Both the above glasses have figures of Peter and Paul, with their names added.) On the same plate are other examples of bilingual redundancy: such as—VIVAS PIZ ZESES, VIVAS CVM TVIS ZESES.

f. 9; Brownlow and Northcote, u. c. pl. xvii. 2, and p. 287), is also of some theological importance as indicating that Peter was then looked upon as the Moses of the new Israel of God, as Prudentius speaks. The honour, however, appears to be divided between Peter and Paul on another glass, unfortunately mutilated. Christ stands on a hill between Peter and Paul. Above is the common legend *PIE Z[ESES]*; below are the words *IERSALE . IORDANES . BECLE* (for *Bethlehem*, C = 97). Peter is here the apostle of the Jews, Paul of the Gentiles, who first worshipped the Saviour at Bethlehem. Below are sheep adoring the Lamb on a hill between them, symbolising both churches (Garrucci, t. x. f. 8.)

The orthography of the legends is sometimes barbarous.<sup>7</sup> Thus Jesus is written *ZESVS* (viii. 5); ZENVS (vii. 17), &c. *CHRISTVS* is spelt *CRISTVS* (viii. 5, xii. 1, &c.); *TIMOTHEVS* becomes *TIMOTVS* (xvii. 2); *HIPPOLYTUS*, *EROLITVS* (xix. 7), or *IPOLITVS* (xix. 5); *CYPRIANVS*, *CRIPRANVS* (xx. 8); *SVCHVS*, *TVCINVS* (xxviii. 6); *SEVERVS*, *SEVERE* (xxix. 5); *PHILIPPVS*, *FILPVS* (xxv. 6). We have also *BIDAS* for *VIVAS* (vi. 7); *VIBATIS* for *VIVATIS* (xxix. 4); *IM PACE* for *IN PACE* (vii. 2, xv. 5); *PIE* for *PIE*



The Adoration of the Saviour. (Garrucci.)

(i. 3, &c.); *PIE* for *Pis* (xxvi. 10). There are a few other instances of similar orthographic changes, to say nothing of such blunders as *DIONTIAS* for *DIGNITAS*, and *CRISTVS* for *CRISTVS* (*Christus*) (Garr. p. 53).

The dates of these works are defined to some extent by their subjects. On one of them (xxiii. 5) a heap of money is depicted, among which we recognise the coins of Caracalla and one of the Faustinas. On another, as has been said, occurs the name of Marcellinus, probably the bishop of Rome, martyred A.D. 304.<sup>8</sup> The martyrdom of St. Agnes, who is so often represented, probably took place about the same time. The appearance of the dress, arrangement of the hair, and of the general art and orthography induces Garrucci (*Pref.* p. ix.) to consider them all anterior to Theodosius (A.D. 380). De Rossi attempts a

<sup>7</sup> Garrucci lays stress on this orthography for fixing the date: "questis manibus di scripturae non constantis riva al secolo quarto" (*pref.* p. ix.). He appears to consider that these glasses all belong to that century.

<sup>8</sup> The martyrdoms of Vincentius and of Genesius, whose names similarly occur, also took place under Theodosius (Garrucci, *pref.* pp. viii. ix.).

more precise limitation, and thinks that they range from the middle of the 3rd to the beginning of the 4th century (Brownlow and Northcote, u. c. p. 279). We shall probably be as far wrong in saying that few or none of them are much earlier or later than the 4th century.<sup>9</sup> The art of the coins of that century, as well as of the MS. illuminations which are assigned to about the same age, strongly remind us of these glasses, more especially of those on which the *christus* is depicted.<sup>10</sup> The execution of some glasses is indeed better than that of others, and occasionally reaches considerable excellence; but to speak generally, they belong to a period in which taste and vigour and correctness of drawing have sensibly declined. They possess, however, apart from their main subjects, much interest as showing the styles of borders and other ornamentations then prevalent, besides giving costume and a variety of domestic objects.<sup>11</sup>

With regard to the uses of these glasses a consideration of the types, coupled with the inscriptions, will lead us to secure conclusions. Even if it were well established<sup>12</sup> that in Tertullian's

<sup>9</sup> Mr. Marriott (*Notes of the Catacombs*, p. 16), after observing that "these glasses, with few exceptions, belong to a period of very degraded art," considers that "there are very strong reasons of a technical kind, in reference to the use of the nimbus, for assigning many of them to the 5th, if not to the 6th century." But if these glasses were found in the catacombs, it is hardly possible to place any of them later than the first quarter of the 5th century after the year 410 no inscriptions occur in the catacombs, and they have become rarer and rarer from the beginning of the last quarter of the 4th century. See *Inscriptions*. It is true that "Pope Symmachus Vigilius and John III. did their best to repair the damage which had been done in the catacombs by the Lombards and others" in restoring the inscriptions of Pope Damasus, but they would scarcely have replaced the glass vessels which had been stuck into the cement which closed the graves. See Brownlow and Northcote, u. c. p. 178.

<sup>10</sup> The *christus* with the *a* and *u* (xxix. 1) is identical in treatment with the same types upon the coins of Constantine II., Magnentius, and Decentius. And this monogram, whenever it occurs, with scarcely an exception (see, however, xvii. 7, where the general style and art differ also), is of the same form (*R*) that is usual on the coins of the fourth century: another form (*G*) is said to occur on a coin of Licinius Jun. (Garrucci, *Monnaie Constantinienne*, p. 103; appendix to his *Vegeti Gram.*).

<sup>11</sup> Martigny observes that those of the best work (representing the Good Shepherd, Garr. vii. 1, reproduced here, which is perhaps the best executed of all and the oldest) have Greek legends, being probably the work of Greek artists (*Dict.* p. 279).

<sup>12</sup> Is it altogether certain that *collores* are *collores* for the communion? St. Ambrose speaks of these "quod rationes ad aspicere martyrum deferunt atque illis in corporum bibunt" (*De oblat. et euc. pascend.*). If not, it may then well be that Tertullian is alluding to some such glasses as these but certainly any which remain to us can be so early as A.D. 300. Oxyrhynchus (*Bull.* n. d. *Med.*) says that the portrait of Meletius was depicted in *dermace*: *qui dermace*; such vessels may possibly have been similar to those of which we have specimens; if so, the art will probably be Asiatic as well as European. We have indeed a bottom of a small glass vessel which simply reads *MELITI* (for *Meletius* probably) *DIACONUS* (xxviii. 4); yet this can hardly be the same person; it may be a present from a parent to a child, or the like. The remark of Cardinal Wiseman appears to be well founded, that "not a single authentic specimen of a single genuine ancient, mentions the



time the Good Shepherd was depicted on chalices, possibly glass chalices ("procedant ipsae picturae calicum vestrorum, si vel in illis *perlucebit* interpretatio," *De pudicit.* c. 7; see also c. 10), there is certainly nothing in these glasses bearing that type or any other type, which would bear out the conclusion that they were chalices for the communion.\* They were at once sacred and convivial, and must therefore have been used in meetings which were both one and the other. Such were the *agapae*, such were the commemorations of martyrs, such were Christian marriages. On all such occasions, and perhaps others, these glasses were used; more especially, it may be, in the commemorations of St. Peter and St. Paul (so often represented thereon), which were "observed as a general holiday in Rome during the fourth century, very much as Christmas now is among ourselves" (Brownlow and Northcote, *u. s. p.* 283). In a well-known passage of St. Augustine (*Confess.* vi. 2), he mentions that his mother Monica never took more than one cup (*poillum*) to the commemoration of the various martyrs—implying that some took more; perhaps bearing effigies of the particular martyrs to be commemorated.

With regard to the plates, large fragments of which have been found at Cologne and smaller ones at Rome, as well as impressions in mortar of entire plates at the latter place, the most obvious and natural interpretation of them would be that they were made use of in the same festivities as those in which the glass cups were employed. Monica, at Milan, as her son informs us, "brought to the commemorations of the Saints, as was the custom in Africa, pulse and bread and wine" (*Confess.* vi. 2). We may then reasonably suppose that these plates were for the purpose of holding the bread or other solid food used in the same commemorations as those in which wine was drunk. A different view, however, as was perhaps to be expected, is taken of them by those who (like Messrs. Brownlow and Northcote) think that "it is quite possible that some of our glasses may be fragments of chalices" (*u. s. p.* 293). Anastasius in the *Vitae Pontif.* s. v. Zephyrinus, says "that he made it a constitution of the church, that ministers should carry glass patens (*patenae vitreae*) into the church in front of the priests, while the bishop celebrated mass with the priests standing before him, and that in this manner . . . the priest should receive the bread to administer it to the people." Messrs. Brownlow and Northcote, commenting on this passage, say (*u. s. p.* 293): "The fragments of the two large *patenae* discovered at Cologne, correspond exactly to the kind of glass here mentioned. The scriptural subjects and the absence of any allusions to secular feasting" there are no inscriptions at all on these glasses "accord well with so sacred a purpose, and we may therefore fairly presume that those other smaller glasses" found in Rome, "of which we have also spoken, may also be remains of the *patenae* used to

convey the Blessed Sacrament from the pope's altar to the parish churches of Rome. Padre Garrucci thinks this not improbable, although he does not admit that any of our catacomb glasses ever formed portions of eucharistic chalices." The reader must be left to form his own opinion, but the subjects on the *patenae* being much the same as those on the bottoms of the cups, it seems to be by far the most probable supposition, that the purpose of the plates and of the cups was one and the same, whatever that purpose was. (Garrucci, *Vetri ornati di figure in oro*, Roma, 1858 and 1864 (ed. 2), fol. 42 plates: the preface contains an account of the literature of the subject, pp. xvii. xviii. and a discussion of the date and use of these vessels; De Rossi, *Bull. Arch. Crist.* for 1864 and 1866; Brownlow and Northcote, *Roma Sotterranea*, c. vii. 1869. Wiseman (Card.), *Lecture delivered in Dublin*, 1858, published by M. Walsh, Dublin, 1859; certainly not revised by the Cardinal himself, but giving a fair view of the subject in a short space.)

(iii.) *Glass pastes*.—Another use of glass among Christian as well as other artists was to make imitations or copies of gems therein. A few such have come down to our times. A paste in imitation of red jasper, published by Le Blant, which exhibits a *Pastor Bonus* of the usual type, with the legend ΔΟΤΑΟC ΧΡΙCΤΟΤ, may serve as an example (Böckh, *C. I. G.* n. 9093). Other gem pastes in imitation of niccolo and garnet exhibit varieties of the chrisma (British Museum, Castellani Collection). Of more importance are the following. A Nativity, in green glass, published by Venuti (*Acad. di Cortona*, t. vii. p. 45), and described and figured by Martigny (*Dict.* p. 431), which is ascribed to the 6th century; it is a semicircular plaque, bearing the words Η ΓΕΝΝΗCΙC above, and a defaced legend below: the Magi adore the Saviour, at whom an ox and an ass are gazing: Mary is lying on a bed, and Joseph is seated in meditation. The Vettori Museum, now in the Vatican, has a large oval plaque of coloured glass (Vettori, *Num. Aer. expl.* p. 37; Martigny, *Dict.* p. 431, with a figure), which seems to be early medieval; it is also a Nativity: the infant Saviour has a cruciform nimbus; two oxen look at him in the manger; Joseph and Mary are seated near him; the moon and the star of the Magi are in the field. (A cast sent from Rome; the British Museum has three other examples cast from the same mould; one is red, in imitation of jasper; the others are of deep colour.) See NATIVITY. A large glass plaque of the same general form, but less regular (1½ by 2½ inches), now, it is believed, in the Vatican, of uncertain date, represents a dead saint prostrate; in the centre a semiaureole resting upon her, including the Virgin with cruciform nimbus and Child without any nimbus, a glorified head with circular nimbus (Joseph?) near the Virgin's knees, Γ Χ̄ in field: outside the aureole on both sides saints and angels (both with circular nimbus) in the act of adoration: perhaps early medieval. (A cast sent from Rome.) We have also glass pastes nearly an inch in diameter which are supposed to have been pendants for necklaces, and are considered to go back to the early Christian centuries: one in green glass shews two Israelites contemplating the brazen serpent; another, a red paste, has the Saviour

existence of this art" (*Lecture*, p. 7). The most that can be said is that Tertullian and Chrysostom may possibly allude to it. The passage quoted by Garrucci from the monk Theophilus (*Dis. Art. Sched.* c. 13), who probably lived about the 12th century, refers to a different mode of decoration, as he himself observes (*pref.* p. vi.).

\* As Boldetti and various others have thought. Their arguments are discussed by Garrucci (*pref.* pp. x.-xiii.)

blessing the twelve apostles; a third, probably Christian, has a frog, which was sometimes taken as a symbol of the Resurrection, being found on a Christian lamp, accompanied by a cross and the inscription, ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ ΑΝΑΤΑΚΙC (Chabouillet, nos. 3474, 3475, 3453). M. Le Blant has a small oblong glass plaque, which he acquired in Rome, which was once, he thinks, part of an ancient Christian necklace; it bears

OMN  
IBVS

in golden characters the word in two lines, enclosed in a parallelogram and a crenulated outer margin. He regards it as a "concise expression of the charity which should unite all men" (*Inc. Christ. de la Grèce*, vol. I. p. 43, with a figure). The British Museum and the French Collection contain various other Christian works in this material, some of which are more or less similar to those which have been already described, or to the Byzantine camel named under GEMS; but as they are of uncertain date (perhaps none of them being earlier than the 9th century) while some may probably be much later) they need hardly be mentioned here.

(iv.) *Mosaic*.—Glass, in fine, was employed from very early times in the construction of mosaics. The cubes were sometimes coloured; sometimes, in the ages of the Lower Empire, underlaid with a ground of gold or silver leaf, "by this means shedding over the large works of the artists in mosaic a splendour before unknown" (Labarte, u. s. p. 94). See MOSAIC.

[C. B.]

**GLEBE.** The word *glebe* is used for a farm or estate in the Theodosian Codex (*Leg. 72, De Decurion.*); but the technical sense in which it is used by English writers, to designate certain lands belonging to an ecclesiastical benefice, is later than our period. See ENDOWMENT, PROPERTY OF THE CHURCH.

[C.]

#### GLORIA. [NINBO.]

**GLORIA IN EXCELSIS.** There is considerable difficulty in tracing out the history of this hymn, because at one period both it and the *SANCTUS* were entitled indiscriminately *Hymnus Angelicus*. In later years the latter is called *Hymnus Seraphicus*; whilst the title *Hymnus Angelicus* or *Hymnus Angelorum* is confined to the former. The hymn is found in various forms.

1. We have simply the words of St. Luke, ii. 14. This is of course the primitive form, everything that has been added to it having been composed,—as the 4th council of Toledo (A.D. 633, Mansi, i. 623) reminds us,—by the ecclesiastical doctors. For this reason the council would not allow any expanded form to be sung in the churches. In this short form the words were recited by the priest, according to the liturgy of St. James, when the priest "sealed" the gifts. (Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, iv. 103.) The same simple form may be seen elsewhere: and is continued to this day in the

† A lens of the Sericior (to be compared with the earlier Byzantine coins) on a circular plaque of blue glass (1½ inch in diameter) brought from Constantinople, now in the Stale Collection; and a panta polydroma mosaic, inscribed BENEDICAT NOS Ds (Chabouillet, u. s. p. 107) may probably not be later than that century.

morning service of the Horology (p. 35, of Venice, 1870).

2. The seventh book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, c. 47, contains an enlarged form of the hymn,—without any introduction in the oldest manuscript; but two, of the 14th and 16th century respectively, entitle the chapter "Morning Prayer." (Lagarde, p. 229.) This version has a peculiar reading: "We worship Thee through the great High Priest, Thee who art one God, unbegotten, alone, inaccessible." We read too "O Lord, only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, and Holy Spirit." The hymn ends "Thou only art holy, Thou only art Lord, Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father. Amen."

3. The treatise which is ascribed to Athanasius "de Virginitate" (Migne, xviii. 251) is undoubtedly spurious, but it gives some insight into the life of a Greek virgin, within our chronological limits. In § 20 (Migne, ut sup. 275) we read "In the morning, say the Psalm O God, my God, early will I seek Thee (Psalm lxi.). At dawn, the 'Benedicite' and Glory to God in the Highest, and the rest." This is the reading of the Basle and English MSS. But others proceed with the first three clauses: "We hymn Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, and the rest." As this difference of the text may be due to a late interpolation, we are left in uncertainty as to the words of the hymn when this treatise was composed. (Mr. Palmer, *Orig. Liturg. i. 156* does not note the doubts regarding this passage.)

4. The famous *Codex Alexandrinus* in the British Museum, of the close of the 5th century, puts some of our doubts at rest. This manuscript, after the psalms, contains the thirteen canticles of the Greek church: i. the song of Moses in Exodus; ii. ditto in Deuteronomy; iii. the prayer of Hannah; iv. prayer of Isaiah (xvi. 9-20); v. prayer of Jonah; vi. of Habakkuk; vii. of Hesiakiah (Isaiah, xxviii.); viii. of Manasseh; ix. prayer of the three children (xv. 1-22); x. hymn of the three children (our *Benedicite*) entitled "Hymn of our fathers;" xi. prayer of Mary, the Mother of God; xii. of Symeon; xiii. of Zachariah (compare CANTICLES). These conclude with the Gloria in Excelsis in Greek, the hymn being entitled *ἕως ἡμερῶν*. This version has been often printed, as by Usher, in his tract *De synodo Romano*: Bunsen, *Analecta ante-Nicensia*, iii. 86: Dr. Campion, *Interleaved Prayer Book*, 1873, p. 321. It differs slightly from the version of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and proceeds with words which distinctively mark it as a morning hymn, some of which words have passed into our Te Deum. It is thus found in the beautiful Zurich psalter reprinted by Tischendorf in his *Monumenta Sacra*, and in other great psalters; and in a form very nearly resembling this, it is used in the Greek communion to this day (*Horology*, ut sup. pp. 69, 70).

5. A Latin translation of this Greek version of the "Gloria in Excelsis," adapted for evening prayer, is contained in the book of hymns of the ancient Irish church, which once belonged to Archbishop Usher, and which has been edited for the Irish Archaeological and Celtic Society by Dr. Todd (part ii. p. 179). In the famous Bangor antiphonary discovered at Milan by Muratori, and reprinted imperfectly by him in his *Anecdota*, tom. iv. pp. 121, &c. (see Migne, tom. 77) we

find at the very end "ad vesperum et ad matutinum: Gloria in Excelsis Deo et in terra pax &c." but Muratori unhappily did not copy it out. Thus we are ignorant of the text. However, the hymn given by Thomasius (*Psalterium cum canticis*, Rom. 1697, p. 760, or *Oper. tom. iii. p. 613*) as the *Hymnus Angelicus* of the Ambrosian breviary, is another and independent translation of the Greek form of the hymn. It was directed to be used daily at matins.

6. Thus it seems clear that when the well known Latin form of the hymn was inserted in the Latin psalters, it was used in the daily or weekly hour services of the clergy. We have additional evidence of this in the rule of Caesarius, c. xxi. and in that of Aurelian. It is there ordered to be used at matins on Sundays.

7. This Latin form Bunsen considered to have been as old as Hilary of Poitiers, to whom indeed Alcuin ascribed the additions to the scripture words. The Roman Catholic ritualists are not satisfied with the testimony of Alcuin, and seem to consider that the hymn in the modern Latin form is of more recent origin. Yet it is found in this form in a very interesting manuscript in the British Museum—Royal 2 A xx.—which is of the eighth century: in the famous *Codex Bobiensis*, from which Mabillon extracted the "*Sacramentarium Gallicanum*" (*Museum Italicum*, i. 273; Muratori, *Liturg. Rom. Vet.* ii. 776; or Migne, 72, p. 455): in the so-called Mozarabic liturgy ascribed to St. Isidore (see Migne, 85, p. 531) and in a form very slightly different in the Gothic breviary (Migne, 86, p. 886).

8. The first introduction of the "Gloria in Excelsis" into the Eucharistic service has been ascribed to Telesphorus, but no confidence can be placed in the tradition. The sacramentary of Gregory directed that a bishop might use the "Gloria in Excelsis" on all Sundays and festivals: a presbyter only at Easter. This rule continued long in the Roman church, and constituted one point of difference between the Roman and Gallican churches, in the latter of which no such difference between bishop and presbyter had been observed. Etherius and Beatus shew that in Spain they always sang it on Sundays and festivals; but they quote only the scriptural words, and if we bear in mind the decree of Toledo, we may suppose that only these words were used (the Mozarabic liturgy shews many marks of interpolations). In the liturgies the hymn was generally sung at the commencement of the service; but Mr. Palmer notes that in the Gallican sacramentary (see above) it was used amongst the thanksgivings after communion.

9. The absence of the hymn from St. Germanus's account of the Gallican liturgy has been noted. He says that the words at the end of the gospel, "Glory be to Thee O Lord," were uttered in imitation (?) of the angels' words "Glory to God in the highest" (*clamantibus clericis Gloria tibi Domine in specie angelorum qui nascente Domino Gloria in excelsis pastoribus apparentibus cecinerunt*. Migne, 72, p. 91). St. Germanus died about the year 585 or 587. This seems to give a superior limit to its introduction into the eucharistic service.

10. It is worthy of notice that whilst the Alexandrine manuscript has in the text of St. CHRIST. ANT.

Luke εὐδοκίας (the reading of N\* B\* D) yet in the morning hymn it as well as all the other copies of the hymn read εὐδοκία. [C. A. S.]

### GLORIA PATRI. [DOXOLOGY.]

GLOVES. (χειροθήκη: *Chirotheca*, *Gantus*, *Gwantus*, *Vantus*, *Wuntus*, *Wantus*.) It would seem that gloves in the strict sense of the word were unknown to the early Greeks and Romans. (See on this point Casaubon's *Animadv. in Athenaeum*, xii. 2.) That they were in use, however, among the ancient Persians appears from Xenophon (*Cyropaedia*, viii. 8. 17). The European custom of wearing them seems to have originated with the German nations, as the Teutonic origin of the common Latin word for them clearly shews: and although, as an ecclesiastical vestment, properly so called, gloves do not appear till the 12th century (the first extant mention of them in that character being in Honorius Augustodunensis, ob. circa 1152 A.D.), they had been used for centuries as articles of practical convenience. Thus we find them mentioned in the life of St. Columbanus, by Jonas Bobbiensis (formerly included among the works of Bede)—"tegumenta manuum quae Galli wantos vocant" (*Vita S. Columbani*, c. 25; *Patrol.* lxxxvii. 1026). In the above instance, the gloves are spoken of as used "ad operam laboris," but sometimes they were obviously of a costly nature, for in the will of Riculfus, bishop of Helena (ob. 915 A.D.), in a long list of valuable articles, he mentions "annulum aureum unum cum gemmis pretiosis et vuantos paria unum" (*Patrol.* cxxxii. 468).

The employment of a glove in connection with the granting or bequeathing of land, is a custom which hardly falls within our present limits: an example may, however, be given. (See Notgeri Leodiensis [ob. 1008 A.D.] *Vita S. Hadilini*, c. 10; *Patrol.* cxxxix. 1146: also Martene, *Anecd.* i. 57.) For further early references to the subject of gloves, see Ducange's *Glossarium*, s. vv. [R. S.]

GLYCERIA, martyr A.D. 141; commemorated May 13 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

### GNOSTIC. [FAITHFUL.]

GOAR, presbyter and confessor at Treves (saec. vi.); "natalis" July 6 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.* Usuardi); deposition July 6 (*Mart. Adonis*). [W. F. G.]

GOD 'THE FATHER, REPRESENTATIONS OF.\* For the first four centuries, at least, no attempt was made at representing the actual Presence of the First Person of the Trinity. It was indicated invariably by the symbolic HAND proceeding from a cloud. Martigny quotes the words of St. Augustine (*Epist.* cxlviii. 4), "Quum audimus manus, operationem intelligere debemus," from which it would seem that the great father saw a tendency to anthropomorphic misapplication of the words hand and eye, or ear of God, as they are frequently used in the Old Testament. The distinction between analogy and similitude has been so often neglected, that bodily parts as well as passions (like those of anger, repentance, &c.) are often attributed to

\* Most representations of the Divine presence have their proper place under the word TRINITY.

the incorporeal and infinite being. This has been repeatedly noticed, as (*e. g.*) by Drs. Whately and Mansel. St. Augustine's expressions show that he was thoroughly awake to the misconception, and consequent irreverence, involved in the forgetful use of such terms as the Divine hand or eye for the Divine power or knowledge. "Quidquid," he says, "dum ista cogitas, corporeae similitudinis occurrerit, abige, abne, nega, respue, fuge."

The symbolic hand appears in Christian representations of several subjects from the Old Testament, principally connected with events in the lives of Abraham and Moses. The two are found corresponding to each other in Bottari (*Sculture e Pitt. sagre*, vol. i. tav. 27; also i. tav. 89). Moses is receiving the book of the law in ii. tav. 128. Elsewhere Abraham is alone (vol. ii. tav. 59, and i. tav. 33, from the Callixtine catacomb). In vol. iii. 37 (from cemetery of St. Agnes), the Deity appears to be represented in human form. He is delivering to Adam and Eve respectively the ears of corn and the lamb, as tokens of the labours of their fallen state, and their sentence to "delve and spin." See also Buonarrotti, p. 1. Cardinal Bosio, and latterly M. Perret (vol. i. 57 pl.), give a copy of a painting of Moses striking the rock, and also in the act of loosening the shoe from his foot. Ciampini's plates (*Vet. Mon.* t. ii. pp. 81, tav. xxiv. also tavv. xvi. and xx. tav. xvii. D.) are important illustrations of this symbol, more especially those of the mosaic of the Transfiguration in St. Apollinaris in Classe, and of the Sacrifice of Isaac in St. Vitale. The author does not find the hand as representing the First Person of the Trinity in pictures of the baptism of our Lord; but it probably occurs in that connexion.

The hand proceeding from clouds appears in the Sacramentary written for Drogon bishop of Metz, and son of Charlemagne, above the Canon of the Mass.

The Creator is represented in the MS. of Alcuin. See Westwood's *Palaeographia Sacra*.

[R. St. J. T.]

#### GODFATHERS. [SPONSORS.]

#### GOLDEN NUMBER. [EASTER.]

**GOOD FRIDAY.** The anniversary of Christ's Passion and Death was from very early times observed with great solemnity by the church. It was known by various names, *ἡμέρα τοῦ σταυροῦ*, *σωτηρία*, or *τὰ σωτήρια*; *πάσχα σταυρώσιμον*, in contrast to *πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον*, Easter Day; or, adopting the Jewish designation (*Joh. xix. 14, 31, 42*), *παρασκευή*, either alone, or with the adjectives *μεγάλη*, or *ἀγία*: in the Latin church *Parasceue*, *Feria Sexta in Parasceue* (*Antiphonar. Gregor.*), *Sexta Feria Major in Hierusalem* (*Sacramentar. Gregor.*). The day was observed as a strict fast, which was continued by those who could endure it to beyond midnight on the following day (*Apost. Constit. v. 18*). The fourth council of Toledo, A.D. 633, severely condemned those who ended their fast on this day at 3 P.M. and then indulged in feasting, and ordered that all save the very young and the very old and the sick should abstain from all food till after the services of the day were concluded. All who refused obedience to this rule were denied a participation in the

Paschal Eucharist (*can. viii.; Labbe, Concil. v. 1707*). Not food alone, but the use of oil and the bath were forbidden by a canon of Gangra (*Nomocanon, can. 434, apud Cotelier. Eccl. Graec. Monum. i. 138*) with the indignant apostrophe, 'Ο Χριστός ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ καὶ σὺ ἐν τῷ βαλανείῳ; In process of time the day came to be distinguished by a peculiar ritual and customs marking the solemn character of the day. The bells were silent from the midnight of Wednesday (*Ordo Roman. apud Muratori, ii. 714*). The kiss of peace was prohibited (*Tert. de Orat. 18*). The altar was stript of its ornaments, and even of its covering. The processions were without chanting (*Sacram. Gelas. Muratori i. 559*). The lamps and candles were gradually extinguished during matins (*Ordo Roman. u. s.*). A long series of intercessory collects was used. A cross was erected in front of the altar, blessed, and adored (*Sacram. Gelas. u. s.*). There was no consecration of the Lord's Supper, but the reserved eucharist of the previous day was partaken of by the faithful.

This communion subsequently received the name of "the Mass of the Presanctified," *Missa Praesanctificatorum*, but incorrectly, the term *Missa* usually implying consecration. Thus Amalarius states that on Good Friday "the mass is not celebrated" (*de Eccl. Offic. iv. 20; Rab. Maur. de Instit. Cler. ii. 37; pseudo-Alcuin, Hittorp col. 251*). The reason of this prohibition of celebration is evident. The eucharist being the highest Christian feast, was deemed out of harmony with the penitential character of the day, for "how," says Balsamon (*Bevereg. Pandect. i. 219*), "can one mourn and rejoice at the same time?" As early as the council of Laodicea, c. A.D. 365, this prohibition was extended to the whole of Lent, with the exception of Saturdays and Sundays (*can. 49; Labbe Concil. i. 1506*). In the letter to Decentius ascribed to Innocent I. c. A.D. 402, but probably not to be placed so early, the restriction is limited to Good Friday and Easter Eve, on which days the tradition of the church was that the sacraments were not to be celebrated at all; "*isto biduo sacramenta penitus non celebrari*" (*Labbe Concil. ii. 1246*). At this period there was no communion of any kind on Good Friday. How early the natural desire to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood on the day when it was offered for us on the cross, led to the reservation of the previously consecrated elements for the purpose of communion, we have no certain knowledge. It is evident from a decree of the 4th council of Toledo, A.D. 633, that in the first half of the seventh century, there was no celebration of the Lord's Supper on Good Friday in Spain. At that time it was a wide-spread custom, which the council condemned, to keep the doors of the churches closed on Good Friday, so that there was no divine service, nor any preaching of the Passion to the people. The council ordained that the Lord's death should be preached on that day, and that the people should pray for the pardon of their sins, that so they might be better fitted to celebrate the resurrection and partake of the eucharist at Easter (*can. viii. Labbe Concil. v. 1707*). We learn also from the acts of the 16th council, held sixty years later, A.D. 693, that on that day "the altars were stript and no one was permitted to celebrate mass" (*ib. vi*



1355). In the Greek church the custom of communicating in the previously consecrated elements was established before the middle of the seventh century, for we find it mentioned as a general practice during the whole of Lent, in the acts of the Trullan (or Quinisext) council A.D. 692 (can. 52, Labbe vi. 1165). It first appears in the West in the *Regula Magistri*, a monastic rule compiled probably in the seventh century, printed by Brockie (*Codex Regul.* i. ii. p. 269). It was established in Rome before the end of the eighth century, when the ritual of Good Friday is prescribed in the *Ordo Romanus* (Muratori *Liturg. Rom. Vet.* ii. 995). The observance of Good Friday commenced at midnight, when all rose for service. Nine Psalms were said with their responsions, these were followed by three lections from the Lamentations, commencing Lam. ii. 8, "Cogitavit Dominus dissipare;" three from the Tractatus of St. Augustine on Psalm 63, and three from the Epistle to the Hebrews, beginning c. iv. 11, "Festinemus ergo &c." Mattins then followed, during which the lights in the church were gradually extinguished, beginning at the entrance, until by the end of the third nocturn only the seven lamps burning at the altar were left alight. These were also put out, one by one, alternately right and left at the commencement of each Psalm, the middle lamp, the last left burning, being extinguished at the gospel. At the third hour all the presbyters and clergy of the city assembled in expectation of the pontiff. On his arrival the subdeacon commenced the lection from Hosea v. 15, "Haec dicit Dominus Deus; in tribulatione sua, &c.," and then was sung as an antiphon Hab. iii. 1-3, "Domine audi, &c." After some prayers said by the pontiff, and the second lection, Exod. xii. 1, "In diebus illis dixit Dominus ad Moysen et Aaron, &c.," Ps. xci. or cxl. was sung, and the Passion according to St. John was recited by the deacon. This over, two deacons stript the altar of the white linen cloth, previously put on "sub evangelio," in a stealthy manner, "in modum furantis." The pontiff came before the altar and recited a series of eighteen prayers, a portion of which form the basis of the Good Friday collects of the church of England. The first and last collect stand alone. The other sixteen are in pairs. Before each pair the deacon warned the people to kneel and after it to rise. "Adnuntiat diaconus flectamus genua; iterum dicit levate." These collects are—(1) for the peace and unity of the church; (2) for perseverance in the faith; (3) for the pope and chief bishop (antistes); (4) for the bishops of their diocese; (5) for all bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, &c.; (6) for all orders of men in the holy church; (7) for the emperor; (8) for the Roman empire; (9) (10) for catechumens; (11) against sickness, famine, pestilence, and other evils; (12) for all in trouble; (13) (14) for heretics and schismatics; (15) (16) for Jews; (17) (18) for pagans and idolaters. A direction is given that the prayers for the Jews are not to be said kneeling. The collects are given in the Sacramentary of Gregory, as printed by Pamelina, and in that of Gelasius, as well as in the old Gallican missal. This last contains the direction to the celebrant "eadem die non salutatur (i.e. does not say *pax vobiscum*), nec psallet." These collects finished, all were to leave the church

in silence: the presbyters going to perform the same service in their own churches.

"Adoration of the cross succeda." The cross is placed a little distance in front of the altar, supported on either side by acolytes. A kneeling stool being placed in front, the pontiff kneels, and adores and kisses the cross, followed by the clergy and people in order. The Ambrosian missal given by Pamelius contains four prayers for the ceremony: "Oratio super crucem;" "Benedictio crucis;" "Oratio ad crucem adorandam;" "Oratio post adoratum crucem." In the Antiphonarium of Gregory also given by Pamelius we have an "Antiphona ad crucem adorandam." The adoration of the cross was followed by the communion of the pre-sanctified. "Two presbyters enter the sacristy or other place in which the Body of the Lord which remained from the previous day was placed, and put it in a paten, and let a subdeacon hold before them a chalice with unconsecrated wine, and another the paten with the Body of the Lord. One presbyter takes the paten, the other the chalice, and they carry and set them on the stript altar" (*Ord. Rom. u. s.*). The cross is meanwhile saluted by the laity, while the hymn *Ecce lignum Crucis* is sung, and Ps. cxix. recited. The salutation of the cross being completed, the Lord's Prayer is recited, "and when they have said Amen the pontiff takes of the holy thing, and puts it into the chalice saying nothing (*nihil dicens*), and all communicate *cum silentio*." The rubrics of the Gelasian Sacramentary agree in the main with the *Ordo*, except that they speak of the reservation of the Blood as well as of the Body of the Lord, and direct that the reserved sacrament be brought out of the sacristy and set on the altar by deacons instead of presbyters. The adoration of the cross by the clergy succeeds the placing of the consecrated elements on the altar, and is followed by the actual communion (Muratori *u. s.* i. 559, sq.) It merits notice that all early authorities prescribe a general communion on Good Friday, "all communicate silently." This custom had entirely ceased in Rome at the beginning of the 9th century (*Amalar. de Eccl. Off.* i. 15), and though it lingered for a long time in some parts, it gradually died out in the West, and at the present day in the Roman church no one but the celebrant communicates on Good Friday. The pontiff pronounces peace to them "in the name of the Father, &c." The people answer, "and with thy spirit." "After a little space each says his vespers privately, and so they go to table" (Muratori ii. 995-996). [E. V.]

**GOODS, COMMUNITY OF.** The idea that all property should belong to a community and not to individuals may be traced to a very high antiquity. The Pythagorean society is commonly supposed to have been constituted on the basis of a community of goods, though probably only those who had reached the highest grade of the initiated renounced all private possessions (Ritter and Preller, *Hist. Phil.* p. 58). Plato, also, in his imaginary Republic, condemns the institution of private property in the strongest manner, as the source of all greed and meanness; he therefore allows it only to the third and lowest class of his citizens—those who are by nature qualified to seek only low and

material ends in life, and are consequently excluded from all share in the government of the state. The two higher classes are to live wholly for the state, a condition—the philosopher holds—incompatible with the possession of private property (*Politia*, iv., p. 421 c ff.; *Leges*, v. p. 739 B.).

To turn from heathen to Jewish social institutions, Josephus tells us (*Bellum Jud.* ii. 8, § 3) of the Essenes, that each member on entrance threw his goods into the common stock, so that there was found among them neither poverty nor riches. In like manner the Therapeutae on Lake Moeris had all things in common.

It was while the Therapeutae and Essenes were still flourishing communities that the gospel of Christ was first proclaimed. And here, too, we read of the earlier church of Jerusalem, that they “had all things common” (Acts ii. 44)—a passage which has often served fanatical sects as a justification of their communism. And yet it is clear from the book of the Acts itself that property made over to the community was of the nature of a voluntary gift; those who entered the church were not deprived of the right to possess property (Acts v. 4); Ananias was not punished for failing to contribute the whole of his property, but for fraud and lying in pretending to give the whole while he only gave part.

In the apostolic age generally it is past all controversy that nothing like a community of goods existed in the church. The churches are evidently contemplated as containing the same variety of wealth and station as ordinary society; contributions are made of freewill; the rich are charged to “be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate;” the cheerful giver is commended (2 Cor. ix. 7; 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18). The disturbed state of the Thessalonians, and their unwillingness to labour while they expected the immediate advent of Christ, had (so far as appears) no connexion with any communistic views. Nor does the testimony of the next age favour the idea that the earliest Christian society was communistic. The writer of the *Epistle to Diognetus* (c. 5) speaks of a “common table,” and no more. Tertullian, indeed (*Apolog.* c. 39), says, in so many words, that Christians had all things in common except their wives (*omnia indiscreta sunt apud nos praeter uxores*); but it is evident that this is nothing more than a characteristically violent expression for their mutual love and charity; for in the very same chapter he states expressly, that the contributions of the brethren to the common fund were wholly voluntary (*modicam unusquisque stipem menstrua die, vel quum velit, et si modo velit, et si modo possit, apponit*). Lactantius (*Epit. Div. Instit.* c. 38) especially condemns communism as one of the cardinal vices of Plato’s Republic, which he would hardly have done if he had supposed the same principle to have animated the first society of believers. The interpretation of Acts ii. 44 as relating to an absolute community of goods seems in fact to have taken its rise from Chrysostom (*Hom. xi. in Acta App.*). Some writers in modern times have seen in this supposed communism of the early Christians at Jerusalem an indication of an Essene influence. (See against this view Von Wegnern, in *Illgen’s Zeitschrift* xi. 2. p. 1 ff.).

As, however, within the church so strong an expression was given to the duty of mutual love and succour, and of the brotherhood of man in Christ, it could scarcely fail but that here and there enthusiastic sects would exaggerate and develop these principles into absolute renunciation of property. This was in fact the case. During the ecclesiastical troubles in Africa in the 4th century, the Donatists were never weary of reproaching their orthodox opponents with the wealth and power which they derived from their connexion with the state. Some of their own adherents, in consequence of these denunciations, renounced private possessions altogether—a renunciation which led to vagabondage and mendicancy rather than to holiness. These CIRCUMCELLIONS—as they came to be called—became the nucleus of a band of discontented peasants and runaway slaves, whose excesses at last required the forcible interference of the government to put them down. And other sects also rejected the idea of property; the Apotactici or Apostolici, as they arrogantly called themselves (says St. Augustine, *De Haeres.* c. 40), admitted none into their community who lived with wives or possessed private property (*res proprias habentes*); and, a common characteristic of heresy, denied salvation to all outside their own sect. The Eustathians also, who were condemned at the council of Gangra about the year 370 (*Conc. Gangr. Praef.*) held that those who did not give up their private wealth were beyond all hope of salvation. The laws of the empire imposed upon Apotactici the same penalties that were laid upon other heretics, except the confiscation of goods; they could not be deprived of that which they had already renounced (*Codex Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. 5, *de Haeret.* ll. 7 et 11).

When Pachomius († 348) first drew together into one body [COENOBIVM] a number of anchorites and wandering mendicants at Tabennae in Upper Egypt, he instituted a system of organized labour and common participation in the fruits of labour. Stewards [OECONOMVS] managed the property of the society for the benefit of the whole, and distributed the excess of income to the poor and needy of the neighbourhood. St. Basil, St. Benedict, and other founders of monastic orders, enjoined the same rule of individual poverty on the members of their societies, and so there arose throughout Christendom, in East and West, religious societies of celibates organized on communistic principles [MONASTICISM]. From the 8th century onward the secular clergy also, who lived the canonical life, adopted, to some extent, the principle of community of goods [CANONICI]. [C.]

GORDIANUS. (1) [EPIMACHUS (1).]

(2) Martyr with Macrinus and Valerianus at Nyon; commemorated Sept. 17 (*Mart. Usuardi, Hieron.*). [W. F. G.]

GORDIAS, martyr, circa 320 A.D.; commemorated Jan. 3 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

GORGONIUS. [DOROTHEUS (3).]

GOSPEL, THE LITURGICAL. I. *Introduction*.—Among the Jews, certainly from the time of the Maccabees, and probably before, one lesson from the Pentateuch and another from the “Prophets” (i. e. from some of the later historical books, and from those more properly called

prophetical) were read in the synagogues every sabbath day. Fifty-four portions from the Pentateuch (called Paraschioth), and as many from the "Prophets" (Haphtoroth), were appointed for this purpose. As the Jews intercalated a month every second or third year, this number was required. When there were not fifty-four sabbaths in a year, they read two of the shorter lessons together, once or twice in the year, as might be necessary; so that the whole of both selections was read through annually. The Paraschioth are generally very long, some extending over four or five chapters; but the Haphtoroth are as a rule short, often only a part of one chapter. Tables of both may be seen in Horne's *Introduction to the Scriptures*, pt. iii. ch. i, sect. iv. The foregoing facts will enable the reader to judge how far the first Christians were indebted to the traditions of the synagogue for the practice of reading Holy Scripture in their synaxis, and for the method of reading it. At all events we may be certain that the Old Testament, so long the only known repository of the "oracles of God," and still acknowledged to be "able to make men wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (2 Tim. iii. 15), would be no more neglected in their common exercises of religion than it was in their private study. At the same time it was inevitable that, when the New Testament came to be written, lessons from that should be read either in addition to or instead of those from the Old. There was, however, a short period during which the Old Testament only would be read in Christian assemblies, viz. before the events of the Gospel were committed to writing; and there is in the most ancient liturgy, that of St. James, a rubric, evidently genuine, which appears to have been framed during this interval. "Then the sacred oracles of the Old Covenant and of the Prophets are read at great length (διεξοδικώτατα, some understand "consecutively," but the Jewish precedent favours the former reading); and the incarnation of the Son of God, and His sufferings, His resurrection from the dead, and ascension into heaven, and, again, His second coming with glory, are set forth." As Mr. Trollope points out (*The Greek Liturgy of St. James*, p. 42), we have here the Old Testament read, but the great events of the Gospel related to the people as if not yet in writing.

II. *Evidence of use.*—Justin Martyr, A.D. 140, describing the celebration of the Eucharist, says, "The commentaries of the apostles and the writings of the prophets are read as time permits" (*Apol.* i. c. 67). A lesson from the gospels was without doubt included under the former head. St. Cyprian, A.D. 250, speaks of a confessor whom he had ordained *lector*, as "reading the precepts and the *gospel* of the Lord" from the stand (pulpitum) (*Ep.* xxxix.). Eusebius, A.D. 315, says that St. Peter authorised the use of the gospel of St. Mark "in the churches." For this he refers to the *Hypotyposes* of Clemens of Alexandria (not of Rome, as Bona and others) and to Papias; but elsewhere he cites both passages, and neither of them contains the words "in the churches." What he says, therefore, does not, as many have imagined, prove from Papias the custom of the apostolic church, but is only a proof of the practice of his own age, in the light of which he read those earlier writers

(see *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. c. xv.; and compare lib. vi. c. xiv., lib. iii. c. xxxix.). Cyril of Jerusalem, A.D. 350, speaks vaguely of the "reading of Scripture" (*Praef. in Catech.* §§ iii. iv.); nor are any of his catechetical homilies on lessons from the gospel. Optatus, A.D. 368, addressing the Donatist clergy, says, "Ye begin with the lessons of the Lord, and ye expand your expositions to our injury; ye bring forth the *gospel*, and make a reproach against an absent brother" (*De Schism. Donat.* lib. iv. c. v.). The so-called Constitutions of the Apostles put an order into their mouths, which begins thus: "After the reading of the law and the prophets and our epistles, and the acts and the gospels, let" &c. (lib. viii. c. v. Cotel. tom. i. p. 392). Pseudo-Dionysius tells us that in the liturgy, after the Psalms, "follows the reading of the tablets of holy writ by the ministers" (*De Eccles. Hierarch.* c. iii. § ii. tom. i. p. 284). These tablets are explained by Maximus the scholiast on Dionysius, A.D. 645, to be the Old and New Testament (*Ibid.* p. 305). St. Chrysostom frequently gave notice of the text on which he proposed to preach some days before; but in one homily he says, "On one day of the week, or on the sabbath (Saturday), at least, let each take in his hands, and, sitting at home, read that section (περικοπήν) of the gospels which is going to be read among you" (*Hom. xi. in St. Joh. Ev.* § 1). This implies that they knew what the lesson from the gospels would be; and therefore that a table of such lessons was drawn up and accessible to all. St. Augustine, in Africa, often preached on the gospel. Thus one of his sermons begins, "The chapter of the holy gospel which we heard, when it was just now read," &c. (*Serm.* lv. § 1). Another: "We heard, when the gospel was read," &c. (*Serm.* lxii. § 1). The council of Laodicaea, probably about 365, has a canon ordering the "gospels to be read with other scriptures on the sabbath" (Can. xvi.). The omission of the gospel on Saturday had without doubt been merely a local custom. A council of Orange, A.D. 441, can. xviii., ordered that thenceforward the gospel should be read to the catechumens, as well as the faithful, in all the churches of the province. That of Valencia, A.D. 524, ordered that "the most holy gospels be read in the mass of the catechumens before the unction of the gifts, in the order of lessons after the apostle," i.e. the epistle (Can. i.). In France, 554, a constitution of Childebert mentions the *gospels*, prophets, and apostle, as read from the altar (*Capit. Reg. Franc.* ed. Baluz. tom. i. col. 7). Germanus of Paris, A.D. 555, in his exposition of the liturgy, similarly recognises the prophecy, apostle, and *gospel* (printed by Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* lib. i. c. iv. art. xii.). Gregory of Tours, A.D. 573, tells a story of certain clerks in the days of Childebert, who "having laid the three books, i.e. of the prophecy, the apostle, and the *gospels* on the altar," prayed for an augury from the passages at which they should open, each "having made an agreement among themselves that every one should read at mass that which he first opened on in the book" (*Hist. Franc.* lib. iv. c. xvi.). This implies that in Gaul at least the lessons were still left to the choice of those who were to read them. In the next century, however, the Gallican church had a lectionary, a



copy of which, nearly complete, in Merovingian characters, was found by Mabillon in the monastery at Luxeuil. It provides a gospel for every mass (*Liturg. Gall.* lib. ii. pp. 97-173). Luxeuil is in the province of Besançon; but the eucharistic lessons (of which the gospel is always one) in the Sacramentary found at Bobio, which is believed to be of the use of that province, and is certainly of about the same age as the lectionary, differ nevertheless from those in that book. From this we may perhaps infer that although the lessons were then generally fixed, every bishop was at liberty to make his own selection. There is another ancient lectionary, ascribed to St. Jerome, and known as the *Liber Comitis*, or *Comes Hieronymi*; but from internal evidence shown to be the work of a Gallican compiler in the 8th century. This has been printed from two MSS., one of which provides three lessons for above two hundred days and occasions; the other for the most part only two; but the gospel is never omitted in either. The shorter recension may be seen in the *Ritualis SS. Patrum* of Pamelius, tom. ii. pp. 1-61. The longer is printed by Baluze in the *Capitularia Regum Francorum*, tom. ii. coll. 1309-1351.

III. *Provision for use.*—In the West, generally, a gospel has been always provided for every Sunday and for other holy days. The number of gospels (and other lessons) in the *Liber Comitis* already mentioned suggests that at one time there was a partial attempt to assign proper lessons to every day in the year. However this may be, the Roman use retained them for every day in Lent, and the Mozarabic for every Wednesday and Friday (except the first) during that season (see *Missale Mixtum*, Leslie, pp. 89-154). There was no such provision in the Gallican Sacramentary found at Bobio (see Murat. *Liturg. Rom. Vet.* tom. ii. coll. 815-835, or *Mus. Ital.* tom. i. pp. 301-319), nor, so far as we can judge in the Lectionary of Luxeuil (Mabillon, *Liturg. Gall.* p. 124). Eight leaves are missing in this MS. between Ash Wednesday and Palm Sunday, but they could hardly have contained more than the Sunday lessons. The ancient Irish Sacramentary, of which but one copy exists in manuscript, probably of the 6th century, is singular in the West in having but one gospel and epistle for the whole year, the former being the sixth chapter of St. John, the latter the eleventh chapter of St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians. See O'Connor's *Append. to vol. i. of the Catal. of the MSS. at Stowe*, p. 45. The fact is also attested by Dr. Todd (see *Pref. to the Liber. Eccl. de B. Terrenani de Arbuthnott*, p. xxiv.).

In the West the gospels appear to have been chosen without any reference to their place in the books of the New Testament. But, in the Greek church, those four books have been divided into lessons (τμήματα, μέρη, περικοπὰς, ἀναγνώσματα, ἀναγνώσεις); so that they may be read through in order, only interrupted when a festival with its proper lesson intervenes (Leo Allatius, *De Libr. Eccl. Gr. Diss.* i. p. 35). It is probably in accordance with this arrangement that the canon of Laodicea, already cited, does not order lessons from the gospels, or sections, or portions, or the like, to be read on Saturday with other scriptures, but *the gospels themselves*, *sc.* the four books so called. From this it may

be inferred that the Greek method was the normal practice of the whole Eastern church before the separation of the Nestorians and Monophysites. There was an exception, however, at one period, whether beginning before or after that separation, in the church of Malabar, the ancient liturgy of which presents but one epistle and gospel for every celebration—the former composed from 2 Cor. v. 1-10, and Heb. iv. 12, 13; the latter taken from St. John v. vv. 19-29. As neither have any special reference to the Eucharist, it may be inferred that the peculiarity was, unlike that of the Irish missal, unintentional, and resulting, probably, from the destruction of sacred books in a season of persecution, and from the ignorance that followed it.

IV. *The Book of the Gospels.*—The book which contained the four gospels as divided for eucharistic use was called by the Greeks Εὐαγγέλιον. The oldest writer cited as using the word in this specific sense is Palladius, A.D. 400: "He brings the 'gospel' to him and exacts the oath." (*Hist. Lausiaca* c. 86.) Another proof of the antiquity of the usage is the fact that the Nestorians, who were cut off from the church in the 5th century, retain the term *Euangelion* in this limited sense to the present day (Badger's *Nestorians*, v. ii. p. 19). The book is similarly called "the gospel" in the liturgy of St. Mark (Renaud. tom. i. p. 136) and others.

V. *By whom read.*—In Africa the eucharistic gospel was read by those of the order of readers in the 3rd century (see Cyp. *Ep.* xxxix. and *Ep.* xxxviii.). It was generally, however, assigned to a higher order: "After these (*i.e.* the other lessons), let a deacon or presbyter read the gospels" (*Constit. Apostol.* lib. ii. c. lvii.). Sozomen, A.D. 440, tells us that among the Alexandrians the "archdeacon alone read that sacred book (of the gospels); but among others the deacons, and in many churches the priests only" (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. xix.). He adds that "on high days bishops read it, as at Constantinople, on the first day of the paschal feast." The liturgies of St. Mark (Renaud. tom. i. p. 138), St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom (Goar, pp. 161 and 69) give this office to the deacon. This was also the common practice in the West. Thus St. Jerome says to Sabinian, "Thou wast wont to read the gospel as a deacon" (*Ep.* xciii.). St. Isidore of Seville, writing about the year 610, is a witness to the same practice (*De Eccl. Off.* lib. ii. c. 8). We observe it also in the most ancient "Ordines Romani" (*Mus. Ital.* tom. ii. pp. 10, 46); and it became the rule throughout Europe, when a deacon was present.

VI. *Where read.*—The gospel was perhaps generally read from a stand called *Ambo* (Ἀμβών) or *Pulpitum* even in the earliest ages. It certainly was so when the celebrant himself did not read it. Thus St. Cyprian, as before quoted, speaks of Celerinus, the reader, as officiating "on a pulpit, *i.e.* on the tribunal of the church," and generally of confessors raised to that order as "coming to the pulpit after the stocks" (*Epp.* xxxviii., xxxix.). The *Ordo Romanus* in use in the 8th century orders the gospel to be read from the higher step of the ambo, the epistle having been read from a lower (*Ord.* ii. nn. 7, 8). In some churches there was a separate ambo for the gospel. An example occurred in the church



of St. Clement at Rome, where also the gospel ambo was a "little higher and more ornate" (Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* lib. i. c. iv. art. iv. n. iii.). This became to some extent a rule (Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 222). We hear of the ambo in the East also. Thus Sozomen, speaking of a tomb over which a church had been built, says that it was "near the ambo, that is to say, the *rostrum* (*βήμα*) of the readers" (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. ix. c. ii.). The same historian tells us that St. Chrysostom, that he might be better heard, used to preach at Constantinople "sitting on the *rostrum* of the readers" (lib. v. c. v.), and Socrates, referring to a particular occasion, speaks of him as "seated on the *ambo*, from which he was wont also before that to preach in order to be heard" (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vi. c. v.). The council in Trullo, A.D. 691, forbade any who had not received the proper benediction to "proclaim the words of God to the people on the *ambo*" (can. xxxiii.). In the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, the deacon who reads the gospel "stands elevated on the ambo or in the appointed place" (Goar, p. 69).

VII. *Read towards the South*.—It was an early, but we think not primitive, custom in the West for the gospeller to "stand facing the south, where the men were wont to assemble" (*Ord. Rom.* ii. c. 8). Amalarius, an early commentator on the *Ordo Romanus*, suggests that this was because the men were supposed to receive the gospel first, and to teach it to their wives at home (1 Cor. xiv. 35). See his *Ecloga*, n. xv. *Mus. Ital.* tom. ii. p. 553. It is probable, however, that a different custom prevailed at the same time in France, or very soon after. For in the latter part of the 9th century Remigius of Auxerre tells us that "the Levite (deacon), when about to pronounce the words of the gospel, turns his face towards the north," as defying Satan, who was supposed (from Isai. xiv. 13) to dwell there (*De Celeb. Missae, ad. calc. Libri Pseudo-Alcuini, de Div. Off.* Hittorp, col. 280).

VIII. *Attendant rites*.—From a very early period the reading of the gospel was attended with circumstances of solemnity. In the Greek church it has for many ages been brought into the church out of the chapel of Prothesis in a rite known as the Little Entrance, the bringing in of the gifts being the Great Entrance. While the choir is singing the *Glory* at the end of the third antiphon the priest and deacon, after bowing thrice before the altar, go out for the book of the gospels. They return into the church, the deacon carrying the gospel, preceded by lights, and welcomed by a special anthem. After a circuit of some length on the north side of the church they stop at the holy doors, where the priest says, secretly, the "Prayer of the Entrance." The deacon then asks for, and the priest gives, a "blessing on the Entrance," *troparia* being sung meanwhile. When they are ended, the deacon shows the gospel to the people, saying, "Wisdom. Stand up." They then enter the bema, and the book is laid on the holy table till required for use (*Euchologium*, Goar, pp. 67, 124, 160). This is found in the older liturgy of St. Basil, as well as that of St. Chrysostom, but it is impossible to say how much of it was practised in the age of those great bishops. There is no trace of the Little Entrance in the liturgy of Jerusalem, from which that of Caesarea (St.

Basil) was derived, nor in the Nestorian liturgies, which came from an independent source before the 5th century. On the other hand, there is a simpler form of the rite in the Armenian liturgy, which was borrowed from Caesarea in the time of St. Basil, and influenced in its subsequent growth by the residence of St. Chrysostom in Armenia, where he died (Le Brun, *Diss. sur les Liturgies*, x. artt. iv. xiii.). We observe, also, an elaborate rendering of the same rite in liturgies that can hardly have been indebted to those of the Greek church after the 6th century at least. "As the book of the gospels," remarks Renaudot, "is carried to the ambo with great ceremony among the Copts, so it is certain that it is in like manner done among the Syrians; and they received it from the Greeks" (tom. ii. p. 69). For the Coptic Entrance see tom. i. p. 210. A short rubric in the liturgy of St. Mark tells us when the Entrance takes place; but it is not described (Renaud. tom. i. p. 136).

Another proof of the antiquity of the Little Entrance is found in its resemblance to a ceremony practised at Rome in certain pontifical masses of the 7th and 8th centuries. The gospel was brought in a case or casket from the basilica of St. John Lateran to the regionary church in which the celebration took place by an acolyte in attendance on the bishop, but under the care of the archdeacon. It was made ready by the reader at the door of the *Secretarium*, while the bishop was within preparing for the service. The acolyte then carried it "into the presbytery to before the altar," preceded by a subdeacon, who then took it from him, and "with his own hands placed it with honour upon the altar" (*Ord. Rom.* i. §§ 3, 4, 5; ii. 2, 4, 5).

As an example of the ritual when the gospel was to be read, we may, for the East, cite St. Mark: "The deacon, when about to read the gospel, says, 'Bless, sir.' The priest, 'The Lord bless and strengthen, and make us hearers of His holy gospel, who is God blessed now and ever, and for ever, Amen.' The deacon, 'Stand, let us hear the holy gospel.' The priest, 'Peace be to all.' The people, 'And to thy spirit.' Then the deacon reads the gospel"—(Renaud. tom. i. p. 138). At Rome, in the pontifical masses before mentioned, the deacon having received a blessing from the bishop, "The Lord be in thy heart and on thy lips," after kissing the gospels, took the book off the altar, and went towards the ambo, preceded by two subdeacons—one with incense—and followed by a third. There the acolytes made a passage for the preceding subdeacons and the deacon. The latter then rested his book on the left arm of the subdeacon without a censer, who opened it at the place already marked. The deacon then, with his finger in the place, went up to that stage of the ambo from which he was to read, the two subdeacons going to stand before the steps by which he would descend. The gospel ended, the bishop says, "Peace be to thee," and "The Lord be with you." Resp., "And with thy spirit." As the deacon came down, the subdeacon who had opened the book took it from him, and handed it to the third subdeacon who had followed. He, holding it on his planeta, before his breast, offers it to be kissed by all engaged in the rite, and then puts it into the case or casket before

oned, held ready by the acolyte who had  
ht it into the church (*Ord. Rom.* i. § 11).  
do, somewhat later, but not lower than the  
entury, tells us that "the candles were ex-  
ished in their place after the gospel was  
' (*Ord.* ii. § 9). The custom of lighting  
es at the reading of the gospel came from  
ast, where it prevailed in the 4th century.  
ough all the churches of the East," says  
rome, "when the gospel is to be read, lights  
urned, though the sun be already shining"  
*Vigilant.* § 7). St. Isidore of Seville, in  
rk written in 636, says that "acolytes in  
k are called *ceroferarii* in Latin, from their  
ng wax candles when the gospel is to be  
&c. (*Etymol.* lib. vii. c. xii. § 29). This  
robably the earliest notice in the West,  
gh the first *Ordo Romanus* belongs almost  
inly to the same century. The symbolism  
e lights needs no explanation (see St. John  
viii. 12).

. *Heard standing.*—It was probably from  
ery first the custom for the people to hear  
ospel standing, out of reverence. Thus the  
*Eccl. Constitutions*, lib. ii. c. lvii.: "When  
ospel is being read, let all the presbyters  
the deacons and all the people stand with  
quietness." Philostorgius, A.D. 425, says  
Theophilus the Indian, when visiting his  
e country, about the year 345, found that  
eople "performed the hearing of the gospel  
us sitting, and had some other practices  
h the Divine law did not sanction" (*Hist.*  
lib. iii. § 5). His language shows how im-  
nt the rite was considered. Isidore of Pelu-  
412, says, in the same spirit, "When the  
Shepherd becomes present through the  
ng of the adorable gospels, the bishop both  
and lays aside the habit (the *ἐμοφόριον*)  
n he wears symbolical of Him" (*Ep.* cxxxvi.  
ino Comiti). In accordance with this,  
men (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. c. xix.) tells us that  
was "a strange custom among the Alex-  
ans, for, when the gospels were read, the  
p did not stand up, which," he adds, "I  
neither known nor heard of among others."  
same rule prevailed in the West. Ama-  
s, writing about 827, says: "During the  
ration of these, i.e. the lesson (epistle) and  
phecy, we are wont to sit, after the cus-  
of the ancients." Then, when he speaks of  
ospel: "Up to this time we sit; now we  
rise at the words of the gospel" (*De Eccl.*  
lib. iii. cc. 11, 18). At the same time all  
d to the East, and laid down the staff on  
h, at that period, they commonly leaned,  
was there crown or other covering on their  
" (*Ord. Rom.* ii. § 8; *Amal. u. s. c.* 18).

*The Doxologies.*—The doxology now com-  
after the announcement of the gospel is  
ioned by writers within our period. Thus  
rius and Beatus, in Spain, A.D. 785: "The  
n commands all to be silent, and says, 'The  
n of the holy gospel according to Matthew.'  
ne people answer, 'Glory be to Thee, O Lord'  
(*Elipind.* lib. i. c. lxvi.). Compare the  
rabic Missal (Leslie, pp. 2, 45, &c.). Ama-  
s only recommends it. After advising the  
e to pray for a profitable hearing, he  
"Let him who is not quick to take in  
ords of the gospel, at least say, 'Glory,'"  
lib. iii. c. 18). The practice probably

came through Spain, like several other rites,  
from the East. In the homily *De Circo*, ascribed  
incorrectly to St. Chrysostom, we read, "When  
the deacon is about to open the gospel, we all  
fix our eyes on him and keep silence; but when  
he begins the course of reading, we forthwith  
stand up, and respond, 'Glory be to Thee, O  
Lord'" (*Opp.* St. Chrya. tom. viii. p. 723, ed.  
Gaume). Compare the liturgies of St. Basil and  
St. Chrysostom (Goar, pp. 161 and 69). The use  
of this form was probably not very extensive  
before the 6th century, or we should have found  
it in all the Nestorian and Eutychian rites. The  
liturgy of Malabar (Nestorian), however, does  
give "Glory to Christ the Lord" (*Hist. Eccl.*  
*Malab.* Raulin, p. 306); the Ethiopic, "Glory  
be to Thee alway, O Christ, our Lord and God,"  
&c. (Renaud. tom. i. p. 510); and the Armenian,  
"Glory be to Thee, O Lord, our God" (Neale's  
*Eastern Church, Introd.* p. 414).

There is no very early evidence of a doxology  
after the gospel. The liturgy of Malabar repeats  
that given above. The Ethiopic has, "The che-  
rubic and seraphim send glory up to Thee."  
The Armenian, like the Malabar, has the same  
after as before. There was none in the early  
Roman liturgy, and *Amen* seems to have been the  
common response in the middle ages (*Notitia*  
*Eucharistica*, p. 228).

XI. *In what language read.*—As the first con-  
verts to the gospel spoke Greek, all the liturgies  
were originally in that language. It is not  
known when Latin was adopted in the services  
at Rome, but the church there had been founded  
more than a century and a half before it pro-  
duced a single Latin writer. It was, therefore,  
natural that Greek should be occasionally and  
partially used in the services after the general  
use of Latin had begun. In particular the  
eucharistic lessons were on certain days read in  
both languages. The chief evidence of this is  
the fact that it continued as a traditionary cus-  
tom throughout the middle ages (see *Notitia*  
*Euch.* p. 207); but we also find some early testi-  
mony to the usage. Thus Amalarius: "Six  
lessons were read by the ancient Romans [on the  
Saturdays of the Ember weeks] in Greek and  
Latin (which custom is kept up at Constan-  
tinople to this day), for two reasons, if I mistake  
not; the one, because there were Greeks present,  
to whom Latin was not known; the other, be-  
cause both people were of one mind" (*De Eccl.*  
*Off.* lib. ii. c. 1). This statement obtains col-  
lateral support from the earliest *Ordo Romanus*,  
in which the four lessons used at the general  
baptism on Easter Eve are ordered to be read in  
Greek and Latin (§ 40). Nicholas I., A.D. 856  
writing to the emperor Michael, confirms the  
statement of Amalarius as to the practice at  
Constantinople. He affirms that "daily, or any  
how, on the principal feasts," the church there  
was "reported to recite the apostolic and evan-  
gelic lessons in that language (the Latin) first,  
and afterwards pronounce the very same lessons  
in Greek, for the sake of the Greeks" (*Ep.* viii.,  
Labbe. *Conc.* tom. viii. col. 298). When John VIII.,  
in the same century, gave permission for the  
celebration of the Holy Communion in the  
Slavonic tongue, he made this proviso, that,  
"to show it greater honour, the gospel should  
be read in Latin, and afterwards published in  
Slavonic in the ears of the people who did not

understand Latin; as appears to be done in some churches" (*Ep.* ccxlvii.; *Labb. Conc.* tom. ix. col. 177). In the churches of Syria the gospel and epistle are still read both in the old Syriac and in the better understood Arabic (*Renaud.* tom. ii. p. 69); and in Egypt in both Coptic and Arabic (*Renaud.* tom. i. pp. 5-8). When they were first read in Arabic we do not know; but it was probably before the 9th century, as both countries were conquered and overrun by the Arabs in the former half of the 7th.

XII. From the 6th century downward we meet with repeated instances of a custom of inclosing the gospels in cases, covers, or caskets, adorned with gems and the precious metals. The first *Ordo Romanus*, in giving directions for the pontifical mass, to which we have referred above, orders, that on festivals the keeper of the vestry at St. John's Lateran shall give out "a larger chalice and paten, and larger gospels under his seal, noting the number of the gems that they be not lost" (§ 3). Childebert I., A.D. 531, is said by Gregory of Tours to have returned from an expedition into Spain, bringing with him, among other spoils, "sixty chalices, fifteen patens, twenty cases for the gospels (*evangeliorum capsas*), all adorned with pure gold and precious gems" (*Hist. Franc.* lib. iii. c. x.). The same writer tells us that one of the emperors of Rome caused to be made for the church at Lyons "a case for inclosing the holy gospels and a paten and chalice of pure gold and precious stones" (*De Glor. Confess.* cap. lxiii.). Gregory the Great gave to the king of the Lombards "a lectionary (*lectionem*) of the holy gospel inclosed in a Persian case (*theca*)" (*Epp.* lib. xii. *Ep.* vii. *ad Theodel.*) [W. E. S.]

GOSPELLER. [GOSPEL, § V. p. 742.]

GOSPELS, BOOK OF. [LITURGICAL BOOKS: GOSPEL, § IV. p. 742.]

GOSPELS IN ART. [See FOUR RIVERS, EVANGELISTS.] The sources of the four rivers, represented continually on the sarcophagi (*Bot-tari, Sculture e Pitture*, tav. xvi. and *passim*) have doubtless reference to the four gospels, as well as to the streams which watered the garden of Eden. See also the woodcut of the Lateran Cross s. v. CROSS.

Rolls of the gospels, or other sacred books are often represented on glasses and cups (*Buonarrotti, Vetri*, tav. ii. viii. 1, xiv. 2). A case containing the gospels is represented in the chapel of Galla Placidia at Ravenna (see *Ciampini, Vet. Mon.* I. lxvii.). They are generally rolls, sometimes with umbilici and capsae. In *Buonarrotti, Frammenti di vasi antichi*, tav. viii. 1, the rolls of the four gospels surround a representation of the miracle of the seven loaves, with probable reference to Matt. iv. 4, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

The portraits or symbolic representations of the Evangelists very commonly bear the gospels from the earliest date: indeed the symbol of four scrolls or books, placed in the four angles of a Greek cross, are asserted by Mrs. Jameson to be the earliest type of the Four Evangelists, and must certainly be among the earliest. In the baptistery at Ravenna (*Ciampini, V. M.* I. p. 234), there is a mosaic of the four gospels

resting on four tables, each with its title. This dates from A.D. 451.

The figures of apostles, *passim* in ancient mediaeval and modern art, bear rolls or volumes in their hands; but Martigny remarks very ingeniously and thoughtfully, that in the earliest examples of apostles the volume must be considered to be that of the Law and the Prophets, to which and to whom they referred all men in their preaching, even from the day of Pentecost. In one instance a picture at the bottom of a cup representing an adoration of the Magi (*Buonarrotti* ix. 3) the book of the gospels is placed near one of the three, in token of their being the first, with the shepherds, to bear the good tidings of the Saviour of Mankind.

A symbol of the gospel, and of the evangelists, of the highest antiquity (indeed, as Mr. Hemans thinks, of the Constantinian period) is the painting of four jewelled books at the juncture of the arms of a large cross, also jewelled, on the vault of a hall belonging to the *Thermae of Trajan*; consecrated for Christian worship by pope Sylvester in the time of Constantine, and still serving as a crypt-chapel below the church of SS. Martino e Silvestro on the Esquiline Hill.

[R. St. J. T.]

GRACE AT MEALS. The Jews were wont to give thanks at table, one of the company saying the prayer "in the plural number, *Let us bless, &c.*," and the rest answering *Amen* (*Beracoth* cap. vii.; *Lightfoot Horae Hebr.* in St. Matt. xv. 36). When our Lord was about to feed the multitudes He took the loaves and fishes, and "blessed" (St. Matt. xiv. 19; St. Mark vi. 41; St. Luke ix. 16) or "gave thanks" (St. Matt. xv. 36; St. Mark viii. 6; St. John vi. 11) before He distributed them. This was in accordance with the Jewish custom, which thus, with the sanction of our Lord's example, passed into His church. St. Chrysostom, commenting on Matt. xiv. 19-21, says that He then "taught us that we should not touch a table before giving thanks to Him who provides this food" (*Hom.* xlix.). In commenting on the account of the Last Supper, he refers to the "Grace" said after meat also:—"He gave thanks before distributing to the disciples, that we may give thanks too. He gave thanks and sang hymns after distributing, that we may do the same thing" (*In St. Matt.* xxvi. 30; *Hom.* lxxxii.). That this was the general practice of the early Christians is proved by many testimonies. St. Paul, to whatever else he may allude beside, certainly recognizes it in 1 Tim. iv. 3-5. Meats, he there teaches, were "created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." Clemens of Alexandria, A.D. 192, both owns the principle, and vouches for the observance. "As it is meet that before taking food we bless the Maker of all these things, so also does it become us, when drinking, to sing psalms unto Him; forasmuch as we are partaking of His creatures" (*Pædagog.* lib. ii. c. iv. § 44; see also § 77). Of the model Christian, he says, "His sacrifices are prayers and praises, and the reading of Scripture before the banqueting; psalms and hymns after it" (*Strom.* lib. vii. c. vii. § 49). Again: "Referring the reverent enjoyment of all things to God, he ever offers to the giver of all things the first-fruits of meat and drink and anointing oil, yielding

thanks," &c. (*Ibid.* § 35). Tertullian, writing probably in 202: "We do not recline (at an entertainment) before prayer be first tasted . . . After water for the hands and lights, each, as he is able, is called out to sing to God from the Holy Scriptures, or from his own mind. In like manner prayer puts an end to the feast" (*Liber Apol. adv. Gentes*, c. xxxix.). St. Cyprian, writing in 246: "Nor let the banquetting hour be void of heavenly grace. Let the temperate entertainment resound with psalms, and do ye each undertake this wonted duty according to the strength of your memory or excellence of voice" (*Ad Donat. sub fin.*). St. Basil, A.D. 370: "Let prayers be said before taking food in most acknowledgment of the gifts of God, both of those which He is now giving and of those which He has put in store for the future. Let prayers be said after food containing a return of thanks for the things given, and request for those promised" (*Ep. ii. ad Greg. Naz.* § 6). Sozomen, A.D. 440, says of the younger Theodosius, that he would eat nothing "before he had blessed the Creator of all things" (*Hist. Eccles. Orit. ad Imp. libro i. praefata*).

Examples remain of the early Graces, both of the East and West. *Eg.* the Apostolical Constitutions (lib. vii. c. 49) furnish the following *Eûxh ês âphortn, Prayer at the midday meal*: "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who feedest me from my youth up, who givest food to all flesh. Fill our hearts with joy and gladness; that always having a sufficiency we may abound unto every good work, in Christ Jesus our Lord, through whom be glory and honour and power unto Thee, world without end, Amen" (*Patres Apostol. Cotel.* tom. i. p. 385). This prayer (slightly varied) is also given to be said after meals in the treatise *De Virginitate* ascribed (most improbably) to St. Athanasius. The writer first gives it and then proceeds as follows: "And when thou art seated at table and hast begun to break the bread, having thrice sealed it with the sign of the cross, thus give thanks, 'We give thanks unto Thee, our Father, for Thy holy resurrection [i.e. wrought and to be wrought in us, if the reading be correct]; for through Thy Son Jesus Christ hast Thou made it known unto us; and as this bread upon this table was in separate grains, and being gathered together became one thing, so let Thy church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom; for Thine is the power and the glory for ever and ever. Amen.' And this prayer thou oughtest to say when thou breakest bread and desirest to eat; but when thou dost set it on the table and attitest down, say *Our Father* all through. But the prayer above written (Blessed art Thou, O God [Lord, *Const. Apost.*]) we say after we have made our meal and have risen from table" (§§ 12, 13, inter Athanas. Opp.). A short paraphrase, as it appears, of an Eastern Grace at meals may also be seen in the anonymous commentary (probably of the sixth century) on the Book of Job printed with the works of Origen (lib. iii.).

The following examples from the Gelasian Sacramentary are probably the most ancient Graces of the Latin church now extant: *Prayers before Mea.* (1) "Refresh us, O Lord, with Thy gifts, and sustain us with the bounty of Thy riches; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." (2) "Let us be refreshed, O Lord, from Thy

grants and gifts, and comforted with Thy blessing, through, &c." (3) "Protect us, O Lord our God, and afford needful sustenance to our frailty; through, &c." (4) "Bless, O Lord, Thy gifts, which of Thy bounty we are about to take; through, &c." (5) "O God, who dost always invite us to spiritual delights, give a blessing on Thy gifts; that we may attain to a sanctified reception of those things which are to be eaten in Thy name; through, &c." (6) "May Thy gifts, O Lord, refresh us, and Thy grace comfort us; through, &c." *Prayers after Meals.*—(1) "Satisfied, O Lord, with the gifts of Thy riches, we give Thee thanks for these things which we receive from Thy bounty, beseeching Thy mercy that that which was needful for our bodies may not be burdensome to our minds; through, &c." (2) "We have been satisfied, O Lord, with Thy grants and gifts. Replenish us with Thy mercy, Thou who art blessed; who with the Father and Holy Ghost livest and reignest God for ever and ever. Amen." Muratori, *Liturgis Rom. vetus*, tom. i. col. 745. Compare the *Benedictio ad Mensam*, and *Benedictio post Mensam lectam* in the Gallican Sacramentary of the 7th century found at Bobbio (*Ibid.* tom. ii. col. 950).

[W. E. R.]

#### GRACILIANUS. [FELICEMINA.]

GRADO, COUNCIL OF (*Gradense concilium*), held A.D. 579 at Grado for the transfer thither of the see of Aquileia, supposing its acts genuine, but later was at this time out of communion with Rome for not accepting the 5th council, and the part assigned to Elinas, bishop of Aquileia, throughout is suspicious. A legate from Rome at his instance exhibited a letter as from pope Pelagius II. to him authorising this change, which was accordingly confirmed. Then he requested that the definition of the 4th council might be recited, which was also done. In the subscriptions which follow his own comes first, after him that of the legate, nineteen bishops or their representatives follow, and list of all twelve presbyters in their own names. Mansi regards it as a forgery (ix. 927).

[E. S. FL.]

GRADUAL (*Responsorium Graduale* or *Gradale*; or simply *Responsorium* or *Responsum*; or *Graduale*. In mediæval English *Grad* spelt variously.)—1. This was an anthem sung after the epistle in most of the Latin churches. Originally, it seems that a whole psalm was sung, at least in Africa, as we gather from several allusions in the Sermons of St. Augustine. Thus in one he says, "To this belongs that when the apostolic lesson (Col. iii. 9) before the canticle of the psalm pronounced, saying 'Put on, &c.'" (*Serm. xxxii. c. 17*). "We have heard the apostle, we have heard the psalm, we have heard the gospel" (*Serm. cliv. c. 1*). Again—"We have heard the first lesson of the apostle. 'This is a faithful saying, &c.' (1 Tim. i. 15) . . . Then we sang a psalm, mutually exhorting one another, saying with one voice, one heart, 'O come, let us worship,' &c. (Pa. xcv. 6). After these the gospel leaves showed us the cleansing of the ten lepers" (*Serm. clxvi. c. 1*). In his *Retractions* (lib. ii. c. vi.) St. Augustine speaks of a custom which began at Carthage in his time of "singing hymns at the altar from the Book of Psalms, either



before the oblation or when that which had been offered was being distributed to the people." The hymn before the oblation has been understood by some to be the psalm before the gospel; but a hymn sung before the catechumens left would hardly have been called by so precise a writer as Augustine a hymn before the oblation. He must rather have meant the offertory which immediately preceded the offering of the elements. Nor was the Gradual sung at the altar, but, as we shall see, from the lector's ambo. We infer, therefore, that the psalm after the epistle was a custom of the church before the age of St. Augustine. Gennadius of Marseilles, A.D. 495, tells us that Musaeus, a presbyter of that city, A.D. 458, at the request of his bishop, selected "from the Holy Scriptures lessons suitable to the feast-days of the whole year, and besides, responsory chapters of psalms adapted to the seasons and lessons" (*De Viris Illust.* c. lxxix.). Another witness is Gregory of Tours, who relates that on a certain occasion in the year 525, his deacon "who had said the responsory at the masses before day" was ordered by king Guntram to sing before him, and that afterwards all the priests present sang a responsory psalm, each with one of his clerks (*Hist. Franc.* L. viii. § iii.). The Antiphonary ascribed to Gregory I. must have undergone changes down to the 11th or 12th century, if it was not originally compiled then. It contains Graduals (there called Responsories) for use throughout the year; but from our uncertainty about their age, we need only state the fact. It was printed by Pamelius (*Liturgicon*, tom. ii. p. 62), and by Thomasius at Rome in 1683. The earliest Ordo Romanus extant, which describes a pontifical mass of the 7th century, fully recognizes the use of the Gradual: "After he (the subdeacon) has read (the epistle) the cantor ascends [the steps of the ambo] with the cantatory, and says the Response" (§ 10; *Mus. Ital.* tom. ii. p. 9). Again: "With regard to the Gradual Responsory, it is [in Lent] sung to the end by him who begins it, and the verse in like manner" (§ 26, p. 18). Compare Ordo ii. § 7. Amalarius (*Prolog. in Lib. de Ord. Antiph.* Hittorp. col. 504) explains the term 'cantatory.' "That which we call the Gradual (*Gradale*) they (the Romans), call Cantatorium; which in some churches among them is still, according to the old custom, comprised in one volume." It was, in fact, a book containing all the Graduals for the year.

II. Strictly only the first verse of the anthem was called the Gradual. The rest was technically called the "verse." The mode of singing it was not everywhere the same; but Amalarius describes at some length how this was done at Rome, whence, he assures us (*De Eccles. Off.* L. iii. c. 11; *De Ord. Ant. u.s.*), the Gradual was derived to other churches:—"The precentor in the first row sings the Responsory to the end. The succentors respond (i. e. sing the Responsory) in like manner. The precentor then sings the verse. The verse being ended, the succentors a second time begin the Responsory from the first word, and continue it to the end. Then the precentor sings, 'Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost.' This being ended, the succentors take up the Responsory about the middle, and continue it to the end. Lastly the precentor begins the Responsory from

the first word and continues it to the end. Which being over the succentors for the third time repeat the Responsory from the beginning and continue it to the end." Amalarius also tells us that "the *Gloria* was not sung with Responsories from the first" (*De Ord. Antiph.* c. 18); from which we infer with probability that they were in use before that doxology was composed.

III. The mode of singing adopted for the Gradual, in which one sang alone for a while and many responded was probably in use from the very infancy of the church. In the *Apostolical Constitutions* the apostles are made to direct that at the celebration of the holy eucharist one of the deacons shall "chant the hymns of David, and the people subchant the ends of the verses" (L. ii. c. lvii.). When St. Athanasius (A.D. 356) found his church surrounded by more than 5000 soldiers, and a violent crowd of Arians, he placed himself on his throne and "directed the deacon to read a psalm, and the people to respond, 'For His mercy endureth for ever'" (*Apol. de Fugâ suâ*, § 24). Eusebius, too, citing Philo's account of certain "Ascetae" in Egypt, among other of their customs which he declares to belong to the Christians, mentions that one would "chant a psalm in measured strains, the rest listening in silence, but singing the last parts of the hymns together" (Euseb. *Hist.* L. II. c. xvii.). Whether those ascetics were Jews or Christians the narrative of Philo shows that the practice must have been known to the Jewish converts of the 1st century, and may even then have been adopted by them.

IV. From Easter Eve to the Saturday in Whitsun week inclusively the Gradual was followed, and at last supplanted by the Alleluia. This had been long known in the West and used, though not prescribed, on public occasions of religious joy. At Rome it was only sung on Easter day, as Sozomen informs us (*Hist. Eccl.* lib. vii. cap. xix.), and his statement is copied by Cassiodorus (*Hist. Eccl. Tripart.* L. xiii. c. xxxix.), who lived at Rome, A.D. 514. Their authority, however, can only prove the fact for an age before their own; for Gregory I. affirms that it was introduced at Rome in masses by St. Jerome (who had learnt it at Jerusalem) in the time of Damasus, A.D. 384 (*Epist.* lib. vii.; *Ep.* lxxiv.). This, of course, refers to its use between Easter and Pentecost; as Gregory himself extended it "beyond the time of Pentecost" (*ibid.*). In the Antiphonary ascribed to him it is only omitted between Septuagesima Sunday and Easter (Pamel. *Liturg.* tom. ii. pp. 81-110). Amalarius (u.s. cap. 13) speaks of it as "sung on feast days."

V. The Tract was another anthem sometimes sung after the epistle. Originally it was always from the Book of Psalms; and like the Gradual was a remnant and evidence of their early use in celebrations as a part of Holy Scripture. The Tract and Gradual differed at first, in all probability, only in being sung differently; or in other words the Tract was nothing more than the Gradual as it was chanted in seasons of humiliation. It is for this reason that we treat of them together. Very soon, however, a Tract was often sung after the Gradual; or, as it would, we presume, be then viewed, a third verse was added to the anthem, which was sung

tractum; i. e. continuously by the cantor without any assistance from the choir. Although the language is obscure, we may perhaps infer that they were sometimes sung together under the first Ordo Romanus. "If it shall be the time for the Alleluia to be said, well; but if for the Tract, well again; but if not let the response (Gradual) only be sung" (§ 10). The Tract is never used without a responsory in the so-called Gregorian Antiphony. Though properly penitential (Amalarius *De Eccl. Off.* lib. ii. c. 3), the Tract was not always of a mournful character. "Sometimes," says Amalarius, "the Tract expresses tribulation, sometimes joy" (*Ibid.* lib. iii. c. 13). It was sung from the same place as the Gradual (*Ord. Rom. I.* § 10; *II.* § 7), and at first by the same cantor (*Ord. I.* § 7); but later on by another (*Ord. III.* § 9). The origin of the name, from *confusus tractus*, a sustained unbroken chant, appears certain. Honorius of Autun, A.D. 1130, is the earliest extant authority for it (*Summa Amalar.* lib. i. c. 98); but it is approved by all the best ritualists.

The mode of chanting the Tract was probably borrowed from the early monks, who sang the psalms by turns, one at a time. Thus Cassian, A.D. 424, "One rises to sing psalms unto the Lord before the company" (*De Consol. Inst.* lib. ii. c. v.). "They divide the aforesaid number of twelve psalms in such a manner that if two brethren be present, they sing six each; if three, four; if four, three" (*Ibid.* c. xi.; see also c. xii.). St. Jerome has an allusion to it when, writing to a monk (*Ep. xiv. ad Rustic. Mon.*), he reminds him of the obligation to rise before sleep would naturally leave him and "sing a psalm in his turn."

VI. The Gradual and Tract were sung from the same step of the ambo from which the epistle was read. According to the second Ordo Romanus (§ 7), the Epistoler "went up on to the ambo to read, but not on to its upper step (or stage, *gradum*), which only he who read the gospel was wont to ascend. After he had read the cantor ascended with the cantorium (=cantatorium) . . . not to a higher place; but he stood in the same place as the reader." It was for this reason that the anthem was called *Gradual*: it was the chant from the *step* of the ambo. This explanation of the term is given by Rhabanus Maurus, A.D. 847, and is accepted by Bonn, Le Brun, Gerbert, Martene, and perhaps all the great writers on ritual.

VII. The fact that the Gradual and Tract were both sung from the lesson desk, and that by a single cantor, detached thither, like the readers, from the choir, seems to indicate their common origin in that extended use of the Book of Psalms with the rest of Holy Scripture which we know to have prevailed during the first ages. Both arrangements were appropriate and natural if the psalms were said in some sort as a lesson; but inappropriate as well as inconvenient for a mere anthem. The sense of this at length led to the Gradual being sung by the cantor in his usual place. Amalarius, indeed, exhibits the cantor as a teacher and preacher no less than those who read the other Scriptures. "By the office of the cantor we may understand that of a prophet . . . By the responsory we may understand the preaching of the New Testament . . . The cantor discharges the functions of a faithful preacher,"

see (*De Eccl. Off.* l. iii. cap. 11). This was, we presume, the traditional view. It is suggested by St. Augustine's manner of referring (see above) to the psalms which in his day formed part of the eucharistic service in Roman Africa, as well as to the epistles and gospels. The same thought underlies the mystical comment of Pseudo-Dionysius. The psalms sung, according to him, put the soul into harmony with things divine, and then those things which have been mystically shadowed forth in them are plainly and fully taught in the lessons from the other parts of Holy writ (*De Eccl. Hier.* c. iii. n. iii. § 5). Psalms are to this day sung before the gospel in the Coptic rite (Renaud. tom. i. pp. 7, 210). In the Armenian "a suitable psalm is recited" immediately before the first eucharistic lesson (the prophecy) is read (*Le Brun, Dum. x. art. xiv.*). In the Milanese a Psalmellus (Pamelli *Liturgicon*, tom. i. p. 295), and in the Mozarabic an anthem headed Psalmello (*Leprie, Mus. No. pp. 1, 222*), in Lent a Tractus (*Ibid.* pp. 98, 101 &c.) is sung between the prophecy and the epistle. In these psalms or anthems we find the evident remains, akin to the Roman Gradual and Tract, of the psalmody which accompanied the reading of the other Scriptures in the primitive church. There was also, we may mention in conclusion, a substitute for it left in the Old Gallican liturgy in the Hymn of Zacharias, often called the prophecy, which was sung before the Old Testament Lesson (*S. German. Expos. Breu. in Martene De Ant. Eccl. R. l. i. c. iv. art. xli. ord. i.; Mabill. Liturg. Gall. l. ii. pp. 251, 322, &c.*), and in the Song of the Three Children (Germanus, u. a.; Mabill. *Ibid.* p. 107) which was sung between the epistle and gospel. [W. E. S.]

GRANATARIUS, in a monastery, one of the four deputies or assistants of the house-steward ("suffraganei cellararii," quaintly styled "*colatarii cellararii*" in the old Benedictine rule), the receiver of the yearly corn-harvest of the monastery, and keeper of the granary (*Mart. Reg. Bened. Comm. c. 51*) and of the farm stock (*Isidor. Reg. c. 19*). In some monasteries his office was to provide all household necessaries (*Ducange Gloss. Lat. a. v.*). The word is also spelt "*granarius*" or "*granatarius*." [I. G. S.]

GRATA. [PROTECTOR.]

GRATIAS DEO. [DEO GRATIAS.]

GRAVES. [ARCOSOLICH; ARRA; BISCHOF; CATACOMBS; CEMETERY; CELLA MEMORIAL; CHURCHYARD.]

GREAT WEEK. [HOLY WEEK.]

GREEK, USED IN SERVICES. [GREEK, § 17; GOSPEL, § XI. p. 744.]

GREEN THURSDAY. [MAUNDY THURSDAY.]

GREETING. [SALUTATION.]

GREETING, THE ANGELICAL. [HAIL, MARY.]

GREETING-HOUSE, a reception-room (*decuratiles atriæ, receptorium, salutatorium, salle d'entrée, parloir*) next to the proaula or proaulum (*Ducange Gloss. Lat. a. v. salutatorium*). In the narrative of the famous interview between Andrew and Thomas, the

bishop is described as sitting in his reception-room before going to the church (Theodoret, *Ecc. Hist.* v. 18), and Gregory the Great speaks of a bishop as proceeding from his reception-room to church (Greg. M. *Ep.* iv. 54). Bingham corrects the opinion of Scaliger that the place spoken of by Theodoret was a part of the bishop's palace used for entertaining strangers, and pronounces it "a place adjoining the church" ("exedra ecclesiae adjuncta," Ducange, v. a.) for the bishop "to receive the salutations of the people" coming for his "blessing," or on "business" (Bingh. *Orig. Eccles.* viii. vii. 8; cf. Vales. *Annotat. in Theodoret.* l. c.). It is recorded of St. Martin of Tours that he sat on a three-legged stool in a room of this kind, in preference to using the bishop's throne which was there (Sulp. *Sev. Vit. S. Mart.*); and that on his visitations he spent night and day in this room (Sulp. *Sev. Ep.* 1). In this "salutatorium" the rule of the convent was read over to candidates for admission (*Reg. Aurel. ad Virgines.* c. 1). The nuns, and even the abbess, were forbidden to see any stranger here alone (*Reg. Donat. ad Virg.* c. 57; *Res. Cassarii ad Virg.* c. 35); and by the council of Macon, A.D. 581, bishops, priests, and deacons, as well as laymen, were prohibited from entering the reception-room of a nunnery, Jews especially being excluded (*Conc. Maticon.* c. 2).<sup>a</sup> On the same principle, women, even nuns, were excluded from the bishop's "salutatorium" (Ducange, v. a.). In a Benedictine monastery this chamber was usually on the east side of the quadrangle, between the chapter-house and the south transept of the church (Whitaker's *Hist. of Whalley*, p. 124, 4th ed. 1874).

A room of this kind was used, according to Mabillon, for robing, for hearing causes, for synods, for keeping relics in, and sometimes for temporary residence (Mabill. *Ann. Bened.* Saec. iv. l. p. 370, cited by Ducange *Gloss. Lat.* v. a.; cf. Sulp. *Sev. Ep.* i.). According to Menard, there was a similar room for the use of the priests (Bened. *Anlan. Concord. Regul.* v. 25; cf. Sulp. *Sev. Dial.* ii. i.).

This receiving-room, or audience-chamber, seems identical with the "sacrarium," or vestry, where the vessels for use in church were kept (Ducange *Gloss. Lat.* v. a.). See DIACONICUM, GAZOPHYLACIUM. [L. G. S.]

## GREGORIAN MUSIC. [Music.]

GREGORY. (1) Bishop of Nyssa in Cappadocia († 390 A.D.); commemorated March 9 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis); Jan. 10 (*Cal. Byzant.*); Hedar 26 = Nov. 22 (*Cal. Ethiop.*); deposition March 9 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Magnus, the pope, "apostolus Anglorum" († 604 A.D.); commemorated with Innocent I., March 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi); deposition March 12 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(3) Bishop and confessor of Eliberis (Elvira) (saec. iv.); commemorated April 24 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(4) Theologus, bishop of Nazianzus and of Constantinople († 389 A.D.); commemorated Jan.

<sup>a</sup> The reading in the text, "extra salutatorium," obviously wrong, is corrected by Labbe in the margin to "infra." The "salutatorium" here mentioned and in the passage quoted above from the Rule of Donatus, is perhaps another place.

25 (*Cal. Byzant.*, *Mart. Bedae*); May 9 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi); Aug. 3 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(5) Thaumaturgus, bishop of Neo-Caesarea and martyr († circa 270 A.D.); commemorated July 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi); July 27 (*Cal. Armen.*); Nov. 17 (*Mart. Bedae, Cal. Byzant.*); Hedar 21 = Nov. 17 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(6) The Illuminator, bishop and patriarch of Greater Armenia in the time of Diocletian († 325-330 A.D.), *Isephaprus*; commemorated Sept. 30 (*Cal. Byzant.*); March 23 (*Cal. Armen.*, *Cal. Georg.*); Maskarram 19 = Sept. 16 (*Cal. Ethiop.*); invention of his relics, Oct. 14 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(7) Bishop of Agrigentum; commemorated Nov. 23 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(8) Bishop of Auxerre; commemorated Dec. 19 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(9) Presbyter and martyr at Spoletum in Tuscany, in the time of Diocletian and Maximian; commemorated Dec. 24 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(10) Ab Shandisal; commemorated Oct. 5 (*Cal. Georg.*). [W. F. G.]

GRIFFIN. See "Cherub" in DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, vol. i. pp. 300 sqq.; and Ruskin's *Modern Painters*, vol. iii. p. 112.

The connexion between the various symbolisms of Cherub and Griffin in Biblical and Northern tradition is strengthened by the etymological resemblance of the words. There is certainly a great likeness between the names *griffin* (with *s* affirmative) and *grifin*. Both are titles of the most ancient existing symbols of Divine omnipotence and omniscience; as it cannot be doubted that the sphinxes of Egypt and winged bulls or lions of Assyria conveyed kindred ideas to the hieratic, or indeed the popular mind. It would seem that all the chief races of men have been taught to set forth such mysterious forms; as this composite idea is so nearly universal. Some figure of this kind must have been the popular shape of the cherub or gryps known to the children of Israel: and the fact that it was a permitted and prescribed image, taken together with the command to make the brazen serpent, forms a very large portion of the substructure of iconodulist arguments. See Johannes Damascenus *De Imaginibus*, Orat. ii. Such instances of griffin forms as appear in the earliest Christian decoration seem to the writer to be in all probability merely ornamental; as, in fact, unmeaning adaptations of Gentile patterns. See, however, Guenée, *Dictionnaire Iconographique*, s. v. "Griffin." The use of the symbolic griffin by the Lombard race, however, dates from well within our period; though the great Veronese works so frequently mentioned by Professor Ruskin are probably as late as the 11th century. Those of the duomo of Verona and the church of San Zenone deserve especial mention.

That the griffin is the Gothic-Christian representation of the cherub, the "Mighty one," or the "Carved Image" of Hebrew sculpture, seems highly probable, further, from the following connexion of ideas in different ages.

The glorified forms of living creatures and of

wheels in the great opening vis on of Ezekiel have necessarily been always connected with those of the Zōa, the Beasts of the Apocalypse [See EVANGELISTS, p. 633]. The latter, as representing the writers of the four gospels, are an universal symbol after the 5th century. It did not escape the eye of Professor Ruskin that the marble wheel by the side of his Veronese griffin is an indisputable reference on the part of the unknown Lombard artist to the first chapter of Ezekiel (Ezek. i. 21): "When those (Living Creatures) went, these went: and when those stood, these stood, and when those were lifted up from the earth, the wheels were lifted up over against them: for the spirit of the Living Creatures was in the wheels." And this is fully confirmed (were that necessary) by Dr. Hayman's researches in the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. But the wheels appear in a more ancient work by a great and mystical genius whose name and date alone remain to us, the monk Rabula, scribe and illustrator of the great Florentine MS., A.D. 586 (See Assemani's *Catalogue of the Laurentian Library*). A woodcut of this is given in this work, p. 85. It represents the Ascension; our Lord is borne up by two ministering angels on a chariot of cloud, under which appear the heads of the Four Creatures: the flaming wheels are on each side, with two other angels, who are apparently receiving His garments, the vesture of His flesh. The sun and moon are in the upper corners of the picture; which is one of the most important works in Christian art as a specimen of imaginative symbolism of the highest character, and also as a graphic illustration of the connexion between Hebrew and Christian vision, or Apocalypse of the Unseen. And to this the Veronese griffin and its wheel, and the whole Christian usage of that composite form as a symbol, really refers. "The winged shape becomes one of the acknowledged symbols of Divine power: and in its unity of lion and eagle, the workman of the middle ages always meant to set forth the unity of the human and Divine natures. In this unity it bears up the pillars of the church, set for ever as the corner stone."

In its merely ornamental use it is derived simply from Heathen or Gentile art and literature.

[R. St. J. T.]

**GROTESQUE.** We have the authority of Prof. Mommsen for assigning the word *κρύπτω* as the original derivation of this adjective, formed, probably, immediately from grot or grotto, a cavern or subterranean recess, and therefore connected in its use, as a word of Renaissance origin, with ideas of Pan, the Satyrs, and other cavern-haunting figures, combining noble with ignoble form. The very numerous and various meanings of the word all point to the idea of novel contrast; either between the noble and ignoble, or less noble, or of the beautiful with the less beautiful. In Christian art, moreover, both of earlier and later date, a large number of works may be called grotesque in the general or popular sense of the word, because they are very singular in their appearance. This may arise in one or in two ways, or be caused by one or both of two conditions: either by the difficulty of the subject, or the archaic style of the workmen, or by a mixture of originality of mind and im-

perfect skill in craft. Many heathen grotesques of the earlier empire, as those of Pompeii, the Baths of Hadrian, and the newly-discovered frescoes of the Doria Pamphili Villa (see Parker, *Antiquities of Rome*, and appendix by the present writer) are extremely beautiful and perfect in workmanship, and come under the first or second classes mentioned, where the less pleasing form is contrasted with the more beautiful; this is the principle also of much cinque-cento grotesque. Early Christian work of this kind is not unfrequent in the catacombs, as in the "Seasons" of the catacombs of SS. Domitilla and Nereus, in many of the mosaic ornaments of St. Constantia and the other Graeco-Roman churches. The employment of actual ugliness for surprise or contrast seems to be a characteristic of the art of the Northern races, found in Italy only in the earlier work of the Lombard race, and then always distinguishable in its manner from that of the French or Germans. Excepting the carvings of St. Ambrogio at Milan, and the churches of St. Michele at Pavia and Lucca, this species of grotesque is not part of our period; but the most characteristic and important of all these buildings, St. Zenone at Verona, cannot be altogether omitted. It seems as well to classify the various meanings of the Grotesque as follows, according to the examples found in various places and periods.

1. Grotesque, where more elaborate or serious representations are contrasted with easier and less important work by the same hand, as in ornamental borders round pictures, fillings-up of vaultings or surfaces round figures, &c. This embraces all the earlier grotesque of ornament, as in the frescoes of Hadrian's villa, or the Doria Pamphili columbarium.

2. Grotesque where the importance of the subject, and the workman's real interest in it, are for a time played with; he being led to do so by the natural exuberance of his fancy, by temporary fatigue of mind, or other causes—this includes the Lombard work.

3. Grotesque where either the imperfection of the workman's hand, or the inexpressible nature of his subject, render his work extraordinary in appearance, and obviously imperfect and unequal. This applies to the productions of all times and places where thoughtful and energetic men have laboured. Among its greatest and most characteristic examples are the Triumph of Death by Orgagna at Pisa, and the Last Judgment of Torcello; its most quaint and absurd appearance may be in the strange Ostrogothic mosaic in the sacristy of St. Giovanni Evangelista at Ravenna; or see Count Bastard's *Peintures des MSS.* passim; but this description of grotesqueness applies to almost all the Byzantine apses and arches of triumph where the spiritual world is depicted, and indeed to all Byzantine work in as far as it attempts naturalist representation, unless it be in the single pictures of birds, found in MSS., and occasionally in mosaic, as at St. Vitale at Ravenna.

Few of the works of the catacombs have any pretence to beauty. The birds and vine ornament of the tomb of Domitilla (perhaps the earliest Christian sepulchre, which is known by dated bricks to be certainly not later than Hadrian, and is very probably the actual grave of a granddaughter of Vespasian) are of the same

date as the tomb, which is anterior to the catacomb. These, with some remains of the paintings in the catacomb, and the 2nd century paintings of the catacomb of St. Praetextatus, are beautiful examples of playful naturalistic ornament, probably the work of heathen hands, under Christian direction, and taken in the Christian sense. They are mentioned here, rather as parallel works to the beautiful secular-Roman grotesques, than as true grotesques themselves. They are symbolical in the strict sense (see J. H. Parker's *Photographs and Antiquities of Rome*, and art. 'SYMBOLISM' in this Dictionary).


The grotesqueness of the early mosaics is of the same nature as that of the forms and figures in the best glass-painting. In both, the advantages of light and shade, correct drawing and perspective, are sacrificed entirely to colour and graphic force of impression. To express the plainest meaning in the brightest and most gem-like colour is the whole object of the artist. Of course in the works from the 5th to the 8th century, down to the bathos of Graeco-Roman art, the rigid strangeness of the mosaics may have much to do with the incapacity of the workmen. Nevertheless the gift of colour is seldom wanting; and this, together with the painful asceticism of faces and forms in these works, points to an Eastern element in the minds and education of these artists. The great Medici MS. of Rabula is perhaps the central example of the genius and originality of design and graphic power, possessed by some of the unknown ascetics of Syria and the East. The mosaic of the Transfiguration at Mount Sinai, of the age of Justinian and many of those in Rome, as the apses of SS. Cosmas and Damianus, of St. Venantius, and above all St. Prassede, are instances giving evidence of necessarily imperfect treatment of a transcendent subject. Those of Ravenna have been already mentioned; but their workmanship greatly excels that of the Roman mosaics, and their quaintness strikes one less than their beauty.

The Lombard invasion of Italy dates 568 A.D., and it is in the earliest work of this extraordinary race that the Christian grotesque, properly speaking, may be said to arise. The best account of some of its examples, in Pavia, Lucca and Verona, is to be found in Appendix 8 of Ruskin's *Stones of Venice*, vol. i. p. 360-65, accompanied by excellent descriptive plates, and comparisons between the Lombard subjects and workmanship in St. Michele and St. Zenone, and the Byzantine masonry and carvings of St. Mark's at Venice. Invention and restless energy are the characteristics of the new and strong barbarian race; graceful conventionalism and exact workmanship, with innate but somewhat languid sense of beauty, belong to the Greek workmen. Neither of them can ever be undervalued by any one who is interested in the bearings of art on history; for there can be no doubt, that as the Lombard churches are the first outbreak of the inventive and graphic spirit which grew into the great Pisan and Florentine schools of painting and sculpture, so the Romano-Greek or Eastern influence, generally called Byzantine, extended over all the Christian world of the early mediæval ages. To trace the Christian grotesque northward and westward

through early MSS., bas-reliefs, and church decoration would be to write a history of Christian art in the dark ages. One of the first accomplishments of the denizens of a convent would of course be calligraphy, and to multiply Evangelaria and missals was a part even of the earliest missionary work.

On the edge of every wave of progress made by the Faith, the convents arose first of all things, and the monks at once employed themselves on copies of the Holy Scriptures. Now it cannot be doubted, that a *Schola Graeca*, a regular set of artists working according to Greek traditions of subject and treatment in art, existed in Rome from the 6th century, if not before, and received a great accession of strength in the 8th during the Iconoclastic struggle in Constantinople, when many ecclesiastical artists must have withdrawn thence to Rome. There in fact, as elsewhere, the first faint revival of

Christian art took place entirely in churches and convents, and under what are called Byzantine forms. Whether Byzantinism be considered as the last embers of Graeco-Roman art, kept alive by Christianity for the Northern races, or as the first sparks of a new light feebly struggling for existence through all the centuries from the 6th to the 11th, there is no doubt that the characteristics of Byzantinism



No. 1. Merovingian Initial and Bird.



No. 2. Carolingian, 8th century. (Bastard, vol. 1.)

—many of them characteristics of weakness, no doubt—prevailed in Christian ornamental work of all kinds, and were grotesque in all the senses of the word. The beautifully illustrated works of Prof. Westwood on Saxon, Irish and Northern MSS. in particular, are of the highest value in this connection, and are in fact almost the only works generally accessible in this country, which illustrate the connection between the Eastern and English churches through the Irish, by way of Iona and Lindisfarne (see *MINIATURE*).

The splendid works of D'Agincourt and Count Bastard are the best authority and sources of information on the Southern Grotesque in minia



vare carving within the limits of our period, and the art of photography is now bringing the remains of the ancient Lombard churches within reach of most persons interested in them. Descriptions fail in great measure without illustration, and few pictures or drawings are really trustworthy for details of ornamental work (see *Stones of Venice*, App. vol. i. ubi sup.). Mr. Ruskin has secured many valuable records by his own pencil and those of his trusted workmen. Didron's *Annales Archéologiques* contain much excellent illustration; and a parallel work of equal value is still, we believe, carried on in Germany, called the *Jahrbuch des Vereins von Alterthums-freunden in Rheinlande*. Mr. Parker's photographs and *Roman Antiquities* above men-



No. 2. *Medicus Sigmus*. (Bastard, vol. 1.)

tioned, are of great value to the historical student of art or of archaeology. The Northern Teutonic grotesque of actual sport of mind, ultra-naturalism, and caricature extends far beyond the limits of our period. But the term grotesque is generally applied to so many things within it, that some early specimens of Gothic humour seem necessary for the purposes of this Dictionary; and three selections from Count Bastard's work are accordingly given. No. 1 is a Merovingian initial letter; No. 2 Carolingian of the 8th century; and No. 3 is the initial portrait of a monk-physician in a *lettres-à-jour* MS. of the 8th century of the medical works of Orbases, Alexander of Tralles, and Dioscorides. All will be found in colour in Count Bastard's first volume, with innumerable others. [R. St. J. T.]

**GUARDIANS.** The duties and liabilities of guardians as defined by the old Roman laws, were but slightly affected by the Christian religion [See *DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQ.* a. v. *Tutor*].

The principal church regulation, which concerned them, arose from the generally admitted maxim, that the clergy ought not to be entangled in secular affairs. Hence a guardian was not allowed to be ordained to any ecclesiastical function, until after the expiration of his guardianship. (*Concil. Carthag. l. c. 9*, A.D. 348.) For the same reason none of the clergy were allowed to be appointed guardians; and those who nominated any of them to such an office were liable to church censures. Thus Cyprian mentions the case of a person named Geminus Victor, who having by his will appointed a presbyter as

guardian to his children, had his name struck out of the *DIPTYCHA*, so that no prayer or oblation should be offered for him. (Cyprian *Ep.* 66, *ad Clerum Furnit.*)

Under the old Roman law a guardian was forbidden to marry his ward, or to give her in marriage to his son, except by special license from the emperor (*Cod. Justin. v. 6*).

But Constantine altered this restriction, so far as to allow such marriages, provided that the ward was of age, and that her guardian had offered her no injury in her minority, in which case he was to be banished and his goods confiscated. (*Cod. Theod. ix. 8*). [G. A. J.]

**GUBA** on the EUPHRATES (COUNCIL OF), A.D. 585, a meeting of the Monophysites of Antioch under their patriarch Peter the younger, to enquire into the opinions of an archimandrite named John, and Probus, a sophist, his friend, and ending in their condemnation (Mansi, *ix.* 965-8). [E. S. Ft.]

**GUDDENE**, martyr at Carthage, A.D. 203; commemorated July 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**GURIAS**, martyr of Edessa, A.D. 288; commemorated with Abibas and Samonas, Nov. 15 (*Cal. Byzant.*, *Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

**GUTHBERTUS**. [GUTHBERT.]

**GYNAECONITIS**. [GALLEKIES.]

**GYROVAGI**, vagabond monks, reprobated by monastic writers. Benedict, in the very commencement of his rule, excludes them from consideration, as unworthy of the name of monks (*Bened. Reg. c. 1*). He pronounces them worse even than the "sarabaites," or "remoboth" (*Hieron. Ep. 22 ad Eustoch. c. 34*), who, though living together by twos and threes, without rule or discipline, at any rate were stationary, and built themselves cells; whereas the "gyrovagi" were always roving from one monastery to another. After staying three or four days in one monastery, they would start again for another; for after a few days' rest it was usual for strangers to be subjected to the discipline of the monastery, to the same fare, labour, &c., as the inmates (*Martene Reg. Comm. ad loc. cit.*); always endeavouring to ascertain where in the neighbourhood they would be most likely to find comfortable quarters (*Reg. Magist. c. 2*; cf. Isidor. *Pelus. l. Ep. 41*, Joann. Climac. *Scal. Grad. 27*). Martene (v. a.) and Ménard (*Bened. Aniss. Concord. Regul. iii. li.*) identify these "gyrovagi" with the "circumcelliones," or "circelliones." [*v. CIRCUMCELLIONES*.] They were of importance enough to be condemned in one of the canons of the Trullan council, A.D. 691, and are there described as wandering about in black robes and with unshorn hair: they are to be chased away into the desert, unless they will consent to enter a monastery, to have their hair trimmed, and in other ways to submit to discipline (*Conc. Quinisextum c. 42*). Bingham (*Origin. Eccles. vii. li. 12*) and Hoespinian (*de Orig. Monach. li. i.*) merely repeat what is contained in the rule of Benedict. [I. G. S.]

## H

**HABAKKUK**, the prophet; commemorated Jinbot 24 = May 19, and Hedar 3 = Oct. 30 (*Cal. Ethiop.*); also Dec. 2 (*Cal. Byzant.*). See also **ABACUC**. [W. F. G.]

**HABIT THE MONASTIC.** (*Habitus monasticus*, σχῆμα μοναδικόν or μοναχικόν). A distinctive uniform was no part of monachism originally. Only it was required of monks that their dress and general appearance should indicate "gravity and a contempt of the world" (Bingh. *Orig. Eccles.* VII. iii. 6). Hair worn long was an effeminacy (August. *de Op. Mon.* c. 31. Hieron. *Ep.* 22, *ad Eustoch.* c. 28, cf. Epiphani. *adv. Haeres.* lxxx. 7), the head shaven all over was too like the priests of Isis (Hieron. *Comm. in Ezek.* c. 44. Ambros. *Ep.* 58 *ad Sabin.*). In popular estimation persons abstaining from the use of silken apparel were often called monks (Hieron. *Ep.* 23 *ad Marcell.*). The same writer defines the dress of a monk merely as "cheap and shabby" (*Ep.* 4 *ad Rustic.*, *Ep.* 13 *ad Paulin.*). And the dress of a nun as "sombre" in tint, and "coarse" in texture (*Ep.* 23 *ad Marcell.*). He warns the enthusiasts of asceticism against the eccentricity in dress, which was sometimes a mere pretence of austerity, a long untrimmed beard, bare feet, a black cloak, chains on the wrists (*Ep.* 22 *ad Eustoch.* c. 28, cf. Pallad. *Hist. Laus.* c. 52). So Cassian protests against monks wearing wooden crosses on their shoulders (*Coll.* viii. 3). Hair closely cut, and the cloak (pallium), usually worn by Greek philosophers and lecturers, were at first badges of a monk in Western Christendom; but even these were not peculiar to him. The cloak was often worn by other Christians, exposing them to the vulgar reproach of being "Greeks" and "impostors" (Bingh. *Orig. Eccles.* I. ii. 4), and any one appearing in public with pale face, short hair, and a cloak, was liable to be hooted and jeered at by the unbelieving populace as a monk (Salv. *de Gubernat.* viii. 4).

Cassian is more precise on a monk's costume, and devotes to it the first book of his Institutes. But he allows that the sort of dress suitable for a monk in Egypt or Ethiopia may be very unsuitable elsewhere, and he condemns sackcloth, or rather, a stuff made of goats' hair or camels' hair (cilicina vestis) worn outside as too conspicuous. He speaks in detail of the various parts of a monk's dress; the HOOD (cucullus), which is to remind the monk to be as a little child in simplicity; the sleeveless tunic (COLUBIUM), in Egypt made of linen, which reminds him of self-mortification; the GIRDLE or waist-band (cingulum), to remind him to have his "loins girded" as a "good soldier of Christ;" the cape over the shoulders (mafors, palliolum); the sheepskin or goatskin round the waist and thighs (melotes, pera, penula); and for the feet the sandals (CALIGAE), only to be worn as an occasional luxury, never during the divine service (Cassian *Instit.* I. cc. 1-10 cf. Ruffin. *Hist. Mon.* c. 3).

Benedict characteristically passes over this item in the monastic discipline very quickly; summing up his directions about it in one of the last chapters of his rule; and discreetly leaving

CHRIST. ANT.

questions of colour and material, as indifferent, to be decided by climate and other circumstances. He lays down the general principle, that there are to be no superfluities, adding, that a tunic and hood, or, for outdoor work, a sort of cape to protect the shoulders (scapulare), instead of the hood, ought to suffice generally; two suits of each being allowed for each monk, and some suits of rather better quality being kept for monks on their peregrinations. The worn out articles of dress are to be restored to the keeper of the wardrobe, for the poor. Benedict, however, "to avoid disputes" appends a short list, corresponding very nearly to Cassian's, of things necessary for a monk, all which are to be supplied to the brethren, at the discretion of the abbat, and none of them to be the property or "peculiare" of any one. The only addition to the Egyptian costume is that of socks (pedules) for the winter; the Benedictine "bracile" apparently corresponding with "cingulum," and the "scapulare" with "palliolum." Benedict allows trousers [FEMORALIA] on a journey, and on some other occasions; underclothing he is silent about; consequently commentators and the usages of particular monasteries differ on this point. To the list of clothing Benedict adds, as part of a monk's equipment, a knife (cultellus) a pen (graphium), a needle (acus) a handkerchief or handcloth (mappula), and tablets for writing on (tabulae). He specifies also as necessaries for the night, a mattress (matta), a coverlet (sagum), a blanket (laena), and a pillow (capitale) (Bened. *Reg.* c. 55). Martene quotes Hildemar for the traditional custom, by which each monk was provided with a small jar of soap for himself and of grease for his shoes (*Reg. Bened. Comment.* ad loc.).

Laxity of monastic discipline soon began to provoke fresh enactments about dress, sometimes more stringent and more minute than at first (e.g. *Reg. Isidor.* c. 14, *Reg. Mag.* c. 81). Councils re-enact, and reformers protest. The council of Agde, A.D. 506, and the 4th council of Toledo, A.D. 633, repeat the canon of the 4th council of Carthage A.D. 398, "ne clerici comam nutriant" (*Conc. Agath.* c. 20; *Conc. iv. Toletan.* c. 40; *Conc. iv. Carthag.* c. 44). Ferreolus, in southern Gaul, A.D. 558, repeats the old edict against superfluities, and forbids his monks to use perfumes, or wear linen next the skin (Ferreol. *Reg.* cc. 14, 31, 32). In Spain, Fructuosus of Braga, A.D. 656, insists on uniformity of apparel. Irregularity about dress seems with monks, as in a regiment, to have been an accompaniment of demoralisation. (See, further, Menard *Conc. Regul.* lxii.; Alteserr. *Ascticon.* v.; Middendorp. *Origin. Ascet. Sylva.* xiii.)

The Greek *Euchologion* gives an office for the assumption of the ordinary habit of a monk (ἀκολουθία τοῦ μικροῦ σχήματος), and another for assuming the greater or "angelic" habit distinctive of those ascetics who were thought to have attained the perfection of monastic life (ἀκ. τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος). See Daniel's *Codex Lit.* iv. 659 ff. [See NOVICE.]


[I. G. S.]

## HAEREDIPETAE. [CAPTATORES.]

**HAGGAI**, the prophet; commemorated Taksas 20 = Dec. 16 (*Cal. Ethiop.*, *Cal. Byzant.*).

[W. F. G.]  
S C

**HAGIOSIDERON.** One of the substitutes for BELLS still used in the East is the Hagiosideron (τὸ σιδηροῦν, κροῦσμα) [see SEMANTRON]. These usually consist of an iron plate, curved like the tire of a wheel, which is struck with a



hammer, and produces a sound not unlike that of a gong. They are occasionally made of brass. The illustration is taken from Dr. Neale's work (Neale's *Eastern Church*, Int. 217, 225; Daniel's *Codex Lit.* iv. 199). [C.]

**HAIL MARY or AVE MARIA.** An address and prayer commonly made to St. Mary the Virgin in the unreformed Western churches.

*What it is, and when used.*—It consists of two parts: 1. The words used by the angel Gabriel in saluting St. Mary, as rendered by the Vulgate, slightly altered by the addition of St. Mary's name, "Hail Mary, full of grace; the Lord is with thee;" followed by the words of Elizabeth, "Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb." 2. A prayer, subsequently added to the salutation, "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now, and at the hour of our death."

This formula is ordered by the breviary of pope Pius V. to be used daily, after the recitation of compline, and before the recitation of each of the other canonical hours, i.e., matins, prime, terce, sext, nones, and vespers. It is also commanded, on the same authority, to be used before the recitation of the "Office of the Blessed Virgin," and before each of the hours in the "Little Office." It is also used nine times every day in what is called the "Angelus." It is also used sixty-three times in the devotion called the "Crown of the Virgin," and one hundred and fifty times in the "Rosary of the Virgin." It also occurs in many of the public offices, and is used before sermons, and it most commonly forms a part of the special devotions appointed by bishops for obtaining indulgences.

*Its date.*—Cardinal Baronius and Cardinal Bona have used an expression which, while not committing them to a declaration of fact, or a statement of their own belief, has yet led subsequent writers (see Gaume, *loc. inf. cit.*) to claim their authority for the assertion, that the second, or precatory, part of the Ave Maria was adopted in, or immediately after, the council of Ephesus, at the beginning of the 5th century. "At that time," says Baronius (*loc. inf. cit.*), "the angelical salutation is believed to have received that addition, 'Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us, &c.,' which came to be constantly repeated by the faithful." "The angelical salutation," says Bona (*loc. inf. cit.*), "is believed to have received this addition in the great council of Ephesus." It is quite certain that the two cardinals and their followers have ante-dated this part of the Ave Maria by more than a thousand years. The first, or Scriptural, part, consisting of the words of the angel and of Elizabeth, is older by some five hundred years than the second, or precatory, part, which has been attached to it, and the first part did not become used as a formula

until the end of the 11th century. The earliest injunction authorising its being taught together with the previously existing formulas of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, is found in the Constitutions of Odo, who became bishop of Paris in the year 1196. The Benedictines of St. Stephen of Caer, in 1706, maintained the following thesis: "The angelical salutation began to be in use in the 12th century, but these words 'Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us, &c.,' seem to have been added a long time afterwards, in the 16th century:" a thesis which was denounced by the then bishop of Bayeux as scandalous, but was defended and maintained against him by Père Massuet. The earliest known use of the first, or scriptural, part, is in the *Liber Antiphoniarum*, attributed by John the Deacon to St. Gregory the Great, and generally published with his works. If St. Gregory is the author of the *Liber Antiphoniarum*, and if the antiphon in which these words occur (p. 657, *Ed. inf. cit.*) is not a later insertion (the same words in the previous page are undoubtedly a modern insertion), the angelical salutation, as found in the Bible, was used as early as the beginning of the 7th century; not, however, as a formula of devotion, but as we might use an anthem on one day of the year. This passage from St. Gregory is the only thing which brings the Ave Maria within the chronological limits assigned to this Dictionary, for it is allowed (see Mabillon, *loc. inf. cit.*) that similar words in the so-called liturgy of St. James the Less are of late introduction there.

The addition of the second, or precatory, part of the Ave Maria, is stated by Pelbertus to have been made in consequence of a direct injunction of St. Mary, who appeared to a pious woman, and gave her instructions to that effect. The use of it sprang up in the 15th century, and is first authorised in pope Pius Vth's breviary, in the year 1568.

The "Crown of the Virgin" consists of sixty-three recitations of the Ave Maria, one for each year that St. Mary was supposed to have lived, with the recitation of the Lord's Prayer after every tenth Ave Maria. Its institution is attributed by some to Peter the Hermit. It appears to have sprung up and spread in the 12th and 13th centuries.

The "Rosary, or Psalter of the Blessed Virgin" consists of one hundred and fifty Ave Marias, after the number of the Psalms of David, together with fifteen Pater Nosters, distributed at equal intervals among the Ave Marias. Its institution is attributed by some to St. Dominic, and to the year 1210.

The "Angelus" consists of three recitations of the Ave Maria at the sound of the Angelus bell in the morning, three at midday, and three at night. On each occasion the first Ave Maria is to be preceded by the sentence, "The angel of the Lord announced to Mary, and she conceived of the Holy Ghost;" the second, by "Behold the handmaid of the Lord. Be it unto me according unto thy word;" the third, by "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." The Angelus appears to have been originated in the year 1287, by Buonvicino da Riva, of Milan, of the order of the Humiliati, who began the practice of ringing a bell at the recitation of the Ave Maria. In 1318 John XXII. gave an indulgence

of ten days for saying an Ave Maria to the sound of a bell rung at night. In 1458, Calixtus III. gave three years and one hundred and twenty days' indulgence for reciting the Ave Maria and the Pater Noster three times a day. In 1518, Leo X. ordered that the Angelus bell should be rung three times a day, and he gave 500 days' indulgence for saying the Angelus morning, mid-day, and evening. Finally, Benedict XIII. and Benedict XIV. gave a plenary indulgence, to be obtained once a month, to all who recited it three times daily.

The dates, therefore, are as follow:—

The earliest known use (in the form of an antiphon, or anthem) of the Scriptural words, afterwards adopted as the first part of the Ave Maria—the 7th century.

The earliest known use of the same part as a formula—the 11th century.

The earliest authoritative recommendation of the said formula—the 12th century.

The Crown of the Virgin—the 12th century.

The Rosary or Psalter of the Virgin—the 13th century.

The Angelus—the 14th century.

The earliest known use of the prayer which forms the second part of the Ave Maria—the 15th century.

The earliest authoritative recommendation and injunction of the same—the 16th century.

*Authorities and References.*—*Breviarium Romanum* Pii V. Pont. M. jussu editum; Baronius, *Annal. Eccles. ad ann.* 431, tom. vii. p. 404, num. 179, Lucae, 1741; Bona, *Divinae Psalmodie*, c. 16, § 2, p. 497, Antverpiae, 1694; Gaume, *Catechismo di Perseveranza*, vol. iii. p. 506, Milan, 1859; Marchantius, *Hortus Pastorum*, tract iv. Lugd., 1672; Bollandus, *Acta Sanctorum*, Mar. 25, Aug. 4, pp. 539, 422, Antverpiae, 1668, 1733; S. Gregorii Magni *Opera*, tom. iii. p. 657, ed. Ben. Venet. 1744; Hospinianus, *De Festis*, p. 69, Genevae, 1674; Mabillon, *Praefationes in Acta Sanctorum Ordinis S. Benedicti*; *Praefatio in Saecul.* v. p. 439, Venet., 1740; Migne, *Summa aurea de Laudibus Virginis*, tom. iv., *Liturgia Mariana: De cultu publico ab Ecclesia B. Mariae exhibito*: Dissertationes iv. v. vi. vii. auctore J. C. Trombelli, p. 209, Parisiis, 1862; Zaccaria, *Dissertazioni varie Italiane*, Dissertazione vi. tom. ii. p. 242, Romae, 1780; *Enciclopedia dell' Ecclesiastico*, s. v. "Ave Maria," Napoli, 1843. [F. M.]

**HAIR, WEARING OF.** The regulations of the ancient church on this subject may be divided into three distinct classes, as relating—i. to the clergy; ii. to penitents; iii. to believers in general.

i. The hair in ancient times appears to have been sometimes worn at great length. Thus Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 23), speaking of James the Apostle, notes that a razor never came upon his head. But shortened hair appears to have been considered a mark of distinction between the heathen philosopher and the Christian teacher. Thus Gregory Nazianzen (*Orat.* 28) says of Maximus, that he brought no qualification to the pastoral office except that of shortening his hair, which, before that time, he had worn disgracefully long. It is also recorded of one Theotimus, bishop of Scythia, that he

still retained the long hair which he had worn when a student, in token that, in becoming a bishop, he had not abandoned philosophy (*Soz. H. E.* vii. 26). But this liberty was restricted by various decrees of councils. The fourth council of Carthage, A.D. 398 (c. 44), provides that the clergy shall neither permit their hair nor beards to grow. Another reading of this decree is, that they were neither to let their hair grow nor shave their beards. The first synod of St. Patrick, A.D. 456 (c. 6), provides that the hair of the clergy should be shorn according to the Roman fashion, and (c. 10) that any who allow their hair to grow, should be excluded from the church. The council of Agde, A.D. 506 (c. 20), ordains that clergy who retain long hair, shall have it shortened, even against their will, by the archdeacon. The first council of Barcelona, A.D. 540 (c. 3), provides that no clergyman shall let his hair grow nor shave his beard. The first council of Braga, A.D. 563 (c. 11), provides that lectors shall not have love-locks (*granos*), hanging down, after the heathen fashion. The second council of Braga, A.D. 572 (c. 66), decrees that the clergy ought not to discharge their sacred functions with long hair, but with closely-cut hair and open ears. The fourth council of Toledo, A.D. 633 (c. 41), denounces certain lectors in Galicia, who, while retaining a small tonsure, allowed the lower portion of the hair to grow. The council in Trullo, A.D. 692 (*Conc. Quinisex.* c. 21), ordains that clergy who have been deprived of their office, should, on their repentance, be shorn after the fashion of the clergy; if they refused this, their hair was to be left long, in token of their preference of a worldly life. At a council held at Rome, A.D. 721 (c. 17), anathema was pronounced against any of the clergy who should allow his hair to grow. The same was repeated at another Roman council, held A.D. 743 (c. 8).

These decrees, however, appear to have been difficult of enforcement. Heretical sects especially appear to have been fond of adopting eccentric fashions of wearing the hair and beard as badges and tokens of their opinions. Epiphanius (*Haeres. in Massil.* n. 6, 7) denounces certain heretical monks, dwelling in Mesopotamia, in monasteries which he calls "Mandras," who were in the habit of shaving the beard and letting the hair grow, and contends that such practices are contrary to the apostolic injunctions. Jerome (*Comm. in Ezek.* c. 44) says that the clergy should neither have their heads closely shaven, like the priests of Isis and Serapis, nor let their hair grow to an extravagant length, like barbarians and soldiers, but that the hair should be worn just so long as to cover the head. In another place (*Epist.* 18, al. 22, ad Eustoch.), he denounces certain monks who indulged in beards like goats and ringlets like women. In his 'Life of Hilarion,' he commends the saint for cutting his hair once a year, at Easter. Augustine (*De Op. Mon.* c. 31) speaks of certain monks who, fearing lest they might lose reverence by their shorn heads, "ne vilior habeatur tonsa sanctitas," allowed their hair to grow, in order to suggest to those who saw them a resemblance to Samuel and the elder prophets. Against these he quotes the saying of the apostle, that in Christ the veil shall be taken away (2 Cor. iii. 14). Gregory the Great



(*Pastoral* p. 2, c. 7) says that priests are rightly forbidden either to shave their heads, or to let their hair grow long. The hair on the head of a priest, is to be kept so long that it may cover the skin, and cut so close that it may not interfere with the eyes. The practice seems to have been, to wear the hair short and the beard long. Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* iv. 24) speaks of one Maximus Palatinus, a clergyman, as wearing his hair short and his beard long. Gregory the Great is described as wearing a beard of the old fashion and of moderate size, a large round tonsure, and his hair neatly curled, "intorto," and hanging to the middle of his ears (Joann. Diac. *Vita Greg. Max.* c. 4, c. 83). Bede (*Eccl. Hist.* i. 4, c. 14), describing a vision of SS. Peter and Paul, says that the one was shaven (attonsus), as a clergyman, the other wore his beard long. For other particulars regarding the hair of the clergy, see TONSURE.

ii. Closely-cut hair was always enjoined on penitents, as a condition of their reception into the church. The council of Agde (c. 15) provides that no penitents shall be received unless they have parted with their hair, "comas deposuerint." The first council of Barcelona (c. 6) speaks of the shaven heads of male penitents. The third council of Toledo (a. 12) provides that the first step to the admission of a male penitent, shall be to shave his head. So Optatus (*Contra Donatist.* i. 23) finds fault with the Donatists for having shaven the heads of certain priests whom they had admitted to penance. With regard to women, Ambrose (*Ad Virg. Laps.* c. 8) speaks of cutting off the hair, which by vain glory had tempted to the sin of luxury; but Jerome, in describing the repentance of Fabiola (*Epist.* 30, al. 84, ad Ocean.), speaks of her dishevelled hair. But before their restoration, penitents and excommunicated persons were obliged to let the hair and beard grow. Thus a certain Ursicinus, bishop of Cahors, being excommunicated, was forbidden to cut either his hair or his beard (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* i. 8, n. 20). In general, neglected hair appears to have been a sign of mourning. Chrysostom (*Serm.* 3, on Job) says that many in time of mourning let the hair grow, whereas Job shorn his. The reason being, that where the hair is honoured, it is a sign of mourning to cut it short, but where it is worn short, it is a sign of mourning to let it grow. Baronius (*Annales*, A.D. 631, n. 4) speaks of a certain bishop, named Lupus, exiled by Clothaire, who came mourning to the king with long dishevelled locks, and the king, in token of forgiveness, commanded his hair to be shorn.

iii. The laity were sometimes recognised as usually wearing their hair long. The council in Trullo (*Conc. Quinisext.* c. 21) ordains that delinquent and impenitent clergy should wear their hair long, as the laity. Yet immoderately lengthened hair appears to have been considered a token of effeminacy and luxuriousness. When the emperor Heraclius succeeded to the throne, his hair was immediately cut short (Baronius, *Annal.* A.D. 610, n. 5). Many attempts were therefore made to restrain the liberty of the laity, in this respect, within due bounds, founded partly on a sense of what was decent and becoming, partly on the principle that it is not right either for men or women to obliterate the characteristics of their sex. The council in

Trullo (c. 96) asserts that it is inconsistent with the baptismal profession, that baptised men should wear their hair in cunningly wove plaits or tresses, and orders that such as would not obey this admonition, should be excommunicated. The council of Gangra (c. 17) anathematizes any women who, through pretended asceticism, should cut close the hair which was given to them as a token of subjection. The decree was confirmed by the emperor Theodosius, with the addition that any bishop who should admit such women into the church, should be deprived of his office (Soz. *H. E.* vii. 26). In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (i. 3), the followers of Christ are ordered not to promote the growth of their hair, but rather to restrain and shorten it. Men are forbidden to wear ringlets, or to use ointments, or in any way to imitate the adornments in use among women. They are also forbidden to collect their hair into a knot or crown, ποιεῖν εἰς ἐν ὃ ἐστὶ σπατάλιον, or to indulge in tresses, either artfully dishevelled or carefully arranged, ἢ ἀποχύμα ἢ μεμερισμένον, or to curl and crisp it, or dye it yellow. They are also forbidden to shave the beard, as if thereby obliterating the peculiar distinction, τὴν μορφὴν, of manhood. Clemens Alexandrinus (*Paedagog.* ii. c. 8) speaks of the folly committed by aged women in dyeing their hair; and (*Ib.* iii. 3) reprehends the folly of which some men were guilty, in eradicating the hair, apparently not only from their beards, but from all parts of their bodies, with pitch plaisters. He also (*Ib.* iii. 11) gives full directions for the arrangement of the hair. The hair of men is to be cut close, unless it is crisp and curly, οὐλας. Long curls and love-locks are strictly forbidden, as effeminate and unseemly. The hair is not to be allowed to grow over the eyes, and a closely-cropped head is alleged not only to be becoming a grave man, but to render the brain less liable to injury, by accustoming it to endure heat and cold. The beard is to be allowed to grow, since an ample beard becomes the male sex; if cut at all, the chin must not be left quite bare. The moustache may be clipped with scissors, so that it may not be dirtied in eating, but not shorn with a razor. Women are to wear the hair modestly arranged upon the neck, and fastened with a hair pin. The habit of wearing false hair is strongly denounced, since, it is said, in such cases, when the priest, in bestowing his benediction, lays his hand upon the head, the blessing does not reach the wearer of the hair, but rests upon the person to whom the hair belongs. [P. O.]

**HAIR-CLOTH (Cilicium).** The rough hair-cloth for which Cilicia was anciently famous was used in several ways, both as an actual instrument, and as a symbol, of mortification.

1. The hair-shirt has frequently been worn, as is well known, as a means of mortifying the flesh without ostentation. Thus Jerome (*Epistaph. Nepot.* c. 9) says that some other may narrate how the young Nepotianus, when in the imperial service, wore hair-cloth under his chlamys and fine linen. And Paulinus Petricor-diensis (*Vita S. Martini*, ii. p. 1019 D, Migne) says of the monks of St. Martin:

"Multis vestis erat setis contexta cameli."

So in Hucbald's *Life of St. Eusebius*, who died

about A.D. 683 (a. 9, in Mabillon's *Acta SS. Bened. Sec. II.*), we read that the saint wore an inner garment of hair-cloth (*seophae amictur cilicio*). One of the saints who bore the name of Theodore was distinguished as *epixenos* from his constant habit of wearing a hair-shirt (*Maeri Hironos. a. v. Trichinus*).

Monks frequently used the hair-shirt. Cassian, however (*Instit. l. 1*) does not consider it suitable for their ordinary garb, both as savouring of over-righteousness and as hindering labour [*HABIT, THE MONASTIC*]. In his time—Cassian died about A.D. 430—few monks seem to have used it; in after times we find it constantly used, at any rate by those who claimed superior sanctity. On the whole subject, see O. Zöckler, *Krit. Geschichte der Askese*, p. 83 [Frankf.-a. M. 1865].

2. Of the symbolic uses of hair-cloth the following are the principal:—The candidates for baptism anciently came to the preliminary examination [*SCANTINUM*] with bare feet, and standing on hair-cloth (*Augustine, De Sym. et Catech. l. 1*; compare *lv. 1*). Penitents in the ceremonies of Ash Wednesday were clothed with a hair-cloth, as well as sprinkled with ashes (*Martens, Bib. Ant. IV. c. xvii.*; *Ordo. 7, 18, etc.*). The altar was sometimes covered with hair-cloth in times of affliction (*R. III. iii. 2*). The dying were covered with a hair-cloth blessed by the priest (*R. l. vii. 4, Ordo 19*). The bodies of the dead were sometimes wrapped in hair-cloth; as, for instance, that of Bernard of Hildenheim (*Life*, c. 43; in *Surin*, Nov. 20). Charles the Great was buried in the hair-shirt which he had worn in life (*Life* by the monk of Angoulême, c. 34; quoted by *Martens*, III. xii. 13). Is an ancient form for the reception of penitents on Maundy Thursday, given by *Martens* (*IV. xxi. § 11. Ordo 6*) from a *Sacrum missal*, a banner of hair-cloth (*vestimentum cilicinum*) is directed to be borne in the procession to the church. [C.]

#### HALLELUJAH. [ALLELUIA.]

HAND, THE, is used as symbolic of the manifested presence of the First Person of the Holy Trinity, GOD THE FATHER.

The declining skill of the earliest Christian workmen, and their utter technical incapacity after the time of Constantine, appears in the strongest light in their attempts to delineate the extremities of the human figure. Martigny remarks that the hands of the martyrs presenting or receiving their crowns in heaven are covered or concealed in token of adoration; but this applies only to the left hand. The comparative skill, or want of skill, with which these parts of the body are treated, might possibly be a test of ancient work in the catacombs, could paintings be discovered of very ancient date, and thoroughly ascertained authenticity without modern retouch.

The hand representing God occurs in the great Transfiguration of St. Apollinaris in Classe at Ravenna (Martigny, p. 639, a. v. Transfiguration). Also in a carving of the same subject on the Ivory Casket of the Library at Brescia (*Westwood, Florilegium*, 84, p. 37, catalogue). [R. St. J. T.]

HANDS, IMPOSITION OF. [IMPOSITION OF HANDS.]

#### HANDS, THE LIFTING OF IN PRAYER.

I. The strict observance of this custom, and the importance attached to it among the early Christians, will hardly be understood, unless we take into consideration the habits and opinions of their Jewish and heathen forefathers. It was a rite that had descended to them from both. Among the children of Israel it accompanied acts of praise as well as prayer. Witness the Book of Psalms:—"Thus will I bless Thee while I live: I will lift up my hands in Thy name" (*Ps. lxxiii. 4*); "Lift up your hands in holiness, and bless the Lord" (*Ps. cxxxiv. 2*). Before Ezra read the law to the people after their return from Babylon, he "blessed the Lord, the great God, and all the people answered Amen, Amen, with lifting up of their hands" (*Neh. viii. 6*; compare *1 Esdr. ix. 47*). In prayer the gesture was so universal that to pray and to lift up the hands were almost convertible terms. Thus in Lamentations, "Lift up thy hands towards Him for the life of thy young children" (*Ch. ii. 19*). Again in Psalm *xviii. 2*: "Hear the voice of my supplications, when I cry unto Thee; when I lift up my hands toward Thy holy oracle." When Heliadorus came to take away the treasures in the temple, the inhabitants of Jerusalem "all holding their hands toward heaven, made supplication" (*2 Mac. iii. 20*; compare *xiv. 34*; *Ps. cxli. 2*; *Is. i. 15*; *1 Esdr. viii. 73*; *Eccles. ii. 19*). This gesture in prayer was without doubt so highly valued among the Jews, partly in consequence of the victory obtained over the Amalekites, while the hands of Moses were held up (*Exod. xvii. 11*); but it was nevertheless "not of Moses, but of the fathers." We might infer this from the manner in which the story is related; but more conclusively from the fact that the same rite prevailed among the Gentiles. "All we of human kind," says Aristotle, "stretch forth our hands to heaven, when we pray" (*De Mundo*, c. vi. comp. *Hom. II. viii. 347*; *Virg. Aen. iii. 176*; *2. 657*). Minutius Felix proves that it was still common among the heathen in the 3rd century, "I hear the common people, when they stretch their hands towards heaven, say nothing but God" (*Octavius*, c. 3).

II. A practice thus universal and of such antiquity, could not fail to have a place in the received ritual of the first Christians. It is more than once recognized in the New Testament itself; as when St. Paul says, "I will therefore that men pray everywhere lifting up holy hands" (*1 Tim. ii. 8*). Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 192, is an early witness to the continued observance of the rite. After defining prayer to be "converse with God," he proceeds to say that therefore, as if reaching up to Him, we "raise the hand and lift the hands towards heaven" (*Strom. vii. c. vi. § 40*). Tertullian, his contemporary:—"Worshipping with modesty and humility we the more commend our prayers to God, not even lifting up our hands too high, but with self-restraint and becomingly" (*De Orat. c. xiii.*). Again: "We Christians, looking upwards, with hands outspread, because free from guilt; with hand bare, because we are not ashamed; lastly, without a remembrancer [of the names of the gods], because we pray from the heart" (*Apol. c. xxi.*). Origen, A.D. 230, says that among the many

gestures of the body, we ought without doubt in prayer to prefer "the stretching forth of the hands and the lifting up of the eyes" (*De Orat.* c. 31); and that when the devout man prays he "stretches forth his soul towards God, beyond his hands, as it were, and his mind further than his eyes" (*Ibid.*). According to Eusebius, Constantine had himself represented on coins and in pictures "looking up to heaven, and stretching forth his hands like one praying" (*Vita Constant.* l. iv. c. xv.). See the epitaph of Petronia, under TOMB.

III. The hands when thus lifted up were often, and perhaps generally, so extended on either side as to make the figure of a cross with the body. See the boy in the group on p. 661. "We" (Christians), says Tertullian (in contrast with the Jews), "not only lift up our hands, but spread them out too, and disposing them after the mode of the Lord's Passion and praying, (so) confess Christ" (*De Orat.* c. xi.). In allusion to this he says elsewhere, "The very attitude of a Christian at prayer is prepared for every infliction" (*Apol.* c. xxx.). Asterius Amasenus, A. D. 401: "The erect attitude of prayer, in which one holds the hands outstretched, by its figure represents the passion of the cross" (*Hom. de Pharis. et Publ.* in Photii *Biblioth.* cod. 271). St. Maximus of Turin: "We are taught to pray with uplifted hands that by the very gesture of our members we may confess Christ" (*De Cruce; Hom. de Pass.* ii.). St. Ambrose, when dying, "prayed with hands spread in the form of a cross" (*Vita*, a Paulino conscr. § 47). Prudentius, describing the death by fire of certain martyrs, relates that, when their bonds were burnt, they lifted up the hands thus set free "to the Father in the form of a cross" (*De Coron.* Hymn vi. l. 107). Many Christian writers believed that this was the manner in which the hands of Moses were held up during the battle with the Amalekites, and that the victory was thus granted to the cross. See *Ep. Barnab.* c. xii.; Justin M. *Dialog. cum Tryph.* cc. 91, 111; Tertull. *Adv. Jud.* c. x.; Cyprian *Adv. Jud.* l. ii. c. xxi.; Maximus Taur. u. s. Gregory Nazianzen:—"They held up the hands of Moses that Amalek might be subdued by the cross so long before shadowed forth and figured" (*Orat.* xii. § 2; Sim. *Carmina*, lib. ii. § 1, c. 1).

IV. At baptism the early Christians lifted the hand as in defiance of Satan. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem, addressing the newly-baptized: "Standing with your face to the West, ye heard yourselves commanded to stretch forth the hand and renounce Satan as present" (*Catech. Mystag.* l. c. ii.). Pseudo-Dionysius describes the same thing; but from him we learn further that after the candidate had thrice renounced Satan, the priest "turned him towards the East, and commanded him to look up to heaven, and lifting up (*ἀνατείναντα*) his hand to enter into compact with Christ" (*Eccl. Hierarch.* cap. ii. § 6; comp. c. iii. § 5). St. Basil, when exhorting catechumens not to defer their baptism, appears to allude to this second lifting of the hands: "Why dost thou wait until baptism becomes the gift of a fever to thee, when thou wilt not be able to utter the salutary words . . . nor to lift up thy hands to heaven, nor to stand up on thy feet?" (*Hom. xiii. Exhort. ad S. Baptism.* § 3). The office of the modern Greek church (*Euchol.*

Goar, p. 338) still witnesses to the lifting up of the hands at the renunciation; but they are now held down when the desire to take service under Christ is professed. The reader will observe that the authorities now cited all belong to the East. There is no evidence so far as the present writer knows, to show that the custom before us prevailed in the West also. [W. E. S.]

**HANDS, WASHING OF.** I. In the law of Moses (*Exod.* xxx. 18-21) it was ordained that "between the tabernacle of the congregation and the altar" there should stand a brazen laver full of water, at which the priests were to "wash their hands and their feet" before they entered. When the temple was built, this laver was replaced by the "molten sea," "for the priests to wash in" (*2 Chron.* iv. 2, 6). Again, when murder had been committed by an unknown person, the declaration of innocence made by the elders of the nearest city was associated with a ceremonial washing of the hands (*Deut.* xxi. 6). These two provisions of the law would, it is conceived, be quite sufficient of themselves to create among those subject to it a general custom of washing the hands before drawing near to God in the more solemn acts of worship and religion. That such a rite prevailed and was held to be of a highly sacred character may be inferred from more than one allusion in the Book of Psalms. "I will wash mine hands in innocency; so will I compass Thine altar" (*Psalms* xxvi. 6); "Verily I have cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency" (*lxxiii.* 13). The metaphor of "clean hands" to denote righteousness could not have come into such frequent use (*Job* ix. 30; xvii. 9; xxxi. 7; *Ps.* xviii. 20, 24; xxiv. 4), if there had been no familiar rite of washing the hands before entering into God's presence. To give an example of later usage, Josephus tells us that the seventy-two who translated the Old Testament into Greek at the instance of Ptolemy were wont each morning to "wash their hands and purify themselves," before they entered on their sacred task (*Antiq.* b. xii. ch. ii. § 13). It is most probable, however, that the custom before us was much older than the law of Moses, for it appears to have been general among the heathen at an early period. Thus Hesiod gives a warning "never with unwashed hands to pour out the black wine at morn to Zeus or the other immortals" (*Opera et Dies*, line 722). He also forbids the passage of a stream on foot before washing the hands in it with prayer (*ibid.* l. 735). According to some ancient authorities temples were called *delubra* from *deluo*, because they generally had fountains, or pools so called, attached to them for the use of those who entered (*Servius ad Virg. Aen.* ii. 225). Nor was the kindred rite before mentioned unknown to the heathen. Pilate "took water and washed his hands before the multitude," when he protested his innocence of the blood of Christ (*St. Matt.* xxvii. 24). Compare *Virg. Aen.* ii. 719. Generally, indeed, "it was a custom with the ancients, after the killing of a man or other slaughters, to wash the hands with water to remove the pollution" (*Scholiast. in Sophocl. Ajac.* l. 664, vol. i. p. 80; Lond. 1758).

II. A rite thus familiar to all classes of the early converts, and so patient of a Christian

adaptation, was certain to be retained in some form or other. To facilitate its observance there was in the ATRIUM of many churches a FOUNTAIN or reservoir of water resembling those with which the temples had been furnished. Thus Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, at the beginning of the 4th century, in an open space before a church which he built in that city, caused to be made "fountains opposite the temple, which by their plentiful flow of water afforded the means of cleansing to those who passed out of the sacred precincts into the interior" (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* l. x. c. 4). In the West, Paulinus of Nola, A.D. 393, gives a poetical description of a basin (cantharus) in the court of a church built by him. "With its ministering stream," he says, "it washes the hands of those who enter" (*ad Sever. Ep.* xxxii. § 15). From the same writer we learn that there was a cantharus in the atrium of the basilica of St. Peter at Rome, which "spouted streams that ministered to the hands and faces" of the worshippers (*ad Pam-mach. Ep.* xiii. § 13). St. Chrysostom says, "It is the custom for fountains to be placed in the courts of houses of prayer, that they who are going to pray to God may first wash their hands, and so lift them up in prayer" (*Hom. de Div. N. T. loc. n. xxv. on 2 Cor. iv. 13*). Socrates tells us that in a riot at Constantinople in the reign of Constantius "the court of the church (of Acacius the martyr) was filled with blood, and the well therein overflowed with blood" (*Hist. Eccl.* l. ii. c. 38).

III. Frequent allusions to the practice for which public provision was thus made occur in Christian writers. For example, Tertullian, A.D. 192: "What is the sense of entering on prayer with the hands, indeed, washed, but the spirit unclean?" (*De Orat.* c. xi.). This is said of all prayer, private as well as public. With regard to private prayer in the morning, the *Apostolical Constitutions* give the following direction: "Let every one of the faithful, man or woman, when they rise from sleep in the morning, before doing work, having washed [not bathed the whole body, but *νιψάμενοι*, having washed parts of it, especially the hands] pray" (lib. viii. c. 32). St. Chrysostom in the following passage is speaking of public worship in general: "I see a custom of this sort prevailing among the many, viz., that they study how they may come (into church) with clean clothes, and how they may wash their hands, but consider not how they may present a clean soul to God. And I do not say this to prevent your washing hands or face, but because I wish you to wash, as is befitting, not with water only, but with the virtues correlative to the water" (*Hom. li. in St. Matth. Ev.* c. xv. 17-20).

More frequently it is spoken of as part of the preparation for Holy Communion. For example, St. Chrysostom: "Tell me, wouldst thou choose to draw near to the sacrifice with unwashed hands? I think not; but thou wouldst rather not draw near at all than with filthy hands. Wouldst thou, then, while thus careful in the little matter, draw near having a filthy soul?" (*Hom. iii. in Ep. ad Eph.* c. i. 20-23). Similarly in the West, Caesarius of Arles, A.D. 502: "All the men, when they intend to approach the altar, wash their hands, and all the women use fair linen cloths on which to receive the body of

Christ . . . As the men wash their hands with water, so let them wash their souls with alms," &c. (*Serm.* ccxxix. § 5 in App. iv. *ad Opp. S. August.*). Again: "If we are ashamed and afraid to touch the eucharist with filthy hands, much more ought we to be afraid to receive the same eucharist in a polluted soul" (*Serm.* ccxcii. § 6; *ibid.*).

IV. The celebrant and his assistants washed their hands between the dismissal of the catechumens and the offering of the gifts. Thus in the *Apostolical Constitutions*: "Let one subdeacon give water to the priests for washing their hands, a symbol of the purity of souls consecrated to God" (lib. viii. c. 11). Cyril of Jerusalem: "Ye saw the deacon who gave to the priest and to the elders surrounding the altar of God (water) to wash (their hands, *νιψασθαι*) . . . The washing of the hands is a symbol of guiltlessness of sins" (*Catech. Mystag.* v. § 1). Pseudo-Dionysius: "Standing before the most holy symbols the high priest (i.e. the bishop) washes his hands with the venerable order of the priests" (*De Eccl. Hierarch.* cap. iii. sect. 3, § 10; sim. sect. ii.). We find the same rite in the West. Thus in one of the Questions out of the Old and New Testaments, probably compiled by Hilary the deacon, A.D. 354, it is implied that at Rome the deacons did not "pour water on the priest's hands, as" (adds the writer) "we see in all the churches" (Qu. ci. *On the Arrogance of the Roman Levites* in App. iii. *ad Opp. Aug.*). We may remark, in passing, that the Clementine liturgy, as above quoted, assigns the office to a subdeacon. In the earliest *Ordo Romanus* extant, probably of the 7th century, it is ordered that, after the reception of the gifts, the bishop "return to his seat and wash his hands," and that "the archdeacon standing before the altar wash his hands, when the receiving (of the oblations) is completed" (*Ord.* i. § 14; *Mus. Ital.* tom. ii. p. 11; compare *Ord.* ii. § 9, p. 47).

Since the clergy, as well as the people, washed their hands before they entered the church, it may be asked, how they came to do so a second time? Ancient writers give only a symbolical reason, but it is not probable that the custom originated in that. The words of the *Ordo Romanus* suggest that the hands might be soiled by the oblations, which at that time were large and various in kind. They certainly were washed immediately after these were taken from the offerers, and before the celebrant proceeded to offer the elements selected out of them for consecration. Another reason which might make it necessary is suggested by Sala (*Notu* (1) in Bona, *Rer. Lit.* l. ii. c. ix. § 6), viz., that a little time before the bishop and priests had laid their hands on the heads of the catechumens and penitents. The washing of the hands, or rather fingers, by the celebrant after his communion, now ordered in the church of Rome, was not practised for more than a thousand years after Christ. [W. E. S.]

HANGINGS. Some few notices may be added to those already given under CURTAINS. The curtains which closed the doors of the chancel screen in later times often bore the pictorial representation of some saint or angelic being. At the present day St. Michael is often represented upon them as prohibiting all access



to the bema (Neale, *Eastern Ch.* i. 195). It was on the curtain of the bema of the church at Anablatha that St. Epiphanius saw the painted figure which gave him so much offence, and caused him to tear the curtain, and desire that it should be replaced by one of a single colour (Epiphan. *Epist. ad Joann.* p. 319). The censure passed by Asterius of Amasia on the excessive luxury displayed in the textile fabrics of his day proves that at the end of the fourth century representations of sacred facts were woven in the stuffs in ordinary use for hangings, and even for dresses. The same author also describes the painted hangings of the sepulchre of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon representing the martyrdom of that saint (Aster. Amas. *Homil. de Divit. et Lazaro; Enarrat. in martyr. Euphem.*). Paulinus of Nola is another authority on the decoration of these *vela* with pictorial designs:—

“Vela coloratis textum fucata figura.”

A *velum* concealing the altar from the gaze of the laity is mentioned in the office for the dedication of a church in the *Sacramentary of Gregory*. When the bishop, having brought the relics which were to be deposited within it, had arrived at the altar, he was to be concealed from the sight of the people by a veil, before he proceeded to anoint the four corners with the chrism (*extenso velo inter clerum et populum*, Muratori, ii. 481). An offering of hangings *vela* was made to the church of St. Peter's by a lady of rank named Rusticiana, which were carried to their destination by the whole body of the clergy chanting a litany (Greg. Magn. *Epist.* ix. 38). The supposititious *Second Epistle of Clement to James the Lord's brother*, “*de sacratis vestibus et vasis*,” gives minute directions for the washing of the altar cloths and other vestments of the church by the deacons and other ministers of the church, in vessels specially set apart for the purpose, near the sacristy. The door-keepers are also enjoined to take care that no one thoughtlessly wiped his hands on the curtain of the door, and to remind those who were guilty of such irreverence that “the veil of the Lord's Temple is holy” (Labbe, *Concil.* i. 99). Gregory of Tours informs us that on the conversion of Clovis, solemn processions were instituted in the streets, which were shaded with painted veils, while the churches were adorned with white curtains (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* ii. 31). According to Hefele (*Beiträge zur Archäologie*, ii. 252), tapestry curtains were employed to protect the apertures of windows in churches before the general introduction of glazing. [E. V.]

**HARE.** The boy who represents Spring among the Four Seasons frequently carries a hare in his hand. The idea of speed in the Christian course was associated with it. It is sometimes connected with the horse (Perret v. lvii.) or with the palm (Boldetti, 506). Its presence in Christian decoration seems to be connected with the Roman taste for ornamenting their rooms with domestic, agricultural, or hunting subjects. Many places of assembly, no doubt, contained pictures by Pagan hands in the earliest days; and the ingenuity of Christian preachers would in all probability make use of them for type and metaphor; and so the animal or other object would become a recognized and customary

subject of Christian ornament, acquiring a symbolical meaning. In such examples as the *vias* or shepherd, that meaning of course existed before; and the distinction between scriptural and all other symbols is on the whole sufficiently well-marked in early work. [R. St. J. T.]

**HARIOLL.** [ASTROLOGY; DIVINATION.]

**HARLOTS.** Compare FORNICATION. The maintaining and harbouring of harlots was severely punished by the laws of the empire; a man who permitted his house to become a place of assignation for improper purposes was punished as an adulterer (*Pandect.* lib. xlviii. tit. 5, l. 8); if a man discovered his wife to be a procuress, it was a valid ground of divorce (*Codex Theod.* lib. iii. tit. 16, l. 1); careful provision was made against fathers or masters prostituting their children or slaves (*Codex Just.* lib. xi. tit. 40, l. 6). Socrates (*H. E.* v. 18) commends Theodosius the Great for demolishing the houses of ill fame in Rome. Theodosius the younger performed the same service for Constantinople, enacting that keepers of infamous houses should be publicly whipped and expelled the city, while their slaves were set at liberty (Theodos. *Novel.* 18, *de Lenonibus*). All these laws were confirmed by Justinian (*Novel.* 14) who also increased the severity of the punishments.

The church, as was natural, visited prostitution with the severest censure. Baptism was denied to harlots (*πόρναι*) and to those who maintained them (*πορνοβοσκούς*). (*Const. Apost.* viii. 32). The council of Elvira, A.D. 305, ordains that if a parent, or any Christian whatever, exercise the trade of a procurer, so far as they set to sale the person of another, or rather their own, they shall not be admitted to communion, no, not at their last hour; and the same penalty is denounced (c. 70) by the same council against a wife who prostitutes herself with her husband's connivance. [C.]

**HATFIELD, COUNCIL OF** (*Haethfeldthense*, or *Hedtfeldense, Concilium*), 17 Sept. A.D. 680, at Bishop's Hatfield in Hertfordshire, attended by all the bishops of Britain, Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, presiding, held for making a declaration against Eutychianism and Monothelism. Pope Agatho wished that Theodore should have attended his council of 125 bishops at Rome, March 27 of the same year, preliminarily to the 6th general council, and had sent John, precentor of his church of St. Peter, with the acts of the Lateran council under pope Martin I., A.D. 649, against Monothelism, to invite him thither. But Theodore, being either unable to leave for other reasons, or unwilling to come from knowing that Wilfrid, bishop of York, whose case had caused so much strife, was already there, collected this council instead, and despatched a copy of its synodical letter to Rome by John, where it was read with great satisfaction, and probably before the 6th council, which met Nov. 7, had commenced. Bede, who was about eight years old when this synod took place, gives three different extracts from its letter, in substance as follows:—

1. The bishops declare that “they have set forth the right and orthodox faith, as delivered by our Lord to His disciples, and handed down in the symbol of the holy fathers, and by all the sacred and universal synods, and by the whole

body of approved doctors of the Catholic church. Following whom, they also confess the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the Holy Trinity in Unity, consubstantial, and the Unity in Trinity, one God in three consubstantial Persons of equal honour and glory."

2. They "receive the five general councils," mentioning each by name.

3. "Likewise the synod of Rome, A.D. 649, under Martin I.," after which they say: "We receive and glorify our Lord Jesus, as they glorified Him, neither adding nor subtracting anything. We anathematise from the heart all they anathematized, and receive all they received: glorifying God the Father without beginning, and His only begotten Son, born of the Father before all worlds, and the Holy Spirit proceeding ineffably from the Father and the Son, according to the preaching of the above-named holy apostles and prophets and doctors, to all which we have subscribed, who with archbishop Theodore have expounded the Catholic faith." This assertion of procession from the Son as well as the Father, which is not found in any document received by the 6th council, may seem to indicate that the interpolated form of the creed had got into Britain by then; but it may be explained in another way. We are told in another place by Bede, that when Theodore was consecrated at Rome by Vitalian, it was expressly stipulated that abbot Adrian should accompany him into England: "Et, ut ei doctrinae cooperator existens, diligenter attenderet, nequid ille contrarium veritati fidei, Graecorum more, in ecclesiam cui praeset, introduceret" (*E.H.* iv. 1). Adrian remained in that capacity till his death, A.D. 710, and Theodore commenced work, "per omnia comitante et cooperante Adriano" (*ib.* c. 2). Now Adrian was a foreigner, as well as Theodore. He was a learned African, and Africa was the country that boasted of the clearest authorities as yet, for procession from the Son as well as the Father, in SS. Austin and Fulgentius. In conclusion, Bede tells us that John the precentor also took part in this synod, and was flocked to by the whole country for instruction in the Roman chant (*Mansi*, xi. 175-80; *Haddan and Stubbs*, iii. 141-51).

[E. S. Ff.]

## HAWKING. [HUNTING.]

**HEAD, COVERING OF THE.** Christian men in ancient days prayed with uncovered head, according to the apostolic injunction (1 Cor. xi. 4, 5). Chrysostom's comment on the passage shows clearly that this was the practice of his own time, as well as of the apostolic age. Tertullian (*Apol.* c. 30) says that Christian men prayed with bare head, as having no need to conceal a blush, insinuating that the heathen might well blush for some of the prayers which they uttered; and Cyprian may perhaps be alluding to the same custom, when he says (*De Lapsis*, c. 2) that the head of a Christian was uncontaminated by the head-covering of the heathen sacrificer. On the other hand, as both the apostolic precept and the custom of the East made it indecent for women to be seen with uncovered head, the women of the Oriental and African churches covered their heads not only in the congregation, but generally when they appeared in public. The breaking in upon this

custom led Tertullian to write his treatise *De Virginibus Velandis*, in which he contends that not only matrons, but maidens—who had been allowed a somewhat greater licence—should cover their heads effectually. He is especially severe (c. 17) on those who wore a simple band or fillet, which did not cover the top of the head; or laid a mere slip of linen on the top of the head, which did not reach even to the ears; he insists that the veil or head-covering should at any rate come down to meet the top of the dress: the whole space which would be covered by one hair if it were let down should be covered by the veil; and he holds up for admiration and imitation the Arab women, who so covered the head and face as to leave only one eye visible. Contrary to Roman practice, they preferred to see rather than to be seen. But most of all does he inveigh against those women who, even when psalms are said and the name of God named, continued uncovered, or with veils thrown back (*retractae perseverant*); who even in prayer fancied themselves covered with a strip of lace or fringe on the top of the head. But Tertullian's rigorous views were not those of the Church at large; as a general rule Christian women have worn the head-dresses of their country and station, and have covered their heads in the place of assembly. Men, to speak generally, have always prayed with uncovered head. Yet about the 8th century the *Ordo Romanus II.* (c. 8, p. 46) says that at the reading of the Gospel neither crown nor any other covering is kept on the head, an expression which seems to imply that during the saying of some portions of the office crowns or other coverings were retained.

2. With regard to the head-covering of clerics, the Gregorian *Sacramentary* (p. 38) lays down the rule, that no cleric stands in the church at any time with covered head, unless he have an infirmity. In spite, however, of the generality of the expression "ullo tempore," the meaning of the sentence is probably limited by the words which stand at the head of the rubric, "per totam Quadragesimam." That some kind of ceremonial head-dress was worn by bishops and priests from the 4th century onward seems certain. See INFULA, MITRE.

3. For the head-covering of monks, see CUCULLA, HOOD. [C.]

**HEAD OF ALL CHURCHES.** The emperor Justinian in a rescript (*Codex*, lib. 1, tit. 2, l. 24) gives to the patriarchal church of Constantinople the title of "Head of all the Churches"—"Constantinopolitana ecclesia omnium aliarum est caput." See PATRIARCH; POPE. [C.]

**HEARERS.** [AUDIENTES; CATECHUMENS; DOCTOR.]

**HEATHEN, THE,** in relation to the Church.

1. The duty of praying for the heathen was amply recognized by the early Christians. Thus in the Ignatian letter to the Ephesians (c. 10) we find the exhortation, "pray also without ceasing for the rest of mankind; for there is in them a hope of repentance, that they may attain to God." St. Augustine (*Epist.* 217, *ad Vitalem*, c. 2) declares that one, who did not believe that the seed of faith was sown in the heart by God, must needs mock at the words of the priest at the altar exhorting the people to pray for un-

believers, that God may turn them to the faith. And again (*De Dono Perser.* c. 22, § 63) he asks, "When was not prayer made in the Church for unbelievers and for its enemies, that they might believe?" Prosper (*De Vocat. Gentium*, i. 12) tells us that "the Church prays to God everywhere, not only for the holy and those already regenerate in Christ, but also for all unbelievers and enemies of the cross of Christ, for all worshippers of idols. . . . And what does she ask for them, but that leaving their errors they may be converted to God?" Such prayers occur in the liturgies; in that of St. Mark, for instance, we have (Renaudot, *Litt. Orient.* i. 153), "Turn back those who have gone astray, enlighten those who are in darkness." So the Clementine (*Constt. Apost.* viii. 15): "We beseech Thee on behalf of those who hate us and persecute us for Thy Name's sake, for those outside the Church and in error, that Thou mayest turn them to good and soften their hearts." In the West, the conversion of the heathen was an especial subject of prayer—as it is still in the English church—on Good Friday. Thus, in the Gelasian *Sacramentary* (i. 41; Migne's *Patrol.* lxxiv. 1105 B) the deacon, after bidding prayer for heretics, schismatics, and Jews, proceeds, "Let us pray also for the pagans, that Almighty God may take away the wickedness from their hearts, and that forsaking their idols they may turn to the true God and His only Son Jesus Christ." So in the Gregorian (p. 64), the prayers to be used on the Wednesday and Friday in Holy Week include one for the pagans.\*

2. While it is clear that heathen were carefully excluded from the Christian mysteries, it is equally clear that from the earliest times they were admitted to that part of Christian worship which consisted mainly of instruction. St. Paul (1 Cor. xiv. 23) evidently contemplates the possibility of heathen entering the place where preaching took place, whether it were in the shape of an utterance in "tongues," or prophesying. At the end of the 2nd century, all portions of divine worship were not open to all alike; for Tertullian (*De Præscript.* c. 41) reproaches certain heretics with their want of order and discipline, in that not only catechumens were admitted to the same privileges as the faithful, but even heathen, if they chanced to enter the place, had equal access; so did the heretics cast their mock-pearls before swine. In this it is implied that the orthodox were more careful of their treasure. [DISCIPLINA ARCANI.] The words of Origen (c. *Celsum*, iii. p. 142, Spencer), where, speaking of the care bestowed upon catechumens, he says that Christians had in view to prevent persons of evil life from coming to their common assembly (*ἐπὶ τὸν κοινὸν αὐτῶν σύλλογον*), seem to imply that some kind of scrutiny took place before men were admitted to any Christian assembly whatever; for he contrasts the Cynic practice of receiving all comers to their harangues with that of the Christians, and the word *σύλλογος* does not appear to be taken (like *συναξίς*) in the limited sense of "the Eucharistic mystery." However this may be, it is certain that at the end of the 4th century the African canons (*IV. Conc. Carth.* c. 84) specially provide

that the bishop is not to hinder any one, whether heathen, heretic, or Jew, from entering the church and hearing the word of God, as far as the dismissal of the catechumens (*usque ad missam catech.*); and a later Council (*Conc. Valletanum*, c. 1; A.D. 524) orders the Gospel to be read after the Epistle, before the bringing in of the gifts [ENTRANCE, § 2] or the dismissal of catechumens,<sup>b</sup> in order that not only catechumens and penitents, but all who belong to the contrary part (*e diverso sunt*) may hear the wholesome precepts of the Lord Jesus or the sermon of the bishop (*sacerdotis*); for many had been drawn to the faith by the preaching of the prelates (*pontificum*). The liberty which was granted to heathen does not seem in all cases to have been allowed to heretics (*Conc. Laod.* c. 5). The liturgies themselves contain evidence that heathen were permitted to be present during the introductory portion of the Eucharistic office. In the Clementine, for instance (*Constt. Apost.* viii. 12), the deacon proclaims before the offertory, "Let no one of the catechumens, no one of the hearers, no one of the unbelievers (*τῶν ἀπιστῶν*), no one of the heterodox [be present!]" from which it appears that heathens had not been excluded during the whole of the previous service.

3. It does not appear that the infant children of heathen parents, remaining in the heathen family, were in ancient times ever baptized. It would have been held a profanation of the sacrament to baptize those who were likely to be brought up as pagans. But baptism was not refused to children of heathen slaves brought to baptism by their owners, who could of course ensure them Christian nurture; and orphans and foundlings—the latter at any rate almost always the offspring of heathen—were frequently presented for baptism by the virgins or others who had taken charge of them (Augustine, *Epist.* 23, *ad Bonifac.*; compare Pseudo-Ambros. *de Vocat. Gent.* ii. 18). We may probably discover in this presentation of infants for baptism by persons other than their parents the origin of SPONSORS.

When the time came that Paganism was proscribed and Christianity enjoined, special care was taken that whole families should be brought within the pale of Christianity, and that the head of a household should not undergo baptism *pro formâ*, while the household remained heathen. "As for those who are not yet baptized," says the Code of Justinian (lib. i. tit. ii. *de Paganis*, l. 10), "let them, with wives and children and all their households, betake themselves to the holy churches; and let them provide that their infants (*parvuli*) be baptized without delay; but let the older children (*maiores*) before baptism be instructed in the Scriptures according to the canons. But if any, with a view to entering the public service, or to acquiring an office or a property, go through a form of baptism (*ingant baptizari*) and leave in their error their children, wives, and others who belong to and depend upon them; they are to be punished by confiscation of goods and other penalties, and excluded from the public service." The special case of the Samaritans is provided for by another law (*Novel.* 144, c. 2); adults were to pass through two years'

\* For the substance of this paragraph the writer is indebted to the Rev. W. E. Scudamore.

<sup>b</sup> This is given from the text of Bruns (*Concordia*, li. 25) some texts have "in missa" for "vel missam."

instruction and probation, while children not capable of instruction in the doctrines of the faith were to be admitted to baptism at once. Both these laws were included by Photius in his *Nomocanon* (tit. iv. c. 4, p. 907) [CODEX CANONUM, p. 400].

4. It does not appear that the Church in the earliest times had special organizations for the conversion of the heathen. It was of course the duty of the bishops and clergy of any church to endeavour to bring over to the faith those pagans who dwelt about them, and men were raised up from time to time who went forth into lands entirely heathen. The monastic orders, in particular, especially that of St. Columba, were constantly active in propagating the faith of Christ [MONASTICISM]. The lives of the great missionaries will be found in the DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY.

It is worth observing, that in the Coronation-office given by Ménard with the Gregorian *Sacramentary* (*Ad Reginam benedicendam*, pp. 263, 264) the conversion of heathen nations is regarded as especially the work of a queen. After putting on the ring, the consecrating bishop prays that the queen on the point of being crowned "may be enabled to call barbarous nations to the knowledge of the truth."

5. The social intercourse of heathen and Christian, while paganism was still a flourishing system, was rendered difficult by two circumstances; the prevalence of more or less idolatrous practices in the family life of heathens—libations, feasts on sacrificial meats, songs implying the recognition of pagan deities, and the like; and afterwards by the horror and hatred with which the heathen came to regard the votaries of what they thought an "ill-omened superstition," destructive of the greatness of the empire. [FAMILY; IDOLATRY.]

Christians who feasted with the heathen in a spot appropriated to heathen festivities, even if for fear of defilement they took with them their own food and ate no other, were sentenced to a two-years' penance among the Substrati [PENITENCE]. (*Conc. Ancyr.* c. 7; A.D. 314.)

6. Until Christianity had developed a literature of its own, those Christians who studied literature at all, beyond the limits of Scripture, of course studied pagan literature; but at the end of the 4th century we find the peremptory prohibition (*IV. Conc. Carth.* c. 16), "that the bishop should not read the books of the gentiles." It is not to be supposed however that this precept was literally and universally observed; the vast pagan learning (for instance) of Jerome and Augustine is matter of notoriety, and it is not to be supposed that it was wholly acquired before they entered the Christian ministry. Jerome, indeed (*Epist.* 10 [al. 70] *ad Magnum*), expressly defends Christian writers against the charge that they were ignorant of pagan writings, and points with pride to the long series of writers who had defended Christianity with weapons drawn from the pagan armoury. See further under PROHIBITED BOOKS. [C.]

HEAVEN. [See FIRMAMENT.] The veiled figure on the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus (Bottari, tav. xv. and elsewhere a female head, *id.* tav. xxxiii.) is always held to represent the firmament of heaven. Considering the word

as denoting the future spiritual state of happiness in the presence of God, we can hardly pass over the symbolic representations of the Lord in glory which seem from the 6th century to have been the accustomed decorations of Byzantine churches. The choir and apse of a church from that date were constantly made to symbolize heaven and earth: the churches triumphant and militant, the new heaven of glory, and the renewed earth of the soul regenerated in baptism. The churches of SS. Cosmas and Damianus, St. Venantius, and especially of St. Prassede, at Rome, may be taken as types of the Byzantine treatment of this great subject. In the former Our Lord stands on the firmament of clouds, a figure of indescribable grandeur. He is not only come to His sanctuary, and present with a congregation of the church, but he is also and at the same moment in heaven, apart from time, with the church triumphant. Accordingly, here, and in St. Prassede, the apse, and the upper part of the arch of triumph in advance of it, represent Him in glory with His own; saints and martyrs, in white robes on gold ground, casting their crowns before Him. But at their feet flows the mystic Jordan, the river of baptism into His death, and also the river of death, the Lethe of life and death. It separates the glorified church in heaven from the sheep of the fold below, who are yet militant on earth.

Parallel representations of the adoration of saints and martyrs in glory are, of course, universal from the 6th century; the great processions at St. Apollinare Nuova, in Ravenna, will be remembered as belonging to the time of Justinian. The Last Judgment of Torcello has its side of accepted souls (see s. v.). [R. St. J. T.]

HEBDOMADARIUS. The word signifies a weekly officer, and was applied in monasteries to those monks who served, a week in rotation, the office of cook or reader during refectory. In Egypt and the Thebaid it was customary in the 5th century for all the monks in turn to act as cooks, and Cassian traces the custom to the monasteries in the East (*Cass. Instit.* iv. 19, cf. Hieron. *Reg. Pachom.* Prol. *Ep.* 22 *ad Eustoch.* c. 35). But see *Cass. Instit.* iv. 22. Similarly Benedict ordered that none should be excused from this duty except on the score of health or urgent occupations, intending thus to promote a fellowship of brotherly feeling; but with his usual consideration, he allowed those who might be unskilful in this sort of work to have assistants (*Bened. Reg.* c. 35).

By the rule called of Magister each "decad" or "decuria" (ten monks) under its two deans (*praepositi*), was to hold this office for five weeks together, two of the number in turn with one dean being told off each week for the kitchen, and the rest under the other dean working in the field (*Reg. Mag.* c. 17). Even abbats, though not unfrequently of illustrious birth, were not always exempt. By the rule of Ferreolus, written in the south of France during the 6th century, the abbat was to be cook on three great festivals in the year, at Christmas, at Pentecost, and on the Founder's Day (*Reg. Ferreol.* c. 38). It is recorded of Benedictus Aniansis the compiler of the *Concordia Regularum*, that he would be intent on literary work while at work in the kitchen (*Vita Bened. Anian.*



c. 14). By the rule of Cassianus, bishop of Arles in the 6th century, abbats and priors were excused altogether.

In some monasteries it was part of the duty of the hebdomadarius to prepare the dinner-table, and to act as waiters. Benedict indeed, distinguishes the "Septimanarii coquinas" from the "servitores" (Bened. Reg. c. 35, 38); but the rule of Isidore, bishop of Seville, in the 7th century, combines the offices (Ibid. Reg. c. 11); and in the rule of "Magister" the cooks or their assistants are ordered not only to wait at table, but to carry water, chop wood, clean shoes, wash towels, dust the mats in the oratory, and perform various other menial tasks (Reg. Mag. c. 12). In the same rule it is provided, that if the weekly officers are negligent in having the table ready for the refectory, the abbat himself is to put them to the blush by doing it himself publicly (Ibid. c. 23). In the Clapac and Claretian monasteries the hebdomadarius were waiters as well as cooks (Martens. Reg. Bened. Comm. ad loc. cit.).

The week of the hebdomadarius commenced on Sunday by a solemn form of admission in the oratory after "matins" (Reg. Bened. c. 35), or after "prime" (Reg. Mag. c. 19); the monks going out of office, as well as those just coming in, entreating the prayers of their brethren, and the blessing of their abbat. On the Saturday those, whose term of office was over, were to deliver up to the "cellarer" for the use of their successors all the utensils &c. under their charge in perfect order (Reg. Bened. v. a. Reg. Mag. v. a.). It was an old custom, symbolic of humility and brotherly love, for the hebdomadarius, closing and commencing their week, to wash the feet of their brethren, during which operation silence was to be kept, or psalms chanted (Cassian. Instit. iv. 12. Bened. Reg. v. a.). By the rule of "Magister," they were to set about preparing the refectory three hours before the hour fixed for it; immediately after "none" if, as was usual, the dinner was at midday, immediately after "vespers" for a dinner at three in the afternoon (Reg. Mag. v. a.). The refectory was to be served on the stroke (Reg. Bened. v. a.); for any unpunctuality they were to be mulcted of the ration of bread or a part of it for certain days (Reg. Mag. c. 19); the Concordia Regularum quotes an anonymous rule (not the "Regula Cujusdam," usually ascribed to Columbanus) sentencing hebdomadarius guilty of any trivial irregularity to twenty-five strokes of the open hand (Reg. Cujusdam. c. 12), just as Cassian cautions them against losing even a pea (Cass. Instit. iv. 20). Benedict wisely arranged that the cooks should have some refreshment, a piece of bread and a small cup of beer, (panem ac singulos bibere) an hour before the refectory, on ordinary days; on festivals they were to wait till after the midday mass (Bened. Reg. v. a.). Various reasons are supposed by commentators for the latter part of this injunction (Martens. Reg. Comm. ad loc.).

The "lector hebdomadarius" or reader aloud during refectory held office, like the "coqui," for a week; but Benedict ordered that only those brethren should be readers, whose reading was likely to edify (Bened. Reg. c. 38). On the Sunday commencing his week of office the reader was thrice to repeat in the oratory the

"Domine, spero in te," and before beginning to read was to ask the prayers of his brethren, lest he should be elated with pride (Ibid.). Not a word was to be spoken during the lecture even by way of asking a question on what was being read; unless the prior (or abbat), should think right to interpose an explanation or exhortation; the monks were to help another to anything wanted without a word (Ibid.). The reader was to have a little bread and wine (for as "murtum" is to be understood, according to Martens, and not as wine and water), just before reading, for fear of faintness or exhaustion; so was to dine with the other hebdomadarius after the public meal (Ibid.). The passages for reading were chosen by the abbat either from the Holy Scriptures or from lives of saints. Cassian derives the custom of reading aloud at refectory from Cappadocia (Cass. Instit. iv. 19). [See also, Altaner. Annot. ix. 10]. [I. G. 8.]

**HECANTONTARCHAE.** The council in Trullo (a. 61) condemns to six years' excommunication those who resort to "the so-called hecantontarchae, or such-like persons" (viri *hypocritae imitantesque & variis modis*) with the view of learning from them what they may choose to reveal. The title of "hecantontarchae," is said by Balsamon (quoted by Van Espen, in. 415) to be equivalent to "Primicerius;" and to have been conferred on certain old men who gave themselves out to be possessed of supernatural knowledge and deceived the simple. Gothofred (quoted by Bingham, Antiq. XVI. v. 6) thinks that these hecantontarchae are to be identified with the "centenarii" of the Theodosian Code (lib. xvi. tit. 10, l. 20), who were officers of certain corporations or companies for managing idolatrous pumps and ceremonies, and frequently claimed the power of divination. [DIVINATION; SOOTHSAIERS.] [C.]

**HEFELDENSE CONCILIUM.** [HATFIELD, COUNCIL OF.]

**HEDISTUS,** martyr at Ravenna (sec. iv.); commemorated Oct. 12 (Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**HEGESIPPUS,** historian, "Vicius Apostolorum temporum" (circa 180 A.D.); commemorated April 7 (Mart. Hieron., Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**HEGIRA** or **HJRAH** (هجرة). The

era commonly used by the Mohammedans, anterior to that of the Hijrah, or flight of Mohammed from Mecca to Medina. The epoch is the first day of the first month, Moharrem, of the year in which this took place (not the day itself, which was about sixty-seven days later). The epoch fell, according to the best Arabian authors and astronomers, cited in Lelzer (Handbuch, ii. 483), on Thursday, July 15, A.D. 622; but according to civil usage and the phase of the moon, a day later. This discrepancy has to be noted. We shall take as the epoch July 16, A.D. 622, or 5335 Julian Period, with interval days from Christian era [ERA], 277,014.

In Mohammedan authors the year is a lunar year of 30 and 29 days alternately, having 354 days. In intercalary years, of which there are 11 in every 30 years, viz., those marked \* in

Table I, the last month has one more day. In a complete cycle of 30 years there are 10,631 days.

To convert a Mohammedan Date into Old Style.—Find the number of cycles by dividing the Mohammedan year-date less 1 by 30. Let Q be the quotient, R the remainder. Multiply Q by 10,631, to which add the number of days corresponding to R in Table I and the number of days corresponding to the months and days in Table II, and also 227,014, the interval days from the Christian era. The number of days divided by 1461 will give the number of quadriennia A.D., and table in ERA § 5, p. 623, will suffice to find the residual year and day of year.

Add 1 for the current year.

To convert an O. S. Date into Mohammedan.—Convert into days from Christian era, by same rule as in ERA, § 5. Subtract 227,014; divide remainder by 10,631. Let quotient be Q and remainder R. To  $30 \times Q$  add the number of years corresponding to the number of days in Table I next less than R, and with those over find the months and days in Table II.

Add 1 for the current year.

TABLE I.

Years.	Days.	Years.	Days.	Years.	Days.
1	354	11	3899	21*	7442
2*	709	12	4252	22	7796
3	1063	13*	4607	23	8150
4	1417	14	4961	24*	8505
5*	1772	15	5315	25	8859
6	2126	16*	5670	26	9214
7*	2481	17	6024	27	9569
8	2835	18*	6379	28	9923
9	3189	19	6733	29*	10277
10*	3544	20	7087	30	10631

TABLE II.

Months.	Days.	Months.	Days.	Months.	Days.
1	30	5	148	9	306
2	59	6	177	10	335
3	89	7	207	11	364
4	118	8	236	12	394 or 395

Observe that two Mohammedan years may begin in the same Julian year. This happens every 33 or 34 years.

It may be worth noting that the Persian era of Yazdegerd commenced June 16, 632, ten years later.

[L. H.]

**HEGUMENOS.** (ἡγούμενος) The Hegumenos of a monastery in the Greek church corresponds to the Latin ABBAT (see that word). He was also termed archimandrite. But, according to Helyot (*Hist. des Ordres Monast. Diss. Prelim.* c. 11), the term archimandrite passed in time from the superior of a monastery to the superior-general, originally called the exarch, whose office it was to "visit" all the monasteries in a province. Any monastery so desirous at its foundation was exempted from the bishop's jurisdiction and placed under the sole authority of the patriarch; and the superior general of these monasteries was a grand archimandrite (cf. Thomass. *Diss. Eccles.* I. iii. 23). The words Hegumens (ἡγούμενος), Hegumenon (ἡγούμενον), and Hegumensia (ἡγουμενία) (all from the classical term for the headship of a confederacy) signify abbot, monastery

(or abbat's rooms), and office of abbat. (Sult. *Thec. Eccles.* s. v.) [I. G. S.]

#### HELLETON. [ELETON.]

**HELENA.** (1) Mother of Constantine the Great (circa 328 A.D.); commemorated Aug. 18 (*Mart. Usuardi*); Maskarram 18 = Sept. 15 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). See also **CONSTANTINE**.

(2) Virgin-saint of Auxerre: "Natalis" May 22 (*Mart. Usuardi*); translation and deposition May 22 (*Mart. Adonis*, in Appendix).

[W. F. G.]

**HELIAS**, presbyter and martyr at Cordova with Isidorus and Paulus, monks; commemorated April 17 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

[W. F. G.]

**HELMENAS**, or **HELYMAS**, presbyter of Babylon, and martyr at Cordula, under Decius, with Chrysotellus and Parmenius, presbyters, and the deacons Lucas and Mucius (or Lucius and Mucas); commemorated April 22 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi).

[W. F. G.]

**HELIODORUS**, martyr in Africa with Venustus and seventy-five others; commemorated May 6 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

[W. F. G.]

#### HELIOLATRAE. [FAITHFUL.]

**HELISAEUS**, **HELIZAEUS**, or **ELISHA**, the prophet; commemorated June 14 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi). See also **ELISHA**.

[W. F. G.]

**HELL.** A frequent subject of mediaeval Christian art in the sense of the appointed place or state of future punishment; but the writer is not aware of any such representation of unquestionable date and authenticity within the first eight centuries, unless the judgment-mosaic of Torcello may be considered an exception, which is very doubtful. See **LAST JUDGMENT**. The Book of Kells, and Saxon and Irish MSS. contain numerous dragons, and even grotesque devils; but they certainly seem to have more to do with the prevailing taste for lacertine or serpentine ornament, and general melancholy or ferocity of mind, than with any doctrinal idea of evil spirits. The regular Inferno begins with the early Florentine revival, in the baptistry of St. Giovanni. [R. St. J. T.]

**HELLADIUS**, *Isopodopus*; commemorated May 28 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

[W. F. G.]

**HELPIDIUS**, bishop and confessor at Lyons; commemorated Sept. 2 (*Mart. Adonis*, Usuardi).

[W. F. G.]

**HEMIPHORION** (ἡμιφόριον), seemingly some kind of upper garment, worn by men and women. Epiphanius (*Haeretic* 69, § 3) describes Arius as wearing a colobion (see that word) and a hemiphorion; the latter probably over the former, which was a close tunic. And Palladius (*Hist. Lausiac*, p. 148) says that the younger Melania gave her silken hemiphoria to make "καλύμματα τοῖς θυσιαστηρίοις," hangings for the sanctuary, or altar-cloths, whichever it may be.

Heychius and Suidas write the word ἡμιφόριον, connecting it with φόρος (a shawl or wrapper), and translating it "dimidium vestis," "dimidiata vestis." It was probably therefore one of the many forms of the pallium, smaller than that commonly worn. (Suicer's *Thesaurus*, s. v.)

[C.]

**HEOTHINA** (ῥὰ ἱεθὶνᾶ). The *Heothinon* is an anthem sung in the Greek office of lauds (ῥὰ ἑσπέρᾶς), and occurs after the *almeis*: (i.e. on ordinary days, Ps. cxviii., cxlix., cl., on Sundays and important festivals, a short equivalent); and certain versicles called *Stichoi* and short anthems called *Stichera* which follow them, and is placed between the clauses of the doxology, "glory, &c." (δόξα), and "both now, &c." (καὶ νῦν). The *Heothinon* varies with the musical tone of the week; there being one to each tone; and they are found in the *Paracletica*, or book containing the various antiphons or *troparia*, arranged according to the different tones. The form of the *Heothinon* is that of any other Greek antiphon.

(2.) ῥὰ ἱεθὶνᾶ (*stereydhina*). These are Gospels relating to the Resurrection, one of which is read on Sundays in the Greek office of lauds. They are eleven in number. [H. J. H.]

**HERACLEAS**. (1) Patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 246; commemorated July 14 (*Mart. Usuardi*); Takas 8=Dec. 4 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(2) Martyr in Thracia with Euticus and Plautus; commemorated Sept. 29 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**HERACLIDES**, martyr at Alexandria with Heros, Plutarchus, Potamiana, Serenus, and three others; commemorated June 28 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**HERACLIUS**. (1) Bishop and confessor at Sens (circa 529 A.D.); commemorated June 8 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Saint, of Nyon; commemorated with Paulus Aquilinus, and two others, May 17 (*Ib.*).

(3) Martyr at Tuder in Tuscany, with Felicitinus and Paulinus; commemorated May 26 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**HERASTUS**, or **ERASTUS**, bishop of Philippi, and martyr; commemorated July 26 (*Mart. Usuardi, Ado de Festiv. SS. Apostolorum*). [W. F. G.]

**HERCULANUS**. (1) Saint, of Rome: "Natalis" Sept. 5 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Soldier, saint at Lyons; commemorated Sept. 25 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) Bishop, martyr at Perugia; commemorated Nov. 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**HERESY**, considered as a *delictum*, or offence against the law of the church.

The Greek word *aisiōsis* imports (1) a choosing (Lev. xxiii. 18, LXX.; 1 Maccab. viii. 30); (2) that which is chosen, especially an opinion which one chooses to hold, as *aisiōsis* ἀνωθείας (2 Pet. ii. 1); used by ecclesiastical writers for opinions deviating from the true Christian faith; (3) a body of men holding a particular opinion, as (e.g.) those holding particular opinions in philosophy (Diog. Laert. i. 13 etc.). In the New Testament it is used of the Sadducees (Acts v. 17), the Pharisees (*Ib.* xv. 5, and perhaps xvi. 5), of the Christian community (*Ib.* xxiv. 5, 14;

xxviii. 22). So Constantine (Emseh. H. E. x. 3, §§ 31, 23) speaks of the church as ἡ αἰσιωσις ἡ καθολική, ἡ ἀγιογράφη αἰσιωσις. We are concerned with the term mainly in the second of these significations.

The word was used by the early fathers with a good deal of latitude to designate systems which adopted, or professed to adopt, any Christian element whatever (Burton, *Bampton Lect.* p. 12); so the Trullan council (c. 95) applies the word "heretic" alike to those who were, and to those who were not, reckoned Christians; but it is generally applied to those who, holding the leading truths of the faith, deviate in some point or points.

To define heresy is, as St. Augustine says (*De Haeret. Praef.*), "altogether impossible, or at any rate most difficult;" and when first asked to write a book on heresy himself, he illustrated the difficulty by pointing out (*Ep.* 232, ad Quodvult.) that Philastrius bishop of Brescia, in his book of heresies, enumerated 28 which had originated among the Jews before Christ, and 128 afterwards, but that Epiphanius of Cyprus discovered only 80 altogether. But he is careful to note (*Epist.* 43) that, whatever be the definition, it is not the mere falseness of an opinion, but the spirit in which it is held, that constitutes heresy; they who do not defend a wrong opinion in an obstinate temper (pertinax animositate), especially they who are in error mainly by the accident of birth, are not to be reckoned heretics. With which accords the common definition, that heresy is "pertinax defensio dogmatis ecclesiae universalis iudicio condemnati." See *Decretum Grat.* Can. xxi. qu. iii. c. 29 ff. The law of the emperor Arcadius, dated A.D. 395, and given in the *Codex Theod.* (XVI. v. 28), is the first legislative definition. "Qui vel levi argumento a iudicio catholicae religionis et tramite detecti fuerint deviare," which is modified by another expression of the same Arcadius (*Code*, l. 13, *De Paganis*), "qui a Catholicis Religionis dogmatibus deviare contendunt," where the word "contendant" is held to refer to the same pertinacity in maintaining an opinion on which Augustine dwells (Van Espen, pt. iii. tit. iv. c. 22 ff.). Van Espen considers this, if not an absolutely accurate description, to be that which has governed the subsequent practice of the church. He maintains its soundness as a definition, because on the one hand it allows no deviation whatever from the Catholic creed, and on the other tolerates a reasonable latitude of speculation by taking no cognizance of constructive heresy. To constitute the canonical offence the heresy must consist—i., in a departure, not from the implied belief of Christianity, but from that which the church through her creeds and canons has declared to be a matter of faith; ii., the error must be persistent and wilful, and, as Augustine points out (*De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 51), after admonition; iii., it must not only be suspected but detected and adjudicated upon. (Van Espen, *Jus Eccl.* III. iv. 2; *Field, Of the Church*, in cc. 3, 4).

2. i. The cognizance of heresy was vested in the bishops separately, as well as collectively. It belongs exclusively to the spiritual office, says Ambrose (*Ep.* 21), addressing the emperor Valentinian, to decide on matters of doctrine.

\* The Greek form of doxology after the Psalms does not contain the clause "Sicut erat in principio" (Goss, *Anal.* notes in *Land. OE.*).

The episcopate was held to be one, where the faith was concerned, and each bishop was charged with maintaining it, although for practical convenience his government extended only over a single diocese. This jurisdiction granted to the bishop in matters of faith appears from the power possessed by him in the ante-Nicene church of varying the expressions of the creed in use in his diocese, in order to meet prevailing heresies; provided, of course, that the fundamental unity of the faith was unimpaired; instances of such variations are given in Bingham, *Antiq.* II. vi. 3. The reference to the belief of individual bishops as a standard of doctrine is further evidence in the same direction. Thus Theodosius in a rescript quoted in Sozomen (*H. E.* vii. 4) exhorts his subjects to keep the faith delivered by St. Peter, and by Damasus of Rome, and Peter of Alexandria. Other references of the kind are collected in Gothofred's commentary on *Codex Theod.* xvi. 1, *de fide Catholica*. It was an exercise of this authority by Gelasius bishop of Rome, A.D. 492-6, condemning in a decretal epistle the writings of Faustus the Semi-pelagian archbishop of Riez, which gave rise to the first Roman catalogue of forbidden books. After the empire became Christian, attempts were made by some of the emperors to arrogate to themselves this spiritual jurisdiction of the bishops. The first instance of the kind, unless the laws of Theodosius on heretics are to be regarded as such, is that of the usurper Basiliscus, emperor of the East, 475-7, who issued an encyclic letter condemning the council of Chalcedon, and laying down definitions of faith. An example followed with more success by Justinian, whose edicts on doctrine as well as discipline obtained acceptance by being promulgated through the patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops. The ecclesiastical legislation of Charlemagne also trenched upon the same prerogative; discussion was permitted in the synods summoned by him, but the emperor reserved the decision to himself, and issued the decrees in his own name. But no ecclesiastical authority superseded that of the bishops till A.D. 1204, when two Cistercian abbots were sent by Innocent III. to the south of France to investigate the Albigensian heresy; and in 1231 Gregory IX. issued a commission to the Dominicans to constitute a special court of heresy; this was the beginning of the Inquisition. (Van Espen, *Jus. Eccl.* I. xxii. 3.)

ii. The general power of each bishop to defend the faith was restricted, in dealing with an individual heretic, to his own diocese. If the accused was one of the clergy, the bishop was required in the African church to take neighbouring bishops to sit with him (1 *Conc. Carthag.* c. 11; 2 *Conc. Carthag.* c. 10); but this rule was not confined to accusations of heresy. With the bishop in some instances sat the presbyters—whether or not this privilege was universally conceded to them. The synod of Antioch, A.D. 264, which condemned Paul of Samosata, contained presbyters (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 28). So the first condemnation of Arius was not pronounced by Alexander bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 319, till he had summoned the presbytery and some other bishops to hear the charge (Epiphan. *Hær.* 69, c. 3). And the accusation against Pelagius was first heard before John, bishop of Jerusalem, and a

synod of his presbyters, A.D. 415. If objection was made to the decision of the bishop, an appeal lay to a larger council, either of the province, or finally of the whole church; instances of which are too notorious to need citing. A bishop charged with heresy could be tried only by a synod of bishops. The officer charged with the preliminary investigation is designated by one of the laws of Justinian (*Novel.* 137, c. 5). "If any clergyman is accused in point of faith, if he is a bishop he shall be examined before his metropolitan, but if he is a metropolitan then before the patriarch."

3. The penalties attached to heresy were both ecclesiastical and civil.

i. By ecclesiastical law an obstinate heretic was excommunicated, and if he continued contumacious, his exclusion from church-membership was made more rigorous. The 6th canon of the council of Laodicea forbids those who continue in their heresy to enter the house of God. But this exclusion could not have been universal, for the 4th council of Carthage, A.D. 398 (c. 84) distinctly prohibits the bishop from preventing Gentiles, Jews, or heretics from being present in church during the Missa Catechumenorum; and the council of Valentia, A.D. 524 (c. i.) orders the gospel to be read before the oblations, so that heretics, among others, may have an opportunity of hearing [cf. HEATHEN]. Another stigma affixed to heretics was the rejection of their evidence in any ecclesiastical court against a Catholic. The Apostolical Canons (c. 74) say expressly that the evidence of a heretic shall not be received against a bishop. The 129th canon of the African code also mentions heretics among other infamous persons whose testimony was inadmissible (4 *Conc. Carthag.* c. 96). The so-called 6th canon of the council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, guards this disability from abuse by confining it exclusively to ecclesiastical causes; if a heretic had a civil cause of complaint against a bishop, the council allowed him his remedy; but the Justinian code deprived him even of this. Another class of penal enactments was directed to the protection of the orthodox from the infection of heresy. One of the Apostolical Canons (c. 45) forbids, under pain of suspension, any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, to pray with heretics, or permit them to officiate; another (c. 63) inhibits either clergy or laity from worshipping in a synagogue of heretics. The council of Laodicea (c. 9) would not permit Catholics to frequent the cemeteries or celebrations of so-called martyrdoms of heretics, nor (c. 33) tolerate any devotions with them. The 4th council of Carthage, A.D. 398 (c. 71), pronounces the assemblies of heretics to be not churches but conventicles; and (c. 72) prohibits both praying and singing psalms with them. The Spanish council of Lerida, A.D. 523 (c. 13), rejects the oblation of any who has presented his children for baptism by a heretic; this must mean, not in a case of necessity, where it would be admitted, but deliberately. (Bingham, *Antiq.* XVI. i. 4). Social intercourse with heretics was also prohibited. "A clergyman must avoid both the entertainments and the society of heretics" (4 *Conc. Carthag.* c. 70; 1 *Conc. Tolet.* c. 15; 1 *Conc. Turon.* c. 8; *Conc. Venet.* c. 3). Augustine relates (*Confess.* iii. 11) that while he was a Manichaean his mother would not sit at the



same table with him. The council of Laodicea (c. 32) forbids Christians to receive the EULOGIAE of heretics, and also (cc. 10, 31) to intermarry with them. This last prohibition appears to have been universally enforced (*Conc. Elber.* c. 16; *Conc. in Trull.* c. 72). The laws of the church are not so strict as the civil edicts afterwards became in prohibiting the study of heretical books; there is one canon (4 *Conc. Carthag.* c. 16) which forbids a bishop to read heathen authors under any circumstances, and heretical ones unless time or necessity require.

ii. The civil proceedings against heretics began with some edicts of Constantine against the Donatists, A.D. 316; but a much more extensive series of laws was enacted by Theodosius the Great with a view to put an end to the divisions of the church arising from the controversies of the 4th century, and to enforce uniformity of belief by legal penalties. The first of these was passed immediately after the general council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. and between that period and A.D. 394, fifteen other such edicts were published. A further law was enacted by Honorius, A.D. 408, and others in the East by Arcadius and the younger Theodosius, and others again by Justinian, A.D. 529. The laws are chiefly contained in book xvi. tit. v. *de Haereticis* of the Theodosian Code, although a few are to be found under other titles. Here it will be sufficient to give a bare abstract of the most severe of them. Heretics were deprived of all offices of profit or dignity in the state; they could neither receive nor bequeath property; no civil contract with them was binding; they were fined, banished, subjected to corporal punishments, and even sentenced to death. Other laws were designed to prevent the propagation of heresy. No heretical assemblies might be held, nor conventicles built, nor clergy ordained; their books were to be burnt and their children disinherited. These edicts were not directed against all heretics indiscriminately, but against various sects which were held to be most dangerous to faith or morals. From the account of Sozomen (*H. E.* vii. 12), they were intended to strike terror rather than to be executed; but heretics were always exposed to them, and, in one conspicuous instance, the most severe penalty, that of death, was inflicted on Priscillian and some of his adherents; the first example in the church of any one being put to death for his opinions.

4. i. The admission of heretics to the church is closely involved with the controversies of the 4th century on the validity of heretical baptism [BAPTISM, ITERATION OF, p. 172]. Their bearing on the reconciliation of heretics, and the further question of the relation in which the practice of anointing converts from heresy stands towards the rite of confirmation, are discussed in Morinus *de Poenit.* ix. 7-11). This article is concerned only with any rites or terms of admission which indicate the course of canonical discipline. The council of Eliberis (c. 22) appoints ten years' penance to those who had deserted the faith and afterwards returned, with a proviso that if they had lapsed in infancy they should be received back without delay. Later councils (*Conc. Agath.* c. 60; *Conc. Epaon.* c. 29) deprecating this severity, reduce the term to two years, on condition that the penitent fasts three days a week and comes frequently to

church. Longer penalties were exacted from those who had submitted to re-baptism among the heretics, the earlier practice in this too being more severe; the 1st council of Valence, A.D. 374 (c. 3), denies communion to them till the hour of death, that of Lerida, A.D. 523 (c. 9), only for nine years. In this, however, as in other points of discipline, much was left to the discretion of the bishop (*Conc. Agath.* c. 60; 4 *Conc. Arel.* c. 8). In general the practice of the church, which is involved in some obscurity, appears to have been to admit converts without any actual penance, submitting them however to some outward form or ceremonial of penitence (*sub imagine poenitentiae*, Innocent: *Ep.* 18, *ad Alexan.* c. 3). A letter of Gregory the Great (*Epist.* ix. 61, *ad Quirin.*) directs that those who had once been baptized in the name of the Trinity should be received by imposition of hands, which was the Western use, or by unction, which was that of the East, or by a profession of faith.

Of these forms of reconciliation that by imposition of hands was the earliest. It is spoken of by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 2) as a practice which was ancient in the time of Stephen, bishop of Rome, A.D. 253-7; Cyprian also calls it the ancient custom in his time (*Ep.* 71 *ad Quintum*). It was prevailing in the time of Innocent (*Epp.* 2 *ad Victor.* c. 8, 22 *ad Epis. Macedon.* cc. 4, 5); it was known to Augustine (*de Bapt.* c. *Donat.* iii. 11, *ibid.* vi. 15), and was the subject of the decrees of various councils (1 *Conc. Arelat.* c. 8; *Conc. Nicaen.* c. 8). By a canonical epistle of Siricius, bishop of Rome, A.D. 384-98, heretics were to be admitted by imposition, together with invocation of the Spirit. But the statement of Gregory that imposition of hands was the Western custom, and unction the Eastern, is only partially correct. Unction was in use in both the Spanish and the Gallic churches (1 *Conc. Arausic.* c. 1; *Conc. Epaon.* c. 16), and it is likely that when Gregory wrote he was referring only to the principal church of the West, that of Rome (*Martene de Rit.* iii. 6).

ii. In the 4th century, converts from some heresies were received into the church by unction, with formal renunciation of their errors (*Conc. Laod.* c. 7; 1 *Conc. Constant.* c. 7). The Trullan council, following the 1st of Constantinople, describes the manner of admission; "We receive Arians, Macedonians, Novatians, Quartodecimans, and Apollinarians, when they give in written forms of belief (ἀποδέχονται; for instances of this practice see Soc. *H. E.* iv. 12, Soz. *H. E.* iii. 22), and anathematize every heresy not according with the mind of the holy and apostolic church; sealing (that is, anointing) them with the holy ointment on the forehead, and eyes, and nostrils, and mouth, and ears; and as we seal them, we say, 'The seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost.'" The Arabic version of the Nicene canons (c. 31, Hardouin, vol. i. p. 468) has another form of admission. "If any one is converted to the orthodox faith he must be received into the church by the hands of the bishop or presbyter, who ought to instruct him to anathematize all who oppose the orthodox faith and contradict the apostolic church. He ought also to anathematize Arius and his heresy, and openly and sincerely profess the faith. After this the bishop or priest whose office it is, shall receive him and anoint him with the unction of Chrism, and sign

him three times while anointing him, and praying over him in the prayer of Dionysius the Areopagite, and prayer shall be made earnestly to God for him, and then he may be received." With regard to other heresies, the canon of the Trullan council already cited proceeds to make the following provisions: "About the Paulianists the Catholic church defines, that they are to be baptized anew; but as to the Eunomians, who baptize with one immersion, the Montanists . . . and the Sabellians . . . and all the other heresies . . .; all who will come over to orthodoxy from these we receive as converts from paganism (ὡς ἑεταῖροι); and the first day we make them Christians, the second catechumens, and on the third day we exorcise them, after breathing thrice on the forehead and ears [ἐκκονίζοντες]; and so we go on to catechize them, and cause them to tarry in the church and listen to the Scriptures; and then we baptize them. And the Manichaeans, and the Valentinians, and the Marcionites, and those who come from such-like heresies must give in *libelli*, and anathematize their own heresy, and Nestorius and Eutyches, and Dioscorus and Severus, and the other ringleaders of such-like heresies, and those who hold their own and the other aforesaid heresies; and so they may be admitted to Holy Communion."

iii. In the case of those who came into the orthodox faith from the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches, the church appears to have been satisfied with a solemn profession of faith by the convert. This is frequently insisted upon by Leo (Epp. I. 6; vi. 2; xiv. xvii. 4). The 2nd council of Seville, A.D. 618, received in this form at its twelfth sitting an heretical Syrian bishop. The bishop made a solemn statement of his errors and of the truth, and confirmed it with an oath. In later periods an oath became an indispensable part of the ceremonial. A Roman synod under Leo III., A.D. 799, required a certain bishop Felix not only to abjure his heresy and write out a form of faith, but also to swear over the holy mysteries to observe his orthodox profession; he was then required to place it over the body of St. Peter, and swear he would never dare repeat his heretical opinions. Cotelierus (Apost. Const., v. 13, note) prints part of an ancient eastern ritual containing a form of renunciation of the Armenian heresy, which concludes with the following imprecation: "If I make this profession with hypocrisy, or return to my heresy openly or secretly, may all calamities overtake me, the dread of Cain and the leprosy of Gehazi, and in the world to come may I be anathema and anathema, and may my soul be sent to Satan and his devils."

iv. The form of admission in use in the East in the 13th century is given by Morinus (de Poenit. li. 2) from a very ancient Greek Euchologion. Those to be received must fast ten or fifteen days, and prostrate themselves in prayer morning and evening like the Catechumens; they may then be thought worthy of the orthodox faith and be initiated. The priest is to bring each into the baptistery, and say to him, "Come N. and his doctrine, and those who agree with him, for I renounce him and every heretical doctrine, and I believe in the holy and consubstantial Trinity." And the priest shall say to the convert three times, "Dost thou believe in the holy and con-

substantial Trinity?" and the convert shall reply "I do." He shall then kneel, and the priest shall lay his hand upon his head and pray as follows . . . After which he shall anoint him with oil with the same form as if he were a neophyte, and say this prayer . . . The convert may then communicate, and he must be instructed not to eat flesh seven days, nor wash his face, but, as the baptized do, persevere for seven days, and on the 8th day wash and be dismissed.

The following example of a prayer used for those who were reconciled, after having been rebaptized by heretics, is from a ritual found at Toulouse, at Rheims, and in Sicily: "God who restorest man, made after thine own image, to that which Thou hast created, look down in mercy upon this Thy servant, and whatever ignorance and heretical perverseness has crept into him, do Thou in Thy pity and goodness pardon, so that any wickedness which he has committed through the fraud of the devil or the iniquity of the Arian falsehood, may not be laid to his charge, but that having been transformed by Thy mercy, and having received the communion of Thy truth at the sacred altars, he may be restored a member of the catholic church."

Heresy as a canonical offence is dealt with by Van Espen (Jus Eccl. Pars iii. tit. iv. c. 2). The admission of heretics to the church is a very complicated subject, owing to the endless varieties of heretical sects. See Martene (de Rit. lib. 6), Morinus (de Poenit. li. 7-11), Suicer (s. v. *aliprands*), and Bingham (Antiq. XIX. ii.). A list of the early and mediaeval writers on heresy is given in the preface to Burton's Bampton lectures on *Heresies of the Apostolic Age*. [G. M.]

**HERETICAL BAPTISM.** [BAPTISM, ITERATION OF, p. 172.]

**HERMAGORAS**, bishop and martyr under Nero at Aquileia, with Fortunatus his archdeacon; commemorated July 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**HERMAS**, saint (supposed bishop of Philippi); commemorated May 9 (*Mart. Usuardi, Ado de Festiv. Apostolorum*). [W. F. G.]

**HERMEAS**, of Comana, *leopardus* under Antoninus; commemorated May 31 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**HERMELANDUS**, abbot in Antrova, an island of the Loire (†circa 730 A.D.); commemorated March 25 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**HERMELLUS**, martyr at Constantinople; commemorated Aug. 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**HERMENEGILDUS**, son of Leovigildus, king of the Goths, martyr in Spain (†586 A.D.); commemorated April 13 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**HERMENEUTAE.** [INTERPRETER.]

**HERMES.** (1) [GATOR.]

(2) Saint at Marseilles; commemorated with Adrianus, March 1 (*Mart. Hieron., Usuardi*).

(3) One of the seventy; commemorated with Agabus, Ananias, Herodion, Philegon, Rufus, April 8 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(4) Martyr at Rome (A.D. 116); commemorated Aug. 28 (*Mart. Bedae, Usuardi*).

(5) [EUSEBIUS (7).]

(6) Exorcista, saint of Retiaria; commemorated Dec. 31 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**HERMITS.** Some mediaeval writers on monasticism define hermits (*eremitae*) as solitaries in cells, and anchorites (*anachoretæ*) as solitaries without any fixed dwelling place; more correctly anchorites are solitaries who have passed a time of probation as coenobites, and hermits those who enter on the solitary life without this preparation (*Martene, Reg. Comm. Bened.* c. 1; *Isid. De Div. Off.* ii. 15). Generally the word "eremite" includes all solitary ascetics of one sort or another; other designations of them in early ecclesiastical writers are ἀθληταί, ἀσκηταί, μονάζοντες, φιλόθεοι, φιλοσοφούντες, κατεργασμένοι, *vir*i Dei, renunciantes, continentes, cellulani, inclusi, reclusi, monachi, &c.; and, later, religiosi. The words μοναχὸς and μοναστήριον were soon transferred from the hermit in his solitary cell to the coenobite in his community.

The asceticism of the desert was among Christians the first step towards the asceticism of the cloister. It was prompted by a passionate longing to fly from the world to escape not merely the fury of the Decian or Diocletian persecutions, but the contaminations of surrounding heathenism. It commended itself to devout Christians by reasons, which, however specious, really contradict and cancel each other, for it seemed at once a refuge from spiritual dangers, and a bolder challenge to the powers of darkness to do their worst; at once a safer, quieter life than the perilous conflict day by day with an evil world, and, in another aspect, a life of sterner self-denial. In the pages of its panegyrist the solitary life presents itself now in one and now in the other of these irreconcilable phases, according to the mood or temperament of the writer. It may be replied, that, far from being either more heroic or more free from danger, it is neither.

Until about the middle of the 3rd century the more austere Christians were only distinguished by such epithets as οἱ σπουδαῖοι or οἱ ἐκλεκτότεροι, without withdrawing from the society of their fellows (*e.g.* Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 11; Clem. Alex. *Homil.* "Quis Dives?" n. 36). About that time, Antony and Ammon in Egypt, and Paul in the Thebaid led the way to the desert; and their example soon found a crowd of imitators (*Socr. H. E.* iv. 23; *Soz. H. E.* i. 13, 14; *Hier. Ep.* 22, *ad Eustoch.*). In Syria Hilarion, in Armenia Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste, in Cappadocia Basil urged on the movement. It spread quickly through Pontus, Illyricum, and Thrace westwards; and the personal prestige of Athanasius, an exile from his see, helped to make it popular in Italy at Rome (*Niceph. H. E.* ix. 16; *Aug. de Op. Mon.* c. 23; *Hier. Ep.* 16; *Epitaph. Marcel.*). But the solitary life never found so many votaries in Europe, as in Egypt and in the East; partly because of the comparative inclemency of the climate, and the proportionate need of more appliances to support life, partly of the more practical character of the West.

The institution of Lauras was the connecting link between the hermitage and the monastery, in the later and more ordinary use of that word.

Pachomius at Tabenna in Upper Egypt had already begun to organise a community of hermits, by arranging that three should occupy one cell, and that all who were near enough should meet together for the daily meal (*Soz. H. E.* iii. 14; *Pallad. Hist. Laus.*). The monks of Mons Nitrus, too, near the Lake Mareotis, though many of them in separate cells (οἰκήματα μοναχικά σποραδῆν, τὰ Κελλία, *Soz. H. E.* vi. 31) had refectories for common use, chapels in their midst for common worship on Saturdays, Sundays and holy days, certain presbyters appointed to officiate in these, and certain lay officers, (*oeconomi*) elected\* by the older hermits to provide for their temporal wants, such as they were, and to transmit their scanty alms (*diaconia*) derived chiefly from the sale of the rush mats which they wove (*Cass. Inst.* v. 26, 40; *Coll.* iii. 1; x. 2; xviii. 5; xxi. 9). In the Thebaid a hermit named Joannes presided over a large number of hermits (*Soz. H. E.* vi. 28, 29). One of the first "Lauras," or irregular clusters of hermits dwelling close together, was at Pharan near the Dead Sea in the 4th century; another was founded near Jerusalem in the next century by Sabas a hermit from Cappadocia, under the patronage of Euthymius.

The early ecclesiastical histories teem with the almost suicidal austerities of the more celebrated hermits. Not content with imposing on themselves the burden hard to be borne of a lifelong loneliness—for even without any vow of continuance it was very rarely that a hermit returned to the companionship of his fellows—and of a silence not to be broken even by prayer, they vied with one another in devising self-tortures; wandering about, almost naked, like wild beasts; barely supporting life by a little bread and water, or a few herbs; only allowing their macerated frames three or four hours sleep in the twenty-four, and those on the bare rock or in some narrow cell where it was impossible to straighten the limbs; counting cleanliness a luxury and a sin; maiming themselves, sometimes with their own hands, to escape being made bishops by force; and shunning a moment's intercourse even with those naturally dearest (*Cass. Inst.* v. 26, 40; *Coll.* ii. 6, 17; *Socr. H. E.* iv. 23; *Soz. H. E.* vi. 29, 34; cf. *Rosweyde Vitae Patr. pass.*). It was only in the decline of this enthusiasm that hermits began to take up their abode near cities. The "father of hermits" used to compare a hermit near a town to a fish out of water (*Soz. H. E.* i. 13).

Usually the hermit's abode was in a cave, or in a small hut which his own hands had rudely put together (*Evagr. H. E.* i. 21); but some, like the "possessed with evil spirits" in Gadara mentioned in the New Testament, had their dwellings in tombs (*Theodoret. Philoth.* c. 12); hence they were called μεμοριταί, and the keeper or superintendent of these tombs the μεμοροφύλαξ (*Altes. Ascetic.* i. 7). Others roved about incessantly, to avoid the visits of the curious, like the "gyrovagi" in having no fixed abode, but unlike them in keeping always alone (*Sulp. Sev. Dial. de Mon.* i. 9), and in feeding only on the wild herbs which they gathered [see *Boschi*]. Others, the "Stylitæ," aspiring to yet more utter isola-

\* Hospinianus wrongly speaks of the presbyteri as thus elected (*De Orig. Monach.*).

tion, planted themselves on the summit of solitary columns. Of these the most famous were the Simeon, who in Syria during the 5th century is said to have lived forty-one years on a tall pillar the top of which was barely three feet in diameter (Evagr. *H. E.* i. 13; ii. 9; Theodoret, *Philoth.* c. 26); his namesake who followed his example in the 6th century (Evagr. *H. E.* vi. 22); and a Daniel, who chose for the scene of his austerities a less dreary neighbourhood, a suburb of Constantinople (Theodor. *Lect. H. E.* i. 32). Other "stylitae" are mentioned by Joannes Moschus (*Prat.* cc. 27, 28, 57, 129). This peculiar form of eremitism was very unusual in Europe. A monk near Treves in the 6th century tried the experiment on the top of a column rising from the summit of a cliff; but by order of the bishop soon relinquished the attempt on account of the rigour of the climate (Greg. Turon. *Hist.* viii. 16).

The reverence with which hermits were popularly regarded led to their aid being frequently invoked when controversies were raging. Thus in the close of the 4th century Antony, who is also said to have more than once broken the spell of his seclusion in order to go and plead the cause of some poor client at Alexandria (Soz. *H. E.* i. 13), being appealed to in the Arian conflict not only addressed a letter to the emperor, but made a visit in person to Alexandria on behalf of Athanasius (Soz. *H. E.* ii. 31; Hieron. *Ep.* 33, *ad Castruc.*). The hermit Aphraates boldly confronted the emperor Valens, as did Daniel, the later of the two pillar-hermits of that name, the emperor Basiliscus (Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 23; Theod. *Lect. Collectan.* i. 32, 33). The great Theodosius consulted the hermit Joannes (Soz. *H. E.* vii. 22). The hermits near Antioch interceded with good effect when the magistrates of that city were about to execute the cruel orders of the exasperated emperor (Chrys. *Homil. ad Ant.* xvii.). But not rarely the unreasoning zeal of the hermits provoked great tumults; and sometimes in a misguided impulse of indiscriminating pity they endeavoured by force to liberate criminals condemned by the law. Nor were their sympathies always on the side of the orthodox. When Theophilus of Alexandria denounced the error of the Anthropomorphitae, almost all the Saitic monks were fiercely incensed against him as an atheist "in their simplicity" as Cassian adds, (Cass. *Coll.* x. 2).

On the comparative excellency of the eremitic or of the coenobitic life there has been much difference of opinion among writers who extol asceticism; the same writer inclining now to the solitary life, and now to the life in a community, as he views the question from one side or another. Sozomen calls the eremitic life the "peak of philosophy" (*H. E.* vi. 31). Chrysostom and Basil speak to the same effect (Chrys. *Ep.* 1; Bas. *Ep. ad Chilon.*). But Basil in the rule for monks ascribed to him commends the coenobitic life, as more truly unselfish, more rich in opportunities both for helping and for being helped (*Reg.* c. 7); and so speaks his friend, Gregory of Nazianza (*Orat.* 21). Jerome, with all his love of austerity, cautions his friend and pupil against the dangers of solitude (*Ep.* 4, *ad Rustic.*). Augustine praises hermits; and yet allows that coenobites have a more unquestionable title to

reuerence (*De Mor. Eccl.* c. 31). Cassian often speaks of hermits as having climbed to the summit of excellence (e.g. *Inst.* v. 36; *Coll.* xviii. 4); at other times he deprecates the solitary life as not good for all, and as beyond the reach of many; and he relates how a devout monk gave up the attempt in despair, and returned to his brother monks (*Coll.* xix. 2, 3; xxiv. 8).

It was from the first very earnestly enjoined by the leaders of asceticism, that none should venture on so great an enterprise as the solitary life, without undergoing probation as a coenobite (Hieron. *Ep.* 4 *ad Rust.*; Cass. *Inst.* v. 4. 36; *Coll.* xviii. 4; Joan. Clim. *Scala*, iv. 27). Benedict compares the hermit to a champion advancing in front of the army for single combat with the foe, and therefore insists on his proving himself and his armour beforehand (*Reg.* c. 1). Councils repeatedly enforce this probationary discipline (*Conc. Venet.* A.D. 465, c. 7; *Conc. Tolet.* iv. A.D. 633, c. 63; vii. A.D. 646, c. 5; *Conc. Trull.* A.D. 692, cc. 41, 42). The permission of the abbat was required (Sulp. Sev. *Dial.* i. 5), sometimes, also, the consent of the brethren (Martene, *Comm. in Reg. Ben.* c. 1) and, sometimes of the bishop (*Conc. Francof.* A.D. 794, c. 12). The length of this period of probation varied (Mart. v. s. cf. Isid. *De Div. Off.* ii. 15). Even those who most admired the hermit-life fenced it round with prohibitions as a risk not lightly to be encountered.

The civil authorities were naturally jealous of this subtraction of so many citizens from the duties of public life. Theodosius ordered all those who evaded their public responsibilities on pretence of asceticism to be deprived of their civil rights unless they returned to claim them (*Cod. Theodos.* xii.; Tit. 1; Lex 63); and it was forbidden for slaves to be admitted into a monastery without their masters' leave (*Conc. Chalc.* A.D. 451, Act xv. c. 4). In Western Europe Charles the Great decreed that all hermits infesting towns and cities for alms should either return to their hermitages or be shut up in monasteries. By the law of the Eastern church a bishop who became a hermit was *ipso facto* deprived of his office.

It was not unusual, particularly in the monasteries of Provence and Languedoc, for one of the brethren most advanced in asceticism to be immured in a separate cell, sometimes underground, always within the precincts, as an intercessor for the monastery (Menard, *Observ. Crit. in Bened. Anian. Cod. Regul.* ii.). After a solemn religious ceremony the devotee, thus buried alive by his own consent, was left, with no other apparel than what he was wearing, to end his days alone. The doorway was walled up, or the door nailed to and sealed with the bishop's ring, whose consent, as well as that of the abbat and chapter, was requisite. Only a little aperture was left, not such as to allow the inmate to see or be seen, for letting down provisions to him (Menard, *u. s.*). These "includi" are not to be confounded with the aged or sickly monks, allowed separate cells because of their infirmities (Cass. *Inst.* ii. 12; *Conc. Agath.* c. 38). [See HESYCHASTAE.] The rule "for solitaires" of Grimlaicus, probably a monk in or near Metz about the end of the 9th century, seems intended not for a separate order, but for these "includi" generally (Bened. Anian. *u. s.*). 3 D 2



as a characteristic difference between Asiatic and European asceticism, that the eremites, or desert monks of the east find their western counterpart in solitaries within the precincts of the community.

As might be expected for obvious reasons there have been few female hermits. Gregory of Tours mentions a nun of the convent of Ste. Croix, Poitiers, who retired to a hermitage by permission of the abbess Rudegunda (*Hist.* vi. 29). Usually these female solitaries had their cells in close contiguity to the wall of a church or of a monastery (Martene, v. a.).

[See further Rosweydh *Vitas Patrum*, Antverpiae, 1628; Hospinianus *De Monachis*, Tigur. 1609; Middendorp *Originum Anachoretarum Syria*, Col. Agripp. 1615; Anton. Dadin. *Altaemnae Asceticorum*, Par. 1674; Bingham's *Origines Ecclesiasticæ* (Bk. vii.) Lond. 1840. See also ASCETICISM in this Dictionary, ANTONY (St.) &c. in the Dictionary of Christian Biography.]

[L. G. S.]

**HERMOGENES.** (1) [PETER (6).]

(2) [GALATA.]

(3) [EVODIUS (1).]

(4) [EVODUS.]

(5) [EUGRAPHUS.]

(6) [DONATUS (10).] [W. F. G.]

**HERMOGRATES.** [HERMOLAUS.]

**HERMOLAUS**, presbyter of Nicomedia, *leopardus*, A.D. 304; commemorated with the brothers Hermenipus and Hermogrates, July 27 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi); and July 28 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**HERMYLUS**, martyr with Stratonice; (†315 A.D.) commemorated Jan. 13 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**HERMENIPUS.** [HERMOLAUS.]

**HERODION.** [HERMES (3).]

**HERON**, or **HEROS**. (1) Bishop of Antioch, successor to Ignatius; "Natalis," Oct. 17 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) [DIOCORUS (3).]

(3) [HERACLIDES.]

**HERTFORD, COUNCIL OF** (*Hertfordiæ concilium*). Held at Hertford A.D. 673, Sept. 24; all the bishops of the Anglo-Saxon church then living, except Wini, the simoniacal bishop of London, being present in person or by deputy (Haddan and Stubbs' *Councils and Documents*, iii. 121, note). Archbishop Theodore, who had summoned them, recited ten canons from a book, in all probability the collection of Dionysius Exiguus from their being all found there, to which all subscribed (*ib.* comp. Mansi xi. 127). [E. S. Fr.]

**HERUDFORDENSE CONCILIUM.** [HERTFORD, COUNCIL OF.]

**HESYCHASTAE** (*Ἠσυχασταί*). Etymologically a term equivalent to "quietists." It was applied to those members of a monastery who were allowed to have separate cells within the precincts that their meditations might be uninterrupted. (Bing. *Orig. Eccles.* vii. ii. 14; Menard on Bened. Anian. *Concord. Regul.* c. 29; cf. Justinian *Novell.* 5, 33.) Eiddle, however,

(*Chr. Antiq.* vii. vii.), takes it as a designation of monks bound to silence; and Suicer (*Thes. Eccles.*) as meaning anchorites, although the passage which he quotes from Balsamon (si *Conc. Nic.* II. A.D. 787) distinguishes Heschasteria from "monasteria" and the cells of "anachoretæ." In the 14th century it was applied to the mystics of Mount Athos (Hersog *Real-Encyclop.* s. v.). [L. G. S.]

**HESYCHIUS, ESICHIUS or ESICUS.**

(1) Bishop and confessor at Circesium (sac. i); commemorated with Euphrasius, Indalecius, Secundus, Teiphon, and Torquatus, May 15 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr at Meia; commemorated June 15 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**HETAEIRIAE** (*ἑταιρίαι*) were originally political clubs; but the word came to signify any association of men for objects not recognized by the law. Thus Trajan (Plinius *Epist.* x. 34 [al. 43]) was unwilling to sanction a *compagæ* (collegium) of firemen at Nicomedia, because he had found that in that district such *compagæ* were liable to degenerate into *hetæiriae*; and it was as *hetæiriae* that the assemblies of the Christians became objects of suspicion to the state (*ib.* x. 96 [al. 97], § 7), and so persecuted (Augusti, *Handbuch*, i. 40). [C.]

**HETERODOXY.** [HERESY.]

**HEXAPSAALMUS** (*ἑξάψαλμος*). By this name are denoted six unvarying Psalms, which are said daily in the Greek office of lauds (ὡς *ἑξήκοντα*). They are *Ps.* iii., xxvii. (xxviii.), lxi. (lxii.), lxxvii. (lxxviii.), cii. (cii.), cxli. (cxlii.). They occur near the beginning of the office; and are introduced by the clause "Glory to God in the Highest, and on earth peace, good will among men," and by the verse "Thou shalt open my lips, O Lord, and my mouth shall show thy praise." After the first three Psalms are said the priest comes out from the bema, and while the last three are being said, recites the twelve morning prayers (ὡς *ἡμετέρας εὐχάς*) secretly before the icon of our Lord. They are concluded with three *Alleluias*; and three *Reverences*. [H. J. H.]

**HEZEKIAH**, the king of Judah; commemorated Nisan 4 = July 28 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [W. F. G.]

**HIBERNICA CONCILIA.** [IRELAND, COUNCILS OF.]

**HEMANTES.** The word *χευαδ(εσθαι)* means primarily "to be storm-tossed" (*Act.* xxvii. 18). Thence, by a natural metaphor, it passed on to the tempest of the soul. Thus Chrysostom (*Hom.* lili. in *Matt.*) says that the mind of a man who has many artificial wants is storm-tossed (*χευαδ(εσθαι)*). Compare James i. 6.

The seventeenth canon of the council of Nicaea (A.D. 325) orders those who have committed unnatural crimes, or who are or have been lepers, to be placed at public prayer among the storm-tossed or storm-beaten (*οἱ τοὺς χευσόμενους εὐχόμενοι*). This is rendered in the "Versio Prisca," "cum eis qui tempestatem patiuntur orare;" by Dionysius Exiguus, "inter eos orare qui spiritu periclitantur immundo;"

ly Isidorus Mercator, "qui tempestate jactantur, qui a nobis ennergumeni appelliantur [*i. e.* furiosi sive ennergumeni intelliguntur]." To the same effect Martin of Braga (*Collect. Con.*, c. 81), "inter daemones orare." The use of the word in the Clementine liturgy (*Const. Apost.* viii. 13, § 20)—*παρεκαλούμεν σε κύριε τῶν χειμαζομένων ἐν τῷ ἁλλοτριῷ*—makes it almost certain that the *χειμαζόμενοι* or *Hiemantes* are identical with the *Ennergumeni* or *DEMONTIACI*, who had a special place assigned them outside the church proper, whether in the porch or in the open air. (Suicer's *Theaurus*, s. v. *Χειμαζόμενοι*; Van Espen, *Jus Eccl.* iii. 132; ed. Colon. 1777). [C.]

**HIERAPOLIS, COUNCILS OF.** (1) A.D. 173, of twenty-six bishops, under its bishop, Apollinarius, against the errors of Montanus, which gave rise to a sect called from the province in which it originated, and in which Hierapolis was situated, "Cataphryges" (Mansi, I. 691-4). Eusebius has preserved extracts from a work written by Apollinarius himself against them (v. 16).

(2) A.D. 445, under Stephen, its metropolitan, when Sabinius was ordained Bishop of Perrhe instead of Athanasius, deposed at Antioch under Domnus the year before. Later, Athanasius was restored by Dioscorus of Alexandria. But the Council of Chalcedon, Oct. 31, A.D. 451, deciding for the moment in favour of Sabinius, referred the final adjudication of the question to Maximus, bishop of Antioch, and a synod to be held by him within eight months to enquire into the charges brought against Athanasius. Should they not have been made good by then, he was to regain his see, and Sabinius was to be allowed a pension. (Mansi, vi. 465-6; and then vii. 315-58.) [E. S. Ff.]

**HIERARCHY.** 1. The word *ἱεράρχης* denotes properly a steward or president of sacred rites (Böckh, *Inscrip.* i. 749). By Christian writers it is occasionally used to designate a bishop (p. 210). Thus Maximus, commenting on the *Ecclēstical Hierarchy* of the Pseudo-Dionysius, says, "*καλεῖται ἱεράρχης τοὺς ἐπισκόπους*," he commonly calls the bishops *hierarchs* (Suicer's *Theaurus*, s. v.). Hence the word *ἱεραρχία* came to designate the order of bishops. Bingham, however (*Ant.* III. l. 6), considers the hierarchy of Pseudo-Dionysius to include bishops, priests, and deacons, quoting Haller's *Defensio Hierarchy Eccl.* (lib. i. c. 3; lib. iii. sec. ii. cc. 1 and 2).

2. In a wider sense, the word Hierarchy is taken to include the whole series of the orders of ministry in the Christian church. See BISHOP, ORDERS. [C.]

**HIERATEION.** [BEMA.]

**HIEREMIAS.** (1) [JEREMIAN.]

(2) [PETER (9).]

(3) [EMILIANUS (4).]

**HIERIUS**, presbyter at Alexandria in the time of the emperor Philip; commemorated Nov. 4 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**HIERONYMUS.** (1) Presbyter (†420 A.D.); deposition at Bethlehem Judah, Sept. 30 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) With ANTHEMIUS, commemorated Sept. 26 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

**HIEROSOLYMITANA CONCILIA.**  
[JERUSALEM, COUNCILS OF.]

**HIEROTHEUS**, bishop of Athens; commemorated Oct. 4 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**HIEBURGIA.** [LITURGY.]

**HILABIA.** (1) [EUMENIA.]

(2) Wife of Claudius, the tribune; martyr with Claudius and their two sons, Jason and Maurus, and seventy soldiers, under Numerian; commemorated Dec. 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**HILARINUS**, monk at Ostia, martyr under Julian: "Pasio," July 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**HILARION.** (1) The younger († reds), A.D. 845; commemorated March 28 and June 6 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) The Great († μέγας), Holy Father, A.D. 333; commemorated Oct. 21 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi, *Cal. Byzant.*).

(3) Commemorated Nov. 19 (*Cal. Georg.*).

[W. F. G.]

**HILARIUS**, or **HILARY.** (1) Bishop of Poitiers and confessor (†369 A.D.); commemorated Jan. 13 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi); deposition Jan. 13 (*Mart. Bedae, Hieron.*).

(2) Bishop of Aquileia (†285 A.D.); martyr with Tatian the deacon, Felix, Largus, and Dionysius; commemorated March 16 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(3) Bishop of Arles and confessor (†449 A.D.); commemorated May 5 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(4) Martyr with Proclus, A.D. 106; commemorated July 12 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(5) The pope (†467 A.D.); commemorated Sept. 10 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(6) Martyr with Florentinus at Samur; commemorated Sept. 27 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(7) Bishop and confessor in Gavalis [Geranden in Languedoc]; commemorated Oct. 25 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**HIPPO, COUNCIL OF.** [AFRICAN COUNCILS.]

**HIPPOLYTUS**, Romanus, martyr at Antioch, *ἱερομάρτυρ*, A.D. 269: "Pasio," Jan. 30 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi, *Cal. Byzant.*); *Revelatio corporis*, Jakabit 6 = Jan. 31 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [W. F. G.]

**HIRELING.** The sight of the hireling from the wolf, as contrasted with the form of our Lord standing in the door of the sheepfold prepared to defend His flock, is beautifully carved on the Brescian casket, 5th or 6th century. (Westwood, *Fictile Ivory Caskets*, p. 36, no. 93.) [H. St. J. T.]

**HIRMOLOGION.** An office book in the Greek church consisting mainly of a collection of the *Hirmoi*; but containing also a few other forms. [H. J. H.]

**HIRMOS** (*strophe*). The Canons, which form so important a part of the Greek offices, are divided into nine *odes*, or practically into eight, as the second is always omitted. Each *ode* consists of a varying number (three, four or five) are the numbers most frequently found) of *troparia*, or short rhythmical strophes, each formed on the model of one which precedes the *ode*; and which is called the *Hirmos*. The *Hirmos* is usually independent of the *ode*, though containing a refer-

ence to the subject matter of it; sometimes however the first *troparion* of an *Ode* is called the *Hirmos*. It is distinguished by inverted commas (" ") in the office books. Sometimes the first words alone of a *Hirmos* are given, and it is not unfrequently placed at the end of the *ode* to which it belongs. The name is considered to be derived from the *Hirmos drawing the Troparion* after its model; i.e. into the same rhythmical arrangement. [H. J. H.]

HISPALENSIA CONCILIA. [SEVILLE, COUNCILS OF.]

HISPANUM CONCILIUM. Held, A.D. 793, at some place in Spain, under Elipand, archbishop of Toledo; from whom the document criticised in the letters despatched to Spain from Frankfort emanated (Mansi, xiii. 857; comp. 865 and sqq.). [E. S. Ff.]

HOLIDAYS. [FESTIVALS.]

HOLY! HOLY! HOLY! [SANCTUS.]

HOLY OF HOLIES. In instituting a parallel between the arrangements of the Jewish Temple and that of a Christian church, the BEMA or sanctuary of the church, containing the altar, was naturally held to correspond with the Holy of Holies of the Temple (*τὸ ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων*), and was frequently called by that name. But with the Nestorians the "Holy of Holies" is not the sanctuary, but a small recess at the east end, into which not even the priest enters, containing nothing but a cross (Neale, *Eastern Church*, pp. 177, 189, quoting Etherege, *Syrian Churches*, p. 109). [C.]

HOLY BREAD. [EULOGIAE.]

HOLY OIL. [OIL, HOLY.]

HOLY PLACES. I. By this phrase were understood, in the first three or four centuries after Christ, chiefly, if not exclusively, the scenes of our Lord's nativity, death, resurrection, and ascension. Of these, therefore, we will speak first. In 212, Alexander, the friend of Origen, "made a journey to Jerusalem, for the sake of prayer and investigation of the places" (*τῶν τόπων ἱστορίας*, Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* i. vi. c. 11). St. Jerome (*De Vir. Illustr.* cap. lxii.) says that he was drawn thither "desiderio sanctorum locorum." If this was the motive, and there is no good reason to doubt it, Alexander is the first on record whom religious feeling drew to those hallowed spots. Origen himself seems to have carried with him to the Holy Land more of the spirit of a learned and devout traveller of our own day. He was in Palestine in 216 on a rather short visit. In 231, he began a residence of some duration at Caesarea, in that country, and, after an absence of uncertain length, in 238 he opened a catechetical school there. He must, therefore, have known the Holy Land well, and his writings show it; but it is instructive to observe how he uses his knowledge. In one passage, as a critic, he expresses his conviction that "Bethabara," not "Bethany," ought to be the reading in St. John i. 28, "as he had been in the places, on a search after the footsteps of Jesus and his disciples, and the prophets" (*Comment. in Ev. Joann.* tom. vi. § 24). In another work, writing against an unbeliever, about 247,

he alleges the cave of Bethlehem as a piece of evidence. If any one desire further proof that Scripture affords of our Lord's birth in that place, "the cave is shown where He was born, and the manger in which He was swaddled; and that which is shown is widely spoken of in those places, even among aliens from the faith, viz., that Jesus, who is worshipped and revered by the Christians, was born in that cave" (*Contre Celsum*, l. i. § 51). From the writings of Origen, we should not infer that either he himself had visited, or that it was the custom of his day to visit, the holy places for the express purpose of stimulating devotion, or under the notion that prayer in them was more acceptable to God than when made elsewhere. The spirit which animated the pilgrims of a later age, had not yet been awakened. Its awakening was probably much delayed by the attempts of the heathen to obscure the locality of events sacred to the Christian. Thus, in the time of Hadrian, a vast mound of earth was raised over the spot where our Lord was buried and rose again, and a temple dedicated to Venus was built on it (Euseb. *Vita Constantini*, l. iii. c. 26; Hieron. *Ep.* xlix. *ad Paulin.*).

The first great impulse given to the veneration of the holy places, came from Helena, the mother of Constantine, who, in the year 326, when nearly 80 years of age, travelled to Jerusalem, that she might so "pay the debt of pious feeling to God the king of all," for the elevation of her son, and the general prosperity of her family. After due reverence done to the footsteps of the Saviour, she "left a fruit of her piety to posterity" in two churches which she built, "one at the cave of the nativity, the other on the mount of the ascension" (Euseb. *u. s.* cc. 42, 43). On the site of the burial, Constantine, after his mother's visit, first caused an oratory to be built, and later sent directions to Macarius, the bishop, for the erection of a magnificent church (*Ibid.* cc. 25-40). To this period, and perhaps to Constantine and Helena, we may probably refer two "very small oratories," one built on Mount Calvary, the site of the passion, the other on the spot where our Lord's body was said to have been embalmed and the cross found, which the Latins, when they took Jerusalem, inclosed within the same wall with the Holy Sepulchre (Gulielmi Tyrii, *Hist. Rerum Transmar.* lib. viii. c. 3). They were only a stone's throw from each other (Tillemont, note iv. *sur Ste. Hélène*); and hence the church of the Resurrection, or Holy Sepulchre, was often spoken of as on Golgotha (Cyrill. *Hieros. Cat.* i. § 1; xiii. § 12; xvi. § 2). Very soon after the recovery of these important sites we find them noticed in the *Itinerarium* of a Christian traveller from Bordeaux, who visited Jerusalem in 333. He saw the "crypt where His body was placed and rose again on the third day" (*Vit. Rom. Itineraria*, p. 594, Amstel. 1735), and "the little hill Golgotha where the Lord was crucified" (p. 593). He also went to "Bethlehem, where the Lord Jesus Christ was born. There," he adds, "a basilica was built by the command of Constantine" (p. 598).

II. From this time, the holy places were visited by believers of every rank and almost every age. Some of the more wealthy settled at Jerusalem, and by their alms assisted, and

perhaps attracted, many of the poorer. The city grew rapidly in population and prosperity; and soon, as an almost necessary consequence, became as notorious for crime and profligacy, as it was famous for its religious monuments. About the year 380, Gregory of Nyssa was called thither by the affairs of the church, and received impressions which it will be well to put before the reader in his own words. In an epistle, written not long after, he tells his friend that he learned there what it was to keep holy day to God, "both in beholding the saving symbols of God the giver of our life, and in meeting with souls in which like signs of the grace of God are spiritually contemplated; so that he believes Bethlehem, Golgotha, the Mount of Olives, and the Resurrection to be verily in the heart of him who has God" (*Ep. ad Eustathiam*, &c., p. 16, ed. Casaub.). The latter thought in this sentence then carries him away, and he seems, probably out of tenderness to the devout women to whom he wrote, to avoid further reference to the holy places. Some years afterwards, however, he wrote a tract, in the form of a letter to some unknown friend, in which he earnestly dissuaded from visiting Jerusalem on religious grounds. He begins by denying that it is any part of a Christian's duty "to visit the places in Jerusalem in which the symbols of our Lord's sojourn in the flesh are to be seen," and then proceeds as follows: "Why, then, is there such zeal about that which neither makes a man blessed, nor fit for the kingdom? Let the man of sense consider. If it were a profitable thing to be done, not even so would it be a thing good to be zealously affected by the perfect. But since, when the thing is thoroughly looked into, it is found even to inflict injury on the souls of those who have entered on a strict course of life, it is not worthy of that great zeal, but rather to be greatly shunned." He next enlarges on the danger to the morals and reputation of all, but especially women, in their travels through the luxurious and profligate cities of the East; and then proceeds to ask, "What will one gain by being in those places?—As if the Lord were still in bodily presence in them, but departed from us, or as if the Holy Ghost were overflowing abundantly at Jerusalem, but were unable to come over to us." So far from this being the case, he declares that city to be in the lowest stage of moral degradation. "There is no species of impurity that is not dared therein. Flagitious actions and adulteries and thefts, idolatries and witchcrafts, and envyings and murders; and this last evil, above others, is common in that place, so that nowhere else is there such a readiness to commit murder as in those places" (*De Euntibus Hierosolymam*, pp. 6–13, ed. Petr. Molinaei). Speaking for himself, he adds, "We confessed that Christ who appeared (there) is true God, before we were at the place; nor afterwards was our faith either lessened or increased. And we knew the incarnation through the Virgin before we went to Bethlehem, and believed the resurrection from the dead before we saw the monument of it, and acknowledged the ascension into heaven to be true, apart from our seeing the mount of Olives. This is the only benefit from our journey, that we know, by comparison, our own parts to be much more holy than foreign. Wherefore, ye

that fear the Lord, praise Him in those places in which ye are" (*Ibid.* p. 14). St. Jerome, who lived at Bethlehem, sometimes speaks very much in the same strain. At other times he encourages and praises those who visited the holy places, especially if their intention was to dwell in retirement near them. This is easily understood. The multitude would be injured by familiarity with the memorials of Christ's life on earth; while the few might through them be brought into closer spiritual communion with Him. It may well be doubted, too, whether he would have encouraged any one to stay at Jerusalem, except under the protection of the monastic life; and even that he was far from thinking altogether safe in such a city. Writing, in 393 or thereabouts, to Paulinus, afterwards bishop of Nola, St. Jerome says, "Not the having been at Jerusalem, but having lived well there is to be praised . . . . The court of heaven is equally open from Jerusalem and Britain. The kingdom of God is within you. Anthony, and all the swarms of monks of Egypt and Mesopotamia, of Pontus, Cappadocia, and Armenia, saw not Jerusalem; and the gate of Paradise is open to them without (a knowledge of) this city. The blessed Hilarion, though he was a native of Palestine, and lived in Palestine, only saw Jerusalem on a single day; that he might not appear to despise the holy places on account of their nearness, nor, on the other hand, to confine God to place." He warns Paulinus not to "think anything wanting to his faith, because he had not seen Jerusalem" . . . . "If the places of the cross and of the resurrection were not in a city of very great resort, in which there is a court, a military station, in which there are harlots, players, buffoons, and all things that are usual in other cities; or if it were frequented by crowds of monks alone, an abode of this kind would in truth be one that should be sought for by all monks; but as things are, it is the height of folly to renounce the world, to give up one's country, to forsake cities, to profess oneself a monk, and then to live among greater crowds, with greater danger than you would in your own country" (*Epist.* xlix.). Nevertheless, when Desiderius and his sister had resolved to visit Jerusalem, he wrote (about 396) to encourage them, begging them to visit him and Paula "on occasion of the holy places." "At least," he adds, "if our society shall be unpleasing, it is an act of faith (or perhaps, "a part of your vow," *pars fidei est*) to have worshipped where the feet of the Lord have stood, and to have seen, as it were, the recent traces of His nativity, and cross and passion" (*Epist.* xlviii.). In the same spirit he invites Marcella (about 389) to Bethlehem (*Epist.* xlv.); and bids Rusticus (A.D. 408) seek peace of mind at Jerusalem. "Thou art a wanderer in thy own country;—or rather not in thy country, for thou hast lost thy country. That is before thee in the venerable places of the resurrection, the cross, and the cradle of the Lord the Saviour" (*Epist.* xc.). In the famous epistle of Paula and Eustochium (about 389) to Marcella, every inducement is held out to her to join them at Bethlehem; the number, eminence, and holiness of those who visited the holy places from every part of the world, the psalms of praise in every tongue continually ascending from them, the



high religious interest of the places themselves, and, in particular, the great piety of the inhabitants of Bethlehem and its neighbourhood; but the truth is not lost sight of, that men might be as holy and devout elsewhere: "We do not say this to deny that the kingdom of God is within us, and that there are holy men in other countries, too," &c. (*Inter Epp. Hieron. ep. xlv.*).

III. Before the middle of this century (about 347), it was reported throughout the Christian world (see Cyrill. Hier. *Catech. iv. § 7; x. § 9; xiii. § 2*) that the very cross on which our Saviour died had been discovered, and was exhibited at Jerusalem. According to Cyril, who was bishop of Jerusalem from 350 to 386, the discovery took place in the time of Constantine (*Epist. ad Constantium, § 2*). As he died in 337, and not a word is said of the cross or its discovery by the traveller from Gaul, already cited, who was at Jerusalem in 333, the story must have arisen and the exhibition of the supposed relic must have begun some time between those years. Later writers (as Ambrose, *de Obitu Theodosii, §§ 43-47*; Paulinus, *Ep. xxxi. § 5*; Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl. l. i. c. 7*; Sulpicius, and later on Theodoret, Socrates, Sozomen, &c.) assert that it was found by Helena, the mother of Constantine; but that princess died five years before the anonymous Gaul visited Jerusalem; and even if we had not his negative testimony, the silence of Cyril with regard to Helena, and the silence on the whole subject of Eusebius, who, in his panegyric on Constantine, written in 337, has zealously heaped together whatever could tend to his honour, or his mother's, throw just doubt on her connection with the discovery, even if that be true [CROSS, FINDING OF, p. 593]. It is painful to suspect that the cross exhibited was not authentic, but when we find that by the middle of the 6th century (See Greg. Turon. *Mirac. l. i. c. 7*), if not long before, the lance, reed, sponge, crown of thorns, &c., used at the Passion were all exhibited, and revered with equal confidence, we surely have (not to mention certain difficulties in the story itself) some excuse for hesitating to affirm that the cross shown at Jerusalem in the 4th century and downward, was that upon which our Saviour died. It was believed, however, and our business is chiefly with the consequence of that belief. "Prostrate before the cross," says Jerome, speaking of Paula's first visit to Jerusalem, "she worshipped, as if she saw the Lord hanging thereon" (*Ep. lxxxvi. ad Eustoch.*). Paula herself refers to it, when urging Marcella to join her in Palestine: "When will that day be on which it will be permitted us to enter the cave of the Saviour; to weep with sister, to weep with mother, in the sepulchre of the Lord; then to kiss (lambere) the wood of the cross; and on the Mount of Olives to be lifted up in desire and mind with the ascending Lord?" This will, perhaps, sufficiently illustrate the importance of the alleged discovery, as a means of attracting pilgrims to Jerusalem. From Paulinus we learn that the cross was only exhibited "to be adored by the people" on Good Friday; but that sometimes it was shown to "very religious" persons, who had travelled thither on purpose to see it (*Ep. xxxii. § 6*).

IV. From one cause or another, then, the resort to the holy places in Palestine continued

and increased. E. g. Cassian, A.D. 424, speaks incidentally of some monks who, while he was at Bethlehem, had "come together at the holy places from parts of Egypt *orationis causa*" (*De Coenob. Instit. l. iv. c. 31*). Eudocia, the wife of Theodosius, bound herself by a vow to visit Jerusalem, if she should live to see her daughter married, which, with the consent of her husband, she fulfilled in the year 438 (*Socr. Hist. Eccl. l. vii. c. 47*). Palladius, a Galatian by birth, who had spent many years in Palestine, writing in 421, tells us that Melania the elder showed hospitality to pious persons going to visit the holy places from Persia, Britain, and almost every part of the world (*Hist. Lausiaca, c. 118*). Gregory of Tours mentions a Briton who, in his time, came to Tours on his way to Jerusalem (*Hist. Franc. l. v. c. 22*). Towards the end of the 7th century, Arculfus, a bishop of Gaul, "went to Jerusalem for the sake of the holy places," and being afterwards a guest of Adamnan, abbot of Iona, gave him an account of them. The latter put it in writing, and his work is still extant (*Acta Bened. saec. iii. p. ii*. See Bede, *Hist. Eccl. Angl. l. v. cc. 15-17*).

V. From the middle of the 4th century, or thereabouts, some other places had been acquiring such a character for holiness, as the scene of a martyr's triumph or the shrine of his relic, that they were visited by pilgrims from a distance, and even received the conventional title of *Loca Sancta*. Thus Rome was famous for the martyrdoms of St. Peter and St. Paul. St. Chrysostom, alluding to the chain with which St. Paul was bound, says, "I would be in those places, for the bonds are said to be there still. . . . I would see those bonds, at which devils are afraid and tremble, but which angels reverence" (*Hom. viii. in Ep. ad Eph. c. iv. 1*). But with him such a pilgrimage would have been only *γυμνασία πρὸς θεοσέβειαν*; for he more than once tells his hearers that they need not cross the sea, for God will hear them equally where they are. "Let us each, man and woman [remaining here at Antioch], both when gathering in church and staying in our houses, call very earnestly on God, and He will certainly answer our prayers" (*Hom. de Statuis, iii. § 5*; cf. *Hom. i. in Ep. ad Philem. c. i. 1-3*). And he claims a similar sanctity for Antioch, in which city he then lived, A.D. 388, as having been the "tabernacle of the apostles, the dwelling-place of the righteous" (*Ibid. § 3*). St. Augustine, A.D. 404, sent two persons, who accused each other of crime to a "holy place," viz. the shrine of St. Felix, at Nola, in the hope that "the more terrible workings of God" there "might drive the guilty one to confession, by punishment (divinely inflicted) or by fear" (*Ep. lxxviii. § 3*). He asks, "Is not Africa full of the bodies of holy martyrs? And yet," he adds, "we do not know that such things are done anywhere here" (*Ibid.*). Nevertheless, in the last book of the *City of God*, which was written about the beginning of the year 427, he records many wonders as wrought in Africa, within the few years previous, at the Memoriae of St. Stephen and other martyrs (*De Civ. Dei, l. xxii. c. 8*). Prudentius, himself a native of Spain, A.D. 405, celebrating the praise of two martyrs, who suffered at Calahorra in that country, says that the dwellers in that city "frequented the sand-

stained with their sacred blood, beseeching with voice, vows, gift; that foreigners, too, and the inhabitants of the whole earth came thither," and that "no one there, in his supplication, multiplied pure prayers in vain." The poet affirms that many miracles were wrought there by the power of the martyrs, and that Christ conferred that blessing on the town, when He gave their bodies to its keeping (*De Coronis*, Hymn I.). We must remember that the writer is a poet, but hardly more could have been said of a popular shrine in the 9th century.

VI. Probably not very long after the time of these writers, a custom began of sending penitents to various shrines (*ad limina sanctorum*), partly as a penance, and partly that they might more effectually obtain the intercession of the martyr of the place. Most writers, following Morinus (*De Sacram. Poenit.* l. vii. c. 15), have supposed that this form of penance was not in use till the 7th century; but a passage in one of the Homilies of Caesarius of Arles (A.D. 502), first printed by Baluzius in 1669, implies that it was known in France, at least, before the close of the 5th:—"Frequenting the thresholds of the saints, they (penitents) would ask for aid against their own sins, and, persevering in fastings and prayers, or in almsgiving, would strive rather to punish than to nourish, or add to, those sins" (*Hom.* iii. p. 23). The great evils to which this practice would soon lead are obvious, and we need only, in conclusion, cite a canon of the council of Châlons-sur-Saône, A.D. 813, by which Charlemagne and his advisers sought to restrain them:—"A great mistake is made by some, who unadvisedly travel to Rome or Tours (to the shrine of St. Martin), and some other places, under pretext of prayer. There are presbyters, and deacons, and others of the clergy, who, living carelessly, think that they are purged from their sins and entitled to discharge their ministry, if they reach the aforesaid places. There are also laymen who think that they sin, or have sinned, with impunity, because they frequent these places for prayer." Some of the powerful, it adds, under pretext of a journey to Rome or Tours "for the sake of prayer or visiting the holy places," oppressed the poor by their exactions, while many of the poor made such pilgrimages an occasion of begging with more success: some falsely pretending to be on their way to the holy places, others going there in the belief that they would be "cleansed from sins by the mere sight" of them (*can. xlv. Conc. Cabil. II.*). [W. E. S.]

**HOLY SPIRIT.** The dove is the invariable and exclusive symbol which expresses special manifestation of the presence of the Third Person of the Trinity, and the article under that word will be found to contain some information as to the use of the symbol in this its highest sense. Luke iii. 22, Matt. iii. 16, Mark i. 10. The baptistery of St. Pontianus, in the catacomb of that name (Aringhi ii. 275), contains one of the earliest of these paintings of the Holy Dove, referable to the early 7th century; but the Lateran cross is reputed to be of the period immediately succeeding Constantine, and is a yet more striking example. [See DOVE, p. 576.]

[R. St. J. T.]

**HOLY TABLE.** [ALTAR.]

**HOLY THINGS.** [ECCLESIASTICAE RES.]

**HOLY THURSDAY.** [ASCENSION DAY.]

**HOLY WATER.** I. The use of lustral water in the Christian church appears to have had a manifold origin.

(1) At an early period we find FOUNTAINS, or basins, supplied with fresh water, near the principal doors of churches, especially in the East, that they who entered might wash their hands at least [see HANDS, WASHING OF], before they worshipped. There can be no doubt that the ritual use of water under the name of holy water (*aqua benedicta*, *ἁγίασμα*, *ὕδατα εὐλογίας*, &c.) arose in a great measure from the undue importance which naturally attached itself to this custom, as ignorance and superstition began to prevail amid the troubles of the Western empire.

(2) Again, under the Mosaic law a person legally unclean was not restored to social intercourse, and to communion in prayer and sacrifice, until he had been sprinkled with the water of separation, and had "washed his clothes and bathed himself in water" (*Numb. xix.*; compare *Ezekiel xxxvi. 25*).

(3) The courts of heathen temples were commonly provided with water for purification; but it is probable that as a belief in the gods declined through the influence of Christianity, many would neglect to use it as they entered. Hence, we may suppose, the custom for a priest to sprinkle them at the door, lest any should present themselves unpurified. An instance is mentioned by Sozomen. When Julian was about to enter a temple in Gaul, a "priest holding green boughs wet with water sprinkled those who went in after the Grecian manner" (*Hist. Eccl.* l. vi. c. 6). This bore such a resemblance to the later rite of Christians as to mislead one transcriber of the work of Sozomen, and induce him to substitute *Ἐκκλησιαστικῶ*, *Ecclesiastical*, for *Ἑλληνικῶ*, *Grecian* (*Annot. Vales. in loco.* p. 109).

(4) We may add that the notion of a lustration by water prevailed also among the earliest heretics. Some of the Gnostics threw oil and water on the head of the dying to make them invisible to the powers of darkness (*Iren. Haeres.* l. i. c. 2, § 5). The Ebionites immersed themselves in water daily (*Epiphan. Haer. xxx. § 16*). The founder of the sect is said by Epiphanius to have been wont to plunge into the nearest water, salt or fresh, if by chance he met one of the other sex (*ibid.* § 2).

II. Many miracles are said to have been wrought by means of water, and to this also we attribute a certain influence in giving both authority and shape to the superstitions which arose with regard to holy water. Count Joseph in the time of Constantine the Great, sprinkled an insane person with water over which he had made the sign of the cross, and his reason was restored (*Epiphan. u. s. § 10*). We are told that by the same means he dispersed the enchantments by which the Jews sought to hinder the erection of a church at Tiberias (*ibid.* § 12). An evil spirit who hindered the destruction of the temple of Jupiter at Apamea, A.D. 385, was, according to Theodoret, driven away by the use of water which the bishop had blessed with the sign of the cross (*Hist. Eccl.* l. v. c. 21; *Cassiod.*

*Hist. Tripart.* l. ix. c. 34). Gregory of Tours describes a certain recluse named Eusitius (A.D. 532), in the diocese of Limoges, as so gifted with power to cure those afflicted with quartan fever, that by "giving them water to drink merely blessed (by him), he restored them forthwith to health" (*De Glor. Confess.* c. 82). Water from a well dug by St. Martin "gave health to many sick," and in particular cured a brother of St. Yriez, who was dying of fever (*De Mir. S. Martini*, l. ii. c. 39); and many were in like manner said to have been healed by the waters of a spring at Brioude, in Auvergne, in which the head of the martyr Julian (A.D. 304) had been washed (*Mirac.* l. ii. c. 3; see also cc. 25, 26, and the *Liber de Passione S. Juliani*). The same author relates how a certain bishop "sent water that had been blessed to a house" in which many had died of fever, and how, "when it was sprinkled on the walls, all sickness was forthwith driven away" (*Vitae Patrum*, c. iv. § 3).

III. The tendency to ascribe virtue to water blessed by the priest, was without doubt greatly promoted by a superstition with regard to baptism, and by the use sometimes made of the water employed at it. St. Augustine, writing in 408, says that some persons in his day brought their children to be baptized not for the sake of any spiritual benefit, but "because they thought that they would by this remedy retain or recover their bodily health" (*Ep.* xciii. § 5, *ad Bonif. Com.*). In the last book of the *City of God*, written about the year 427, the same father tells us of two persons who were at their baptism suddenly and entirely cured of very serious maladies of long continuance (*lib.* xxii. c. 8, §§ 4, 5). It was but a short step from belief in such miracles to suppose that the water used at a baptism might have virtue available for the benefit of others than those who were baptized in it. It would be often tested, and several alleged results of the trial are on record. At Osset, near Seville, was a font in the form of a cross, which, according to Gregory of Tours, was every year miraculously filled with water for the Easter baptisms. From this font, after it had been duly exorcised and sprinkled with chrism, every one "carried away a vessel full for the safety of his house, and with a view to protect his fields and vineyards by that most wholesome aspersion" (*Mirac.* l. i. c. 24; see also *Hist. Franc.* l. vi. c. 43). A mother put on the mouth of her daughter, who was dumb from birth, "water which she had sometime taken from the fonts blessed" (by St. Martin), and she became capable of speech (*De Mirac. S. Mart.* l. ii. c. 38).

In the East, even in the time of St. Chrysostom, the water from the baptisms at the Epiphany was carefully kept throughout the year, and believed to remain without putrefaction. "This is the day on which Christ was baptized, and hallowed the element of water. Wherefore at midnight on this feast, all draw of the waters and store them up at home, because on this day the waters were consecrated. And a manifest miracle takes place, in that the nature of those waters is not corrupted by length of time" (*De Bapt. Christi*, § 2). In the West two centuries or so later we find a similar reservation, practised at Rome at least, but, as might be expected, with a more definite purpose. There, after the consecration of the water on Easter

eve, "The whole people, whoever wished, took a blessing (*benedictionem*; compare the use of *ἀγιασμός*) in their vessels of the water itself, before the children were baptized in it, to sprinkle about their houses, and vineyards, and fields, and fruits" (*Ordo Rom.* i. § 42; *Musar. Ital.* tom. ii. p. 26). It will be observed that the water was now considered holy for this purpose after being blessed, and before any one had been baptized in that font. It was an easy transition from this stage of practice and belief to the benediction of water without any reference to baptism, which should nevertheless have the same power of protecting and benefitting house, field, and person, that was ascribed to water taken from the baptismal font.

IV. The earliest example of an independent benediction of water for the above-mentioned uses occurs in the so-called *Apostolical Constitutions*, but there can be no doubt of its being one of the corrupt additions made to the original recension probably in the 5th century. "Let the bishop bless water and oil. If he is not present let the presbyter bless it, in the presence of the deacon. But if the bishop be there, let the presbyter and deacon assist. And let him say thus: 'Lord of Sabaoth, God of hosts, creator of the waters and giver of the oil . . . who hast given water for drink and cleansing, and oil to cheer the face . . . Thyself now by Christ sanctify this water and the oil . . . and give it virtue imparting health, expelling diseases, putting to flight devils, scattering every evil design, through Christ,' &c. (*lib.* viii. c. 29). From Balsamon we learn that holy water was "made" in the Greek church at the beginning of every lunar month. The observance of any festival at the new moon was forbidden by the council of Constantinople, A.D. 691; and he regarded this rite as in some manner a substitute for that relic of heathenism. "Owing to this decree of the canon, the feast of the new moon has ceased from time beyond memory, and instead of it, by the grace of God, propitiatory prayers to God and benedictions (*ἀγιασμοί*) by the faithful people have place at the beginning of every month, and we are anointed with the waters of blessing, not of strife" (*Comm. in Can.* lxx.).

In the West the earliest mention of holy water not blessed for baptism, occurs in one of the Forged Decretals, ascribed to Alexander I., A.D. 109, but composed probably about 830. It is certain, however, that these fictitious orders, put forth in the names of early bishops of Rome, did not, except possibly in a very few cases, create the practices which they pretended to regulate. The rite existed before, at least in some locality familiar to the author of the fraud. The following decree, therefore, is witness, we may assume, to a custom already of some standing. "We bless water sprinkled with salt, that all being therewith besprinkled may be sanctified and purified. Which also we command to be done by all priests" (*Gratian*, p. iii. *De Cons.* d. iii. c. 20). In the same century Leo IV., A.D. 847, in a charge to his clergy, says, "Every Lord's day before mass bless water wherewith the people may be sprinkled, and for this have a proper vessel" (*Conc. Labb.* tom. viii. col. 37). The same order occurs in three similar "synodal charges" of about the same period, which have been printed by Baluze (*App. ad lib. Legationum*

*de Eccl. Discipl.* pp. 503, 6, 9). In a "visitation article" of the 9th century, it is asked whether the presbyter blesses water, as directed, every Sunday (*Ibid.* p. 10). Hincmar of Rheims, the contemporary of Leo, after directions similar to his, adds a permission that all who wish may carry some of the water home "in their own clean vessels, and sprinkle it over their dwellings, and fields, and vineyards, over their cattle also, and their provender, and likewise over their own meat and drink" (cap. v. *Conc. Labb.* tom. viii. col. 570).

We have argued in effect that the prevalence of a custom in the 9th century implies that it was, to say the least, not unknown in the 8th. In the present case we have a direct proof beside. In the Pontifical of Egbert (p. 34; Surtees Society, 1853), who was archbishop of York from 732 to 766, are forms of prayer for exorcising and blessing the water to be used in the consecration of a church. Referring to the Gelasian Sacramentary (*Liturgia Rom. Vet.* Murat. tom. i. col. 738), we find the same forms to be used over water for the purification of any house, the exorcism only being adapted by Egbert to the occasion. The same benediction occurs in the Gregorian Sacramentary, and an abbreviated form of the same previous exorcism (*Ibid.* tom. ii. col. 225). As it is almost certain that Egbert borrowed his formulæ from a Roman source, we infer that the office for making holy water was in the Roman Sacramentaries a century before the practice was enjoined, as we have seen, by Leo IV. It should be mentioned that the headings of these prayers speak only of water "to be sprinkled in a house," and they were obviously drawn up with reference to that only (Murat. tom. i. col. 738); but as they are followed closely (as in the modern *Rituale*) by benedictions of new fruits, &c. (*Ibid.* col. 742; tom. ii. col. 231), and no other express benediction of water is prescribed (except in the Gelasian, for the dispersion of thunder), we may perhaps infer that water once blessed for one purpose was considered available for general use. In all the offices to which reference has been made, the salt which is to be mixed with the water is itself previously exorcised and blessed. [W. E. S.]

**HOLY WEEK** [EASTER EVE, MAUNDY THURSDAY, GOOD FRIDAY]. The week immediately preceding the great festival of Easter, commencing with Palm Sunday, and including the anniversaries of the institution of the Lord's Supper, the Passion, and Resurrection of Christ was observed with peculiar solemnity from the early ages of the church (Chrysost. *Hom.* xxx. in *Genes.*; *Hom.* in *Ps.* cxlv.). It was designated by various names—*ἑβδομάς μεγάλη*, *ἁγία*, or *τῶν ἁγίων*; *Hebdomas major, sancta*, the former being the earlier title in the Western church (*Missal. Ambros.* apud Pamel. p. 359) *authentica* (*ibid.*) *ultima* (i. e. of Lent) (*Ambros. Epist.* 33). From the restriction as to food then enjoined it was called *ἑβδ. ξηροφάγίας* (Epiph. *Haer.* lxx. 12) *Hebdomas Xerophagias*: as commemorating our Lord's sufferings, *ἑβδ. τῶν ἁγίων πάθων*; *ἡμέραι παθημάτων*, *σταυρώσιμαι*; *Hebd. roenosa, luctuosa, nigra, lamentationum*: from the cessation of business, *ἑβδ. ἀπρακτος*, *Hebd. muta*: and as ushering in the Paschal absolution, *Hebdomas Indulgentiae*.

The observance of Holy Week belongs to very early, if not to primitive, antiquity. As the historian Socrates has justly remarked (*H. E.* v. 22), no commemorative seasons were appointed by the apostles, or found any place in the ritual of the apostolic church. But as Easter naturally succeeded to the commemoration of the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egypt, so the anniversary of the passion took the place of that of the slaying of the paschal lamb, while the sanctity of these holy days was gradually extended to the whole week preceding Easter, which therefore assumed a special character in the Christian year. The observance of Holy Week is accordingly closely connected with that of Easter, and is probably but little later in its origin. The earliest notice of Holy Week, which speaks of it as universally accepted, is in the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which represent the Eastern custom towards the end of the 3rd century. About the same time, c. 260, Dionysius of Alexandria also mentions it as of universal observance. If we may accept as genuine the ordinance of Constantine the Great given by Scaliger (*de Emendat. Temp.* p. 776) and Beveridge (*Pandect.* ii. 163) the sanctity of this week as well as of the succeeding one was consulted by enforced abstinence from public business at the beginning of the fourth century. The whole week was, as far as possible, kept as a strict fast, from midnight on Palm Sunday till cockcrow on Easter Day.

By the *Apostolical Constitutions* (v. 18, 19), abstinence from wine and flesh was commanded, and the diet restricted to bread, and salt, and vegetables, with water as a beverage. Total abstinence was enjoined on Friday and Saturday, or at least on Saturday "when the bridegroom shall have been taken from them," while on the other days of the week no food was to be eaten till 3 p.m. or the evening, according to ability. The fast was observed in this manner in the time of Dionysius of Alexandria (c. A.D. 260), who in his canonical epistle speaks of some who fasted through the whole six days (*ἡμέρας πᾶσας ὑπερτιθέασιν ἄσιτοι διατελοῦντες*), others, two, three, or four days, according to power of physical endurance; while some kept no fast at all, and others faring delicately during the first four days sought to make up for their self-indulgence by excessive strictness on Friday and Saturday (Dionys. Alex. *Ep. Canon.*, Routh. *Reliq. Sacr.* iii. 229). Epiphanius describes the practice in his days almost in the same words (*ὑπερτιθέμενοι διατέλουν*); some, he adds, ate every two days, others every evening (Epiph. *Haeres* xxix. 5; *Expos. Fid.* 22). Tertullian speaks of the continuous fasts of this week in the phrases *jejunia conjungere*, *Sabbatum continuare jejuniis Parasceves*. (Tertull. *de Patient.* 13; *de Jejun.* 14.) Epiphanius in another place describes the bodily mortifications practised this week, such as sleeping on the ground, strict continence, watchings, xerophagy, &c., and charges the Arians with passing the time in jollity and merriment (Epiph. *Haeres.* lxxv. 3). Sozomen (*H. E.* i. 11) relates an anecdote of Spyridon, bishop of Trimythus in Cyprus, illustrating the habit of continuous fasting, *ἐπισυνάπτειν τὴν νηστείαν*, at this season. All work was as far as possible laid aside, and business, private and public, suspended during the week. From the time of



Theodosius (A.D. 389) actions at law ceased, and the doors of the courts were closed for seven days before and after Easter (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. ii. tit. viii.; *De Fer. leg.* ii. [see Gothofred's *Commentary*, vol. i. p. 124]; *Cod. Justin.* lib. iii. tit. xii.; *de Fer. legg.* vii. viii.; August. *Serm.* xix.; Ed. Bened. vol. i. p. 741). Those in prison for debt and other offences, with the exception of those guilty of more heinous crimes, were ordered to be released by a law of Valentinian's, A.D. 367, the earliest of the kind, according to Gothofred *Comment.* vol. ii. p. 273 (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. ix. tit. xxxviii.; *de Indulg. Crim. legg.* iii. iv.; Ambros. *Epist.* 33; Chrysost. *u. s.*). Slaves were manumitted, and there was a general cessation from labour during this and the following week, not only to afford the servants rest but also opportunity of instruction in the elements of the faith (*Apost. Constit.* viii. 33; Greg. Nyssen. *Hom. III. de Resurr.* tom. iii. p. 420; *Cod. Justin.* lib. iii. tit. xii.; *de Fer. leg.* viii.). The week was also distinguished by liberal almsgiving (Chrysost. *u. s.*).

The observance of the week may be said to have commenced with the preceding Saturday, when, with reference to John xii. 1-9, the church commemorated the raising of Lazarus—an event assigned erroneously by Epiphanius to that day (Epiphani. *Homil. eis τὰ Βαΐα* tom. ii. pp. 152, 153; Neale *Eastern Ch.* ii. 747). The Gallican liturgies commemorated this miracle the next day (Palm Sunday), known therefore as *Dominica Lazari*, as appears from the collects of the *Missale Gallicum Vetus*, and the *Sacram. Gallicanum* (Muratori ii. 718, 834). On the Saturday the pope was accustomed to give special alms at St. Peter's, in allusion to Christ's words spoken that day (Mar. xiv. 7). (*Comes Hieronymi* apud Pamel. ii. 21; *Sacram. Gregor.* ib. 244.)

The Sunday next before Easter, the first day of Holy Week, was distinguished by many different names. The earliest and most constant, indicating the great event of the day, being *Palm Sunday*; *κυριακή, ἑορτὴ τῶν Βαλῶν*; ἡ βασιφόρος ἑορτὴ; *Dominica Palmarum*, or in *Palmis*, *Florum*, or *Ramorum*, or *Osanna*. A later appellation derived from the same event was *Pascha florum*, or *floridum*. From the Easter absolution which followed it was known as *Dominica indulgentias*; and with reference to the great Paschal baptism, *Pascha petitem*, or *competentium* (*Ordo Romanus*), while the mass was styled *Missa in Symboli traditione*, because on this day, or according to the Ambrosian rite the day before (*Miss. Ambros.* apud Pamel. i. 336) the creed was recited to the *competentes*, or candidates for baptism, to be learnt by Easter eve, as was ordained by the 13th canon of the council of Agde, A.D. 506 (Labbe, *Concil.* iv. 1385; cf. *Isid. de Eccl. Off.* i. 27. ii. 21). The works of Augustine and other fathers contain sermons delivered on this and the following days to the *competentes* in exposition of the creed (Aug. *Serm. de Temp.* 113-135). Palm Sunday was also called *capitilavium* because on that day the heads of the catechumens were washed in preparation for baptism and confirmation (Raban. *De Inst. Cler.* c. 35).

The ceremony of the benediction of the palm branches, or other branches that were substituted for them, especially olive boughs, appears in the *Sacramentary* of Gregory, where it has a special

collect (Pamel. ii. 245). The jubilant processions which have long formed so characteristic a part of the ritual of Palm Sunday in the East as in the West, are mentioned by Gregory Nyssen (*l. c.*) and were introduced almost universally by the end of the 7th century (Augusti *Habch. der Christ. Arch.* vii. 338).

Each day in this Holy Week was one of special sanctity, designated *μεγάλη δευτέρα, μεγάλη τρίτη, &c.* (Bevereg. *Pandect.* ii. 163), the observances gradually rising in solemnity to the Thursday in *Cena Domini* [MAUNDY THURSDAY], and the Friday, *Passio Domini* [GOOD FRIDAY]. The history of our Lord's Passion was recited on successive days, beginning with that by St. Matthew on Palm Sunday, and closing with that by St. John on Good Friday. [E. V.]

**HOMICIDE** (*Homicidium*, φόρος). Murder was regarded by the church as one of the gravest crimes. It is joined by Cyprian (*de Pat.* c. 9) with adultery and fraud, by Pacian (*Paraen. ad Poenit.* c. 9) with fornication and idolatry, by Augustine (*de Fid. et Op.* c. 19) also with fornication and idolatry, as one of the three mortal sins which were always to be visited with excommunication. By the laws of the Christian emperors murderers were expressly excepted from the general pardons granted to criminals on occasions of great festivals (*Cod. Theod.* IX. xxxviii. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8), and were refused the right of appeal (*ibid.* XI. xxxvi. 1). In some dioceses the peace of the church was denied for ever to wilful murderers (Tert. *de Pudicit.* c. 12; Gregor. *Thaumat. Can. Ep.* c. 7, Comp. Cyprian *Ep. 55 ad Anton.* on the practice of some of his predecessors with reference to the other great crime of adultery). But in general a murderer was re-admitted to the church after a long term of exclusion. By a decree of the council of Ancyra A.D. 314, c. 22, this term was lifelong; by Gregory of Nyssa (*Ep. ad Letoi.*) it was fixed at twenty-seven years; by Basil (*ad Amphil.* c. 56) at twenty. In the Penitential of Theodore (l. iv. 1), a murder committed to revenge a relation, was punished by seven or ten years' penance; but if restitution was made to the next of kin, half the term was remitted. If one layman slew another (*ibid.* c. 4), he must either relinquish arms or do penance seven years, three of them without wine and flesh; but (*ibid.* c. 5) if a monk or one of the inferior clergy was slain, the slayer must either relinquish arms and serve God the remainder of his life, or do penance seven years, as the bishop should direct; if a presbyter or bishop was the victim, the matter was to be brought before the king (Bed. *Penitent.* iv. 1-8, Egbert *Poenitent.* iv. 10, 11). In the *Dialogue* of Egbert (Haddan and Stubbs *Councils and Eccl. Doc.* iii. 403), there is some variety in the penalty; a layman who slew a bishop was to pay the fine and submit to the term of penance a council should appoint, if he slew a priest the fine was to be eighty shillings; if a deacon, sixty; if a monk, forty. The ecclesiastical law in these instances being in accordance with the well-known system of early English jurisprudence, which allowed homicide and every variety of personal injury to be expiated by money payments. See the laws of Ethelbert, between A.D. 597, and 604, on the payments to be made for murders (cc. 5-7, 13).

and for injuries to the person (cc. 33-72). The laws of Ine of Wessex A.D. 690 (c. 76), contain the provision that if a man slew another's godson or godfather, he must pay "bot" (fine to justice), as well as "wer" (recompence to kindred); and that if the slain was a bishop's son (i.e. confirmation son), only half the payment was to be exacted. For a full account of the laws on injuries to the person, see Turner *Angl-Saxons*, vol. ii. pp. 436-447, ed. 1852.

Murder joined with other great crimes was more severely punished. One who used magical arts to slay another, thereby adding idolatry to murder, was denied communion even at the last (*Conc. Eliber.* c. 6). The same sentence was decreed against a woman who added murder to adultery by slaying the offspring which she had conceived in the absence of her husband (*ibid.* c. 63), and the council of Lerida A.D. 523, more than two centuries after that of Eliberis, when the terms of penance had become much easier, assigned (c. 2) a lifelong exclusion to any who used sorcery to get rid of the offspring of adultery. In an English Penitential code (Theodor. *Poenitent.* l. vii. 1) the punishment of homicide combined with adultery, was seclusion in a monastery for life. The parricide or the slayer of any near blood relation was, by the civil law (*Cod. Theod.* l. x. xv. 1), in imitation of the old Roman custom, to be sewn in a sack with serpents and thrown into the water; and if this were generally executed there would be no opportunity for the early church to attach any special stigma to the crime. In England a woman who slew her son, was to do penance fifteen years, with no relaxation except on the Lord's day (Theodor. *Poenitent.* l. xiv. 25). The parricide or fratricide was assigned by some seven years, by others fourteen, of which half were to be passed in exile (Egbert *Poenitent.* iv. 10).

The modern distinction between murder and manslaughter was not invariably observed. In the council of Ancyra A.D. 314 (cc. 22-23) a shorter term is imposed upon involuntary than upon wilful homicide. But in the canonical epistle of Gregory of Nyssa involuntary homicide is explained to mean that which occurs through simple accident; but homicide which is the result of passion, is treated as if it were wilful murder, even if deliberation and intention, which constitute the legal crime of murder, are absent. The distinction however appears in the Penitential of Theodore, where it is decreed (l. iv. 7) that if a man kills another by accident, he shall do penance one year; if in a passion, three years; if over the wine cup, four years; if in strife, ten. Homicide committed at the command of a master or in war was to be subject (*ibid.* l. iv. 6) to forty days' penance. The chastisement of a slave with such severity that he died, which was a crime on the borderland of manslaughter and murder, was not dealt with so severely as wilful homicide (*Conc. Eliber.* c. 5, *Conc. Epauon.* c. 34).

Causing abortion in any stage of conception, or taking or even administering drugs for that purpose, was treated as a form of murder, and a long period of penance was allotted to it (Tert. *Apolog.* c. 9; Basil *ad Amphiloc.* cc. 2, 8; *Conc. Ancyra.* c. 21; *Conc. Nicaea.* c. 2; *Conc. in Trull.* c. 91). But that there was some laxity of

opinion on the crime, appears from one of the English Penitentials (Bed. *Poenitent.* iv. 12), which excludes from communion for a longer term a woman who procured abortion in order to conceal her shame, than one who did so because she was too poor to maintain her child. Closely allied to this crime was the EXPOSING OF INFANTS. [See that head.]

Anger and strife as tending to murder (Matt. v. 22) were brought under discipline. In the African church (*Stat. Eccl. Antiq.* c. 93, ed. Bruns) the oblations of those who were at enmity with their brethren were received neither at the altar nor in the common treasury, and they were consequently excluded from communion. A similar decree prevailed in the Gallic church (2 *Conc. Arelat.* c. 50), those who broke out into open strife were to be removed from all church assemblies till they were reconciled. The discipline of the English church was more in accordance with the practice of the Anglo-Saxon law. He who wounded another in strife was to pay him a recompence, and help to support him till he had recovered, and do half a year's penance; if he was unable to support him, the penance was to extend to a whole year (Bed. *Poenitent.* iv. 9). [G. M.]

**HOMILY AND HOMILIARIUM.** The word *ὁμιλία* designates generally "intercourse," implying the interchange of thought and feeling by words. In a special sense, it is used for the instruction which a philosopher gave his pupils in familiar conversation (Xenophon, *Mem.* l. ii. 6 and 15). In this sense of "familiar instruction" it passed into Christian usage. Thus St. Luke uses the word *ὁμιλήσας* of the same address which he had previously described by the word *διαλεγόμενος* (Acts x. 9, 11). Compare Euseb. *H.E.* vi. 19, § 17. Photius (*Biblioth.* no. 174, 4, in Suicer's *Thes.* s. v.) notices that the discourses of Chrysostom were properly called *ὁμιλῆαι*, rather than *λόγοι*, as being simple, inartificial, popular addresses, in a style rather conversational than formal, while a *λόγος* was constructed according to the rules of art, and with a certain dignity and elevation of style. Similarly the French *Conférence*. The council of Ancyra (c. 1) A.D. 314, forbidding presbyters who have sacrificed to idols *προσφέρειν ἢ ὁμιλεῖν ἢ ὁλως λειτουργεῖν* seems to use the word *ὁμιλεῖν* as the common technical expression for the address of the presbyter in the liturgy.

Probably the earliest extant addresses commonly called *Homilies* are those of Origen, who (if he himself applied the term to his discourses) no doubt took it from the schools of philosophy.

The word seemingly did not pass into common use in Latin before the fifth century; for Victor Vitensis (*Persec. Vandal.* i. 3, p. 10, Ruinart), writing towards the end of that century, speaks of Augustine's popular addresses, "quos Græci *homilias* vocant," as if "homilia" were still to some extent strange to his Latin readers.

Augustine had himself made a similar explanation of the word (*On Ps.* 118 [119], Pref.; *Epist.* 2, *ad Quodvultdeum*). And he also supplies abundant evidence that these homilies were intentionally careless and colloquial in style. So long as all are instructed (he says), let us not fear the critics (*Serm.* 37, c. 10, p. 187); let



Durandus uses (*Rationale*, vi. 1. §§ 28, 32) the form *Homiliarius* [i.e. Liber] as well as *Homeliarius*.

(Binterim's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, iv. 3.340 ff.; Wetzler and Welte's *Kirchenlexicon*, v. 307; Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, 290 ff.; Ranke in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1855, ii. p. 387 ff.) [C.]

**HONEY AND MILK.** 1. The giving of honey and milk to a person newly baptised, as a symbol of the nourishment of the renewed soul, has already been mentioned [BAPTISM, § 66, p. 164].

2. Among the things enumerated by the *Apostolical Canons* (c. 3), which the bishop is forbidden to bring to the altar [or sanctuary], are honey and milk. The 24th canon of the third council of Carthage also excludes honey and milk from the offerings on the altar, in that it forbids anything to be placed upon it but bread and wine mixed with water. But the 27th of the African canons, repeating this, adds: "Primitiae vero, seu mel et lac quod uno die sollemnissimo in infantum mysterio solet offerri, quamvis in altari offerantur, suam tamen habeant propriam benedictionem, ut a sacramento Domini Corporis et sanguinis distinguantur; nec amplius in primitiis offeratur quam de uvis et frumentis." It is evident from this, that at the time when these canons were drawn up, the custom had arisen of placing on the altar the honey and milk for the neophytes at Easter, and (apparently) of consecrating them with the bread and wine. It is this latter practice which is here forbidden; the honey and milk are to have a benediction of their own, but not that given to the eucharistic elements. At the end of the seventh century the placing of honey and milk on the altar was wholly forbidden (*Conc. in Trullo*, c. 57; cf. c. 28).

(Bingham, *Ant.* XV. ii. 3; Van Espen, *Jus Eccl.* iii. 329, 414; ed. Colon. 1777.) [C.]

**HONOR.** 1. The word is used specially of ecclesiastical dignities or orders. Thus Optatus of Milevis (c. *Donat.* ii. 24) says, speaking of the attempts of the Donatists to annul the orders of Catholic priests, "quid prodest quod vivi sunt homines et occisi sunt honores a vobis?" So Augustine, *Adv. Epist. Parmen.* ii. 11; and *Conc. Arelat.* IV. cc. 1 and 2. In Charles the Great's *Capitularies* (v. 8), "honorabilis persona" is used apparently to distinguish one in major orders from "ecclesiastici viri" who were only in minor orders (Ducange, s. v.).

2. The second council of Braga, A.D. 572, lays down (c. 2) that no bishop making a visitation of his diocese should take anything from the churches besides the customary honorarium to the see (praeter honorem cathedrae suae) of two solidi. We may perhaps discern here the germ of the later use, according to which "honor" means a benefice. [C.]

**HONORATUS.** (1) Bishop of Arles (†429 A.D.); commemorated Jan. 16 (*Mart.* Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) [DEMETRIUS (3).]

[W. F. G.]

**HOOD** (κουκοῦλλον, κουκούλιον, κούκουλλα, καπούτζιον, ἕνεα μαλαύχη; capitium, capitium,

\* Dapin reads, "quia vivunt homines, et honore a vobis ecclesiastici viri?"

cucullus, cuculla, cucullio, capa, cappi). Garments intended for outdoor wear were very frequently provided with a hood as a protection for the head against rain or cold, which might be drawn forward when need required, or might be allowed to fall back upon the shoulders. This would of course be ordinarily, but not necessarily, attached to the dress. The *lucerna*, for example, was generally furnished with a hood or cowl (see e.g. Martial xiv. 132, 139; and cf. Juvenal vi. 117, 330; viii. 145); so also was the *caracalla*, which was introduced into Rome from Gaul, and from which the emperor Aurelius Antoninus derives the name by which he is ordinarily known. Jerome refers to it by way of illustration in his description of the ephod of the Jewish high-priest, "in modum caracallarum, sed absque cucullis" (*Epist.* 64 ad Fabiolam, § 15; vol. i. 364, ed. Vallarsi), where the last words imply what was the ordinary fashion of it. A hood was also the appendage of the *casula*, which Isidore (*de Origin.* xix. 24) describes as *vestis cucullata*; of the *colobion* (see e.g. Honorius Augustodunensis, *Gemma Animae*, i. 211; *Patrol.* clxxii. 607), and of the *cope* (see e.g. Durandus, *Rat. Div. Off.* iii. 1. 13, who speaking of the symbolism associated with the *pluviale*, or *cappa*, adds "habet etiam caputium, quod est supernum gaudium"). As regards the last of these, we may take this opportunity of remarking that Isidore (*de Origin.* xix. 31) uses the word *cappa* distinctly in the sense of hood, "cappa . . . quia capitis ornamentum est." As an example of this more restricted meaning of the word, we may cite a remark in a letter of Paulus Diaconus, in the name of abbot Theodemar, to Charlemagne as to the dress of the monks of Monte Cassino, "illud autem vestimentum, quod a Gallicanis monachis cuculla dicitur, et nos capam vocamus . . ." (Pauli Diac. *Epist.* i.; *Patrol.* xcvi. 1587). He had just before remarked that the word *cuculla* with them meant the same dress "quam alio nomine casulam vocamus." A later instance is found in the records of a council of Metz (A.D. 888), which enjoins the use of the *capa* (in the sense of hood) to monks and forbids it to laymen (can. 6, Labb. ix. 414). An earlier council, that of Aix-la-Chapelle (A.D. 816), had restricted the use of the *cuculla* to monks, excluding other ecclesiastics (can. 125, Labb. viii. 1395). It may be added here that the congress of Gallican abbots and monks, held at the same place in the following year, carefully fixed the size of the cowl, "mensura cucullae duobus consistat cubitis" (cap. 21; *op. cit.* 1508). With reference to the foregoing prohibitions, it may be mentioned that the Theodosian code had expressly permitted to slaves, with certain exceptions, the use of the *byrrus* and *cucullus* (*Cod. Theodos.* lib. xiv. tit. 10, l. 1).

The most prominent instance of the use of the hood is to be found in that of the monastic cowl, which is frequently referred to in various Rules, and which formed a special part of the monkish dress at least as early as the time of Jerome. The hermit Hilarion was, according to this father, buried "in tunica cilicina et cuculla" (*Vita S. Hilar.* cc. 44, 46; vol. ii. 39, 40, ed. Vallarsi). We meet with several allusions to the *cuculla* in Jerome's translation of the Rule of the Egyptian Pachomius (see e.g. cc. 81, 91, 99,



*op. cit.* 67, sqq.). Thus the monks in this system were to have two cowls, which were to bear tokens indicative of the particular monastery, and without his cowl and "pellicula" no monk was to appear at divine service or at meals. The Rule of St. Benedict allowed to each monk, in the case of dwellers in temperate climates, a frock and hood (*cuculla*), the latter to be "in hyeme villosa. in aestate pura aut vetusta" (*Reg. S. Bened.* c. 55; in Holstenius, *Codex Regularum*, pt. ii. p. 32; ed. Paris, 1663). The same distinction between hoods for summer and winter wear is also found in the Rule of St. Fructuosus (c. 4; *op. cit.* p. 139), which allows a couple to each monk, "villata et simplex." The *Regula Magistri* lays down a wholesome provision as to the hoods and frocks of the monks who discharged the weekly office of cook (c. 81; *op. cit.* p. 257). The word *cuculla* passed from Latin into Greek, where it appears as *κουκούλλιον*, etc. Thus, for example, it is mentioned in connection with the monastic dress by Sozomen (*Hist. Eccles.* iii. 14, where he remarks on the Egyptian monks), Pseudo-Athanasius (*de Virginitate*, c. 11; vol. ii. 116, ed. Montfaucon), and by Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople (ob. 740, A.D.), who also appears to allude to the cross on the cowl, still worn by bishops and *σταυρόφοροι* in the Greek church (*Historia Ecclesiastica et Mystica Contemplatio*; *Patrol. Gr.* xcvi. 396). The name *ἑνω καμηλαύχιον* (variously spelled) is given to the hood which covers the under headdress (*κάτω καμηλαύχιον*) worn by a Greek patriarch who has been a member of a monastic order (see Ducange's *Glossarium Graec.* s.v. *καμελαύκιον*). An illustration of this may be seen in Goar's *Euchologion* (p. 156; cf. also p. 518), where the patriarch Bekkus is thus figured. This name, however, belongs to a date subsequent to our period.

We may briefly refer in passing to the hood worn after baptism, which is spoken of in connection with the white baptismal robe, but as distinct from it (see e.g. Theodulf, bishop of Orleans [ob. 821 A.D.], *de Ordine Baptismi*, c. 16; *Patrol.* cv. 234; Jesse Ambianensis [ob. 836 A.D.], *Epist. de Baptismo*, ib. 790; Rabanus Maurus, *de Inst. Cler.* i. 29; *Patrol.* cvii. 313). We may perhaps further refer to an epistle of Gregory the Great, who blames one Peter, a Jew, for having on the day after his baptism entered a synagogue and placed there, among other things, "birrum album, quo de fonte resurgens indutus fuerat" (*Epist.* lib. ix. ep. 6; vol. iii. 930, ed. Bened.). For further remarks on this species of hood, reference may be made to Martene, *de Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, i. 54, ed. Venice, 1783; Ducange's *Glossarium Graec.* s.v. *κούκουλλα*; Goar's *Euchologion*, p. 366. [R. S.]

#### HOPE. [SOPHIA.]

**HOROLOGIIUM** (*ὥρολόγιον*). An office book of the Greek church, containing the daily hours of prayer, and certain other forms, and which therefore corresponds in a general manner, though with important differences, to the Latin breviary.

The contents of the *Great Horologium* (*ὥρολόγιον τὸ μέγα*) which is the fullest form, as described in the edition published at Venice 1856, and approved by the oecumenical patriarch,

are arranged in *three generic parts* (*τρία γενικά μέρη*) as follows:

1. The office for the day and night hours of the church from matins to compline (*ἀπὸ τῆς μεσονυκτικῆς ἕως τοῦ ἀποδείπνου*).

This part therefore corresponds in the main to the "Psalterium cum Ordinario Officii de Tempore" of the Latin breviary.

2. The variable antiphons and hymns, by whatever name they are distinguished, taken from the *Menology* (which answers to the Roman Martyrology) and from the other office books which contain the variable portions of the office, and whatever is sung in it on Sundays, festivals, and ordinary days.

This part therefore corresponds in some measure to the "Proprium de Tempore" of the Latin breviary.

3. Various short offices (*ἀκολουθίαι*), prayers, and *canons*; independent of the *hours*; and for occasional use. Into the details of these it is unnecessary to enter; and would be impossible without considerable explanation.

This part therefore may be compared to the collection of short offices and forms of prayer which are found at the end of the Latin breviary; though the offices contained in it are for the most part different from and more numerous than those in the breviary.

The *Horologion* is often prefaced by the calendar of the *Menology*, which begins with September; sometimes (as in a copy I possess, printed at Venice 1523) by "the gospel" according to St. John: i.e. the introduction, and four last chapters; and sometimes (as in another copy in my possession, printed at Venice 1775 "con Licenza de' Superiori"), by the Athanasian creed in Greek, of course without the words which imply the double procession. [H. J. H.]

**HORRES**, martyr at Nicaea with Arabia, Marcus, Nimpodora, Theodora, Theusetas; commemorated March 13 (*Mart.* Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

**HORSE**. The horse is represented attending on the Orpheus shepherd [FRESCO, p. 696]. As a servant or companion of mankind, he occurs frequently in representations of the Magi (Bottari, tav. cxxxiii. &c.). Two horses act as cross-bearers (tav. iii.); and horses of course occur in the numerous representations of the translation of Elijah which are found on sarcophagi and elsewhere. The horses of Egypt are commemorated in representations of Pharaoh and the Red Sea (Aringhi, vol. i. p. 331), where a mounted horseman accompanies the chariots. In Bottari (tav. clx.) there are two quadrigae, with horses decorated with palm-branches or plumes. Martigny states in this connexion that the horse symbol has been very frequently found in the graves of martyrs, quoting the titulus of the youth Florens (Lupi, *Dissert. elett.* i. p. 258), and the horses loose and grazing in the tribune of the cemetery of Basilla (Bianchini *Not. ad Anast. Prolegomena*, t. iii.). [R. St. J. T.]

#### HORSE-RACING. [CHARIOTEERS.]

**HORTULANUS**, the gardener of the monastery. The rule of Benedict provided certain deputies (*solatia*) to assist the cellarer (*cellarius*) in the larger monasteries. These were, usually, a farm bailiff (*granatarius*) & butler:

countes parls et vini), and a gardener (*hortulanus*) (*Reg. Bened.* c. 31; cf. *Bened. Anian. Concord.* *Regal.* lxxi. 17).

[L. G. S.]

**HOSANNA** (or *Osanne*). This word, adopted from the salutation of the populace at Christ's entry into Jerusalem, occurs in the Mass at the end of the *Sanctus*, which ends thus: "Hosanna in excelsis. Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini. Hosanna in excelsis." The same words are found in the Greek form of the *Sanctus*, called *ἱεράκια ἑσπερος*; as given in the liturgies of SS. Basil, Chrysostom, &c.

The word also frequently occurs in the antiphons and other parts of the service for Palm Sunday as given in the Latin *Processionale*, as for instance in the hymn at the Procession:

"*Exultet in Rex Davidis et Iherosolymite,  
Hominis qui in Davidis, Rex benedictus, venit:  
Gloria tunc et honor tibi sit, Rex Christo Redemptor,  
Cum pacifice domus promptus Osanne plerum.*"

[H. J. H.]

**HOSEA**, the prophet; commemorated *Jakobit* 37 = Feb. 21 (*Cat. Eklog.*).

[W. F. G.]

### HOSPITALARIUS. [HOSPITIUM.]

**HOSPITALITY.** Hospitality, or a friendly reception and entertainment of strangers, was a Christian virtue strongly inculcated in the New Testament, and practised most liberally by the early Christians, until long after the apostolic times.

The feeling of Christian union and sympathy was so strong, that every Christian was ready to receive another as a friend and brother, although previously unknown: a circumstance which excited the astonishment, and even the hatred and misrepresentations of pagan opponents (*Tertul. Apol.* 39; *Lactant. de mort. perig.* 13). And one of the means by which Julian hoped to restore the old Roman paganism was an imitation of this Christian liberality. In a letter of his, addressed to Aranes, a chief priest of Galatia, the emperor urges him to take great care of strangers, and to establish houses for their reception (*ἡσπιδεύειν*) [*HOSPITALIA*] in every city, after the example of the Christians (*Sosomen. v.* 16).

All Christian families in the earlier times considered it their duty to exercise this hospitality, and Tertullian mentions it as one great objection to a Christian woman marrying a pagan, that she would not be able to entertain any Christian strangers in her house (*Tertul. ad Us.* ii. 4).

But presbyters, and afterwards bishops, were specially expected to excel in this virtue. Thus Jerome extols the liberal hospitality of the young presbyter Nepotian (*Epist. Nepotiani* c. 10). And Chrysostom mentions it as a high praise of Flavian, bishop of Antioch, that his house was always open to strangers and travellers, where they received so kind and generous an entertainment, that it might be doubted whether it ought not to have been called the travellers' home, instead of his (*Chrys. in Genes.* i. 4).

Monasteries also were distinguished by their ready hospitality to Christians coming from distant parts [*HOSPITIUM*]. Palladius (*Historia Laica*, c. 6) describes the hospital or guest-house (*ἡσπιδεύειον*) which adjoined the church of the Nitrian monks, in which pilgrims might stay, if they chose, two or three years; the first week a

guest was not required to work; if he stayed longer, he must work in the garden, the bake-house, or the kitchen; or if he was a person of too much consideration for menial labour, the monks would give him a book to read. In our monastery, says Jerome, hospitality is our delight. We receive with a joyful welcome all who come to us, with the exception of heretics (*Jer. adv. Ruf.* iii.). In the Rule of Benedict of Aniane, drawn up at the end of the eighth century, particular directions are given for the reception and entertainment of the poor and of strangers. They were first to join in prayer with the monks; they then received the kiss of peace; water was brought for their hands and feet; and in their subsequent entertainment the strict monastic rules of fasting were to be relaxed in honour of the guests. There was a distinct kitchen for the strangers' use, with officers to superintend it, so that the regular order of the monastery might not be disturbed (*Concor. Reg. S. Benedict.* § 60, *de hospitibus suscipiendis*). This relaxation of strict ascetic rules on occasion of hospitality to strangers is also mentioned with approbation by Cassian (*Collat.* i. 36, and xxi. 14, &c.). The council of Aix in 816 (*ii. c.* 28), desired a place to be prepared at the gate of a monastery where all comers might be received.

The openhanded hospitality of Christians naturally led sometimes to the practice of deceit and imposture on the part of applicants; and to guard against the admission of pretenders, or otherwise unworthy and dangerous persons, it became customary for letters of recommendation [*COMMENDATORY LETTERS*] to be required. Christians going into a foreign country, or to any place where they were not known, commonly took with them such letters from their bishop, or some other well-known Christian; which letters were, if necessary, to be examined, on their presentation, by the deacons of the place (*Constit. Apostol.* ii. 58).

In the earlier times Christians received strangers into their own homes; but at a later period, when such hospitality became inconvenient, and hardly sufficient for what was needed, houses were specially built or prepared for the reception of strangers (*ἡσπιδεύειν*). These were established in places where travellers were most likely to resort, or where Christian strangers were commonly most numerous, such as along the lines of travel taken by pilgrims, when the practice of making pilgrimages to holy places had become usual.

At these houses Christian travellers were entertained according to their need, and were sent forward on their way in peace.

A singular remnant of this ancient hospitality still remains at St. Cross near Winchester, where any one who applies at the porter's lodge receives gratuitously a glass of beer and a slice of bread.

[G. A. J.]

**HOSPITALS.** 1. *General account of Hospitals.*—The remarkable outflowing of benevolence and sympathy with others, which marked the very commencement of Christianity, led immediately to a care for the poor, especially in times of sickness and distress.

From the earliest times the funds of the church were applied to the maintenance of widows &c.

and orphans, sick and poor, prisoners and sojourners (Justin Martyr, *Apol. I. c.* 67). It was the special duty of the deacons and deaconesses to attend to the sick at their own houses (*Constit. Apost. iii.* 19, and Epiphanius, *Fidei Expos.* 21). But all Christians, particularly the women who had the most leisure for this purpose, considered it incumbent on them to visit and relieve the sick poor (*Epist. ad Zen. et Seren. c.* 17, in Justin Martyr's Works, p. 416; Tertullian, *ad Uxor. ii.* 4). And this they did without being deterred by any fear of infection in the case of plagues or other contagious diseases; of which a notable example, among many others, was seen in the heroic conduct of the Christians at Alexandria during the great plague there in the time of the emperor Gallienus (A.D. 260–268). See the account given in Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles. viii.* 22).

Public hospitals for the reception of the sick, the needy, and the stranger, began to be erected as soon as Christianity, being freed from persecution, could display its natural tendencies without danger or restriction. Houses were set apart for the reception of travellers or sojourners (*ξενοδοχεῖα*), for the poor (*πτωχοτροφεῖα*), for orphans (*ὀρφανοτροφεῖα*), for foundlings (*βρεφοτροφεῖα*), and for the aged (*γερωντοκομεῖα*), as well as for the sick (*νοσοκομεῖα*). [HOSPITALITY, EXPOSING OF CHILDREN, FOUNDLINGS.] Several of these objects were often combined in one establishment, so that it is most convenient to treat of them under one head.

Epiphanius (*Haeres. 75, c.* 1) mentions that Aetius, afterwards known as a heretic, about the middle of the 4th century was made by the bishop Eustathius superintendent of the hospital (*ξενοδοχεῖον*, says Epiphanius, called in Pontus *πτωχοτροφεῖον*) at Sebaste in Pontus. It does not appear that the hospital was then first established, and Epiphanius mentions it as a common custom for bishops of the church to provide for the maimed and infirm by setting up such establishments.

The most complete hospital of which we have any account in antiquity was built by Basil the Great, soon after his accession to the see, near Caesarea in Pontus. St. Basil, defending himself from the charge of seeking to gain undue influence, which had been brought against him before the prefect of the place, says (*Epist. 94* [al. 372] *ad Heliam*), "Whom do we injure, in building lodgings (*καταγώγια*) for the strangers who stay with us in passing through, and for those who need attendance (*θεραπείας*) in consequence of infirmity? What, in supplying necessary comfort for these persons, nurses, medical attendants, means of conveying them (*τὰ νωτοφόρα*),\* and persons to take charge of them in removal (*τοὺς παραπέμποντας*)? And these things must of necessity carry with them handicrafts, both such as are required for sustenance and such as conduce to decorum, and these again require workshops." He also (*Epist. 142* [al. 374]) begs an official of the empire to exempt his poor-house from state taxation, and speaks (*Epist. 143* [al. 428]) of its being managed by a chorepiscopus. St. Basil's hospital is thus spoken of by Gregory of Nazianzus (who had himself seen it) in his panegyric on the saint (*Orat. 20, p.* 359, ed. Colon.

1690). "Go forth a little from the city, and behold the new city, the treasure-house of goodness . . . in which the superfluities of wealth—nay, even things not superfluous—have been laid up in store at his exhortation; . . . in which disease is investigated (*φιλοσοφῆται*) and sympathy proved . . . We have no longer to look on the fearful and pitiable sight of men like corpses before death, with the greater part of their limbs dead [from leprosy], driven from cities, from dwellings, from public places, from water-courses . . . Basil it was more than any one who persuaded those who are men not to scorn men, nor to dishonour Christ the head of all by their inhumanity towards human beings." From this it appears that at least a portion of St. Basil's hospital was for lepers. Sozomen, again (*H. E. vi.* 34) speaks of Prapadius having been principal of this "Basiliad, that most famous lodging for the poor founded by Basil, from whom it received the appellation which it still retains." Of St. Chrysostom, too, Palladius (*Vita Chrys. p.* 19, ed. Montfaucon) relates that he diverted the superfluous expenses of his see to the maintenance of the hospital (*νοσοκομείον*), and that as the need increased he founded several, over which he set two presbyters of high character; he engaged further physicians and cooks, and kind unmarried attendants to work under them. St. Chrysostom himself (*Hom. 66* [al. 67] in *Matt.*) pointing triumphantly to the large-handed bounty of the church, says, "consider how many widows, how many virgins, the church sustains day by day; the number on the roll is not less than three thousand [in Constantinople]. And she provides also for those who are in distress in the guest-house; for those who are maimed in body; and yet her substance is not diminished." It is evident that a regular system of providing for the poor in connexion with the church was organised in the middle of the fifth century; for the council of Chalcedon (c. 3) especially recognises the care of widows and orphans, and the needy generally as one of the justifications for a cleric's engaging in secular affairs (*κοσμικαὶ διοικήσεις*), if he does it at the command of his bishop.

The emperor Julian recognised the importance of institutions such as those of St. Basil; "these impious Galilaeans," says he (*Fragment. p.* 305, quoted by Rheinwald) "give themselves to this kind of humanity; as men allure children with a cake, so they, starting from what they call love and entertaining and serving of tables, bring in converts to their impiety;" and again he bids Arsacius (*Epist. 49, u. s.*), "establish abundance of hospitals in every city, that our kindness may be enjoyed by strangers, not only of our own people, but of others who are in need."

Placilla, the wife of Theodosius the Great, devoted herself much to the care of the sick. She cared, says Theodoret (*Hist. Eccl. v.* 19), for those who were maimed and injured, not devolving the charge of them on subordinates, but attending to them personally, going into the places where they were received (*τὰς τοῦτον καταγώγας*) and supplying their several wants. So also, making the round of the hospitals (*ξενώνας*) of the churches, she attended on those who were confined to bed, herself handling the pots and tasting the broth, bringing bowls, breaking bread, and offering mouthfuls, washing

\* Compare Xenophon, *Cyrop.* vi. 2, 31.

cupes, and performing other services which are generally done by domestics.

Samson of Constantinople received the name of "Xenodochus" from his devotion to the care of hospitals and asylums, and is said to have persuaded the emperor Justinian to give up his own palace for the purposes of a xenodochion (see the Byzantine *Menaea*, June 27). Procopius however (*De Aedif. Just.* i. 2) gives a somewhat different account of the matter. There was, he says, a hospital for the sick and infirm, built in former years by the pious care of one Samson, of which there were in Justinian's time some remains in a ruinous condition. This the emperor restored, decorated, and amplified in the most liberal manner. He increased, says Procopius, both the number of wards (*οικιδίων*, domuncularum) and the annual revenue. Whether by the expression *οικιδίων* we are to understand detached buildings, or rooms, is doubtful; if the former, Justinian's hospital, like that of Basil previously described, would resemble a little town, a place of many buildings within a wall. Justinian further built, in concert with Theodora, two other hospitals (*ξενώνας*). Of the empress Eudocia it is related (*Vita Euthymii*, c. 16, in *Acta SS.* January, vol. ii. p. 317) that she built many churches, gerontocomia, ptochotrophia, and monasteries. She is said also to have prepared food for the sick with her own hands.

It is not necessary to go through the long list of pious foundations for the benefit of the sick which we meet with in the history of the church. But it may be mentioned as an instance of the general recognition of the duty of providing for sick and infirm brethren, that by the so-called Arabic canons of Nicaea the bishop was expressly bound, in virtue of his office, to institute hospitals. Canon 70 (Hardouin, *Concilia*, i. 475) prescribes, that in every city a place should be set apart for strangers, sick, and poor, which should be called a xenodochium; and that the bishop should select one of the monks of the desert, himself a foreigner, far from home and family, and a man of integrity, to take charge of the hospital, to procure for it beds and whatever may be necessary for the sick and poor; and that if the property of the hospital be inadequate, he should make a collection from the Christians, according to their several means, and with this provision sustain the brethren who are strangers, poor, or sick, as each may have need.

Most of these instances belong to the Eastern church; but the Western church was not behind in the good work. Paulinus of Nola has left us (*Poem.* xx. 114) a brief description of the hospital which he himself built, which appears to have been rather for the reception of the poor and old than of the sick, as such:

"Dispositi trino per longa sedilia cœtu  
Ob-trepere senes, inopum miserabile vulgus,  
Et socio canas residentes agmine matres."

This description suggests long wards, provided with "sedilia"—perhaps "berths," or divans running along the wall—in which the inmates were separated into three classes—poor, old men, and old women.

Jerome, in a letter to Pammachius (*Epist.* 66 [al. 26], c. 11, written, according to Vallarsi, A.D. 387) speaks of a xenodochium which the latter had built in the Portus Romanus, of

which he (Jerome) had just heard. This was probably attended to by Pammachius himself and the monks for whom he had provided a convent in the neighbourhood. Jerome himself founded a hospital for the reception of the sick and the stranger in Bethlehem; finding his means insufficient to finish it, he sent his brother Paulinianus (u. s. c. 14) to sell his remaining property in his native country, to provide money for its completion. Fabiola, the friend of Jerome, also founded a hospital at Rome. Having been obliged to obtain a divorce from her first husband on account of his intolerable profligacy, she married another before his death. On becoming a widow she learned that according to church law, of which she had been previously ignorant ("nec evangelii vigorem noverat," says Jerome *Ep.* 77 [al. 30], c. 3), it was unlawful for her to have married again during her first husband's life, however justly she had separated from him. Upon this she submitted to a humiliating penance; and afterwards devoted all her property to charitable purposes, and among other good works built a hospital, where she ministered to the sick with her own hands (*ib.* c. 6).

Jerome remarks that Fabiola was the first person who founded a hospital (*prima omnium νοσοκομείων* instituit). But this perhaps only means the first hospital in Rome or Italy. And the fact that Jerome uses the Greek word *νοσοκομείων*, and not the Latin *valetudinarium*, tends to confirm the account which points to the Eastern church as the first to exhibit such acts of benevolence.

Rome itself had an ancient fame for its care of the sick and poor (Prudentius, *Peristeph.* ii. 140 ff.). Its hospitals were frequently the objects of the munificence of the popes. Anastasius (*Vitas Pontif.* 134 A, ed. Muratori) tells us of Pelagius II. (578–590), that he caused his own house to be made a refuge for the poor and aged (*ptochium pauperum et senum*). His successor, Gregory the Great (*Dialogus*, iii. 35, p. 243) seems to say that he had taken Amantius from his own dwelling to pass some days in the infirmary; and John the Deacon relates of him that he set over the several hospitals careful and conscientious men, who had to submit their accounts to himself, that the beneficence of the people towards those institutions might not be checked by mismanagement of the funds. He also provided Probus with money to build a xenodochium on a large scale at Jerusalem, and supported it by an annual subvention (*Vita Greg.* ii. 7). Other hospitals in Rome of an early date are known to us at least by name. Pope Symmachus (498–514) is said by Ado (*Chronicon*, in Migne's *Patrol.* cxiii. 106 B) to have founded or restored three hospitals (*pauperibus habitacula*) known by the names of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Laurence respectively. Stephen III. (752–757) is said by Anastasius (*Vitas Pontif.* p. 165, c. D.) to have restored four xenodochia and founded two others, which were placed in the charge of the regionary deacons of St. Maria and St. Silvester; and Adrian I. (772–795, *ib.* p. 190, D) to have founded three *DIACONIAE* (see the word) "foris portam Beati Apostolorum Principis."

Nor was it only in Rome that such institutions were found. In Gaul they existed at any rate before the death of St. Remi (432), if we may



trust Flodoard. The saint is made (*Hist. Remens.* i. 18) to entreat his successors to preserve inviolate his statutes for the management of his poor-houses (ptochia), coenobia, martyria, diaconiae and xenodochia, as he had done those of his predecessors—an expression which implies that some at least of these foundations existed before St. Remi came to the see of Reims before 496. The fifth council of Orleans, A.D. 549, places (c. 13) the property of xenodochia on the same footing, with regard to alienation, as that of churches and monasteries; and (c. 15) makes special provision for the magnificent hospital which, under the influence of its bishop Sacerdos, Childebert with his queen Ultragotha had founded in Lyons, forbidding the bishop of that city to merge any of its property in that of his church, or to diminish its privileges in any way, and enjoining him to take care that active and God-fearing superintendents (praepositi) be always appointed, and that the care of the sick and the entertainment of strangers be always maintained according to the statutes.

We do not trace the existence of hospitals in the African fathers or councils. In Victor's account of the Vandal persecution (i. 8), we find that Deogratias bishop of Carthage, A.D. 455, turned two churches into hospitals for the reception of the wretched captives who were poured on the African shores from Italy; but this was a temporary expedient, such as has often been adopted in times of calamity. But we are not to suppose that the sick of the African church were ill-cared for; the houses of the bishops, the clergy and the monks often served for the reception of the sick. Augustine (Possidius, *Vita Aug.* cc. 22, 23) exercised constant care for the sick and poor, and (*Regula ad Servos Dei*, c. 5) gives directions to monks as to their reception and treatment of the sick and infirm; directions in which he seems to contemplate the case not only of feeble members of the monastic body, but of sick persons brought in from without.

In the Teutonic countries, we have of course no accounts of hospitals of so early a date as those which have been mentioned in Italy and Gaul. Chrodegang, however (*Regula*, c. 45, in Migne's *Patrol.* 89, 1076), recommends that a guest-room (hospitale) should be formed in a suitable place, convenient for the brothers to visit; and desires the brothers of his Rule, even if they cannot maintain a hospital at other times, at least in Lent to wash the feet of the poor in a hospital or guest-room. The famous Alcuin at a somewhat later date also warned the bishops of the great necessity there was for forming hospitals, and probably also directed the attention of his patron Charles the Great to the same subject. To Eanbald, as soon as he entered on his see, Alcuin wrote urging him to establish "xenodochia, id est, hospitalia" (*Epist.* 56, *ad Eanb.*, *Alc. Opp.* i. 65) in which the poor and the strangers might be received. In accordance with the Rule of Chrodegang and the wish of Alcuin, the synod of Aix, in the year 816, ordered (c. 28) that every ecclesiastical foundation, whether canonical or monastic, should provide accommodation for the poor, the sick, the widows, and the strangers. The poor-house was to be placed near the church, and a priest was to be its superintendent; the infirmary was to be within the convent, as were also the wards for the widows and

poor maidens, though probably in a building separate from that which contained the cells of the canons or monks (*Conc. Germ.* i. 539). The Frankish Capitularies also take order for the maintenance of the poor and sick. Thus it is ordered (i. c. 70, A.D. 789) that "hospites, peregrini et pauperes" have the due entertainment in various places to which they are entitled by the canons; a passage in which "peregrini" are probably monks from other houses, "hospites" are lay guests. And again (ii. c. 29) they bring xenodochia, ptochotrophia, nosocomia, orphanotrophia, gerontocomia, and brephotrophia under the same law as churches and monasteries with regard to the non-alienation of their property.

The establishment of many of the hospitals which existed in the northern countries in the 8th and 9th centuries is due to the Irish missionaries, who cared for the bodies as well as the souls of the people among whom they preached. Hence they received the name of "Hospitalia Scotorum,"<sup>b</sup> an expression found both in the canons of Meaux (*C. Meldense*, c. 40), and in the petition of the bishops of the provinces of Reims and Rouen to Lewis the Pious (c. 10, Baluze, *Capit. Franc.* ii. 111). These hospitals were closely connected with the monasteries founded by the same missionaries. Gretser (*Ad Vit. S. Willibaldi*, lib. i. observ. 19; *Greta. Opera*, x. 778) enumerates some of the hospitals of their foundation.

2. *Administration of Hospitals.*—In the first instance, the hospitals, like other institutions of the church, were under the immediate superintendence of the bishops. In many cases, as we have seen, they were founded by the bishops themselves from the funds placed at their disposal by the church, and so the oversight of them naturally fell to the founder and his successors. And even when endowed by private persons, such foundation was regarded as of the nature of alms, and so given into the hands of those who were, directly or indirectly, the universal almoners. The property of hospitals was regarded (as has been shewn above) by kings and rulers as being of the same kind as the property of the church. And the attendants on the sick were, at least in very many cases, drawn from the neighbouring monasteries or houses of canons. When the duty was laid upon bishops of providing, so far as in them lay, food and clothing for those who in consequence of infirmity were unable to earn their own living (*Conc. Aurd. I.* c. 16), it naturally followed that they superintended and directed the establishments for attaining this end.

It must however have been from the first impossible for a much-occupied bishop to give personal attention to all the details of a large hospital, and therefore other clerics were employed under him on this behalf. We have seen already that Aenius was a hospital-superintendent under his bishop Eustathius; and as early as the council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, we find the clerics attached to the poor-houses (τῶν πτωχέων) placed on the same footing as those of the monasteries and martyr-churches, and admonished to obey their bishops according to the tradition of the fathers (c. 8), a passage which probably indicates that they had been disposed to assert

<sup>b</sup> It must be borne in mind that by "Scoti" at this period we are to understand natives of Ireland.

too great independence. The legislation of Justinian provided carefully for the due administration of hospitals. Thus (*Codez*, l. 42, § 9, *De Episcopis et Clericis*) it is provided that prefects of hospitals (of whatever kind) shall be appointed according to the judgment and with the approval of the bishop of the place; and again (*Ib.* l. 46, § 3) bishops are enjoined not to administer the hospitals within their dioceses personally, but to appoint superintendents, and to act themselves as visitors and auditors, in case of need removing the officials. The same law desires that men be appointed to such offices who have before their eyes the fear of God and of the dreadful day of judgment. The same code (l. 28) makes the bishop of the diocese the executor of a will containing a bequest for pious uses, where no executor has been named in the will itself; and desires him (l. 49) in cases where the testator has not designated special objects of his bounty, to apply the bequest to the benefit of the hospital of the city, or to the poorest hospital, where there were more than one. In deciding the question, which is poorest, he is to take counsel with his clergy. But in case there be no hospital (xenon) in the city, then the oeconomus or the bishop is to take the bequest, and apply it for the benefit of the poor. In case the bishop is negligent in discharging this duty, then the metropolitan of the province or the archbishop of the diocese [see DIOCESE] may enquire into the matter and compel the bishop to act. Or (l. 46, § 6) any inhabitant of the city interested in the matter may compel the carrying out of the will.

That in the time of Gregory the Great the xenodochia were under the jurisdiction of the bishop is clear from several passages in his letters. Thus (*Epist.* iv. 27) he desires Januarius, bishop of Cagliari, to take care that the xenodochi render their accounts to him; and begs him not to let the hospitals fall to decay by his neglect; and he desires that men of proved integrity may be appointed prefects of xenodochia, and these only ecclesiastics (religiosi), who cannot be harassed by lay tribunals. To those whom he himself had appointed prefects of diaconiae or xenodochia he gave full power over the funds, expressly exempting them from rendering an account to any one (*Joan. Diaconus, Vita Greg.* ii. c. 51).

The bishops of the provinces of Reims and Rouen, in their petition to Lewis the Pious, son of Charles the Great, beg that the rectors of monasteries and xenodochia be made subject to the authority of their bishops (c. 10, in *Baluze Capit. Franc.* ii. 111).

3. *Dedication*.—Martigny (referring to Wernsdorf *De Columbae Simulacris*) says that hospitals were in ancient times commonly dedicated to the Holy Spirit, which was represented under the form of a dove, either on the façade, or on some other conspicuous part of the building. The principal hospital in Rome bears this designation, and has borne it from a very remote period (*Fantucci, Trutt. di tutte le opere pie nell'alma città di Roma*, c. 1, quoted by Martigny).

(Thomassin, *Vetus et Nova Eccl. Disciplina*, P. I. lib. ii. c. 89; Van Espen, *Jus Ecclesiasticum*, P. II. sec. iv. tit. 6; Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, Bd. VI. Th. iii. p. 32 ff.; Rheinwald, *Kirchliche Archäologie*, § 41, p. 103 ff.; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chréti. s. v. Hôpitaux*.) [G. A. J. and C.]

HOSPITIUM (also *Hospitale*). One of the characteristics, perhaps the most commendable, of monasticism, was its unvarying hospitality to all comers. None were to be refused admission; all were to be made welcome (*Bened. Reg.* c. 53); especially monks, clergy, poor, and foreigners (*Reg. Pachom.* c. 51; *Isidor. Reg.* c. 23; *Mart. ad Bened. Reg.* c. 53). No questions were to be asked (*Reg. Patr.* c. 4) unless by the abbat's order (*Reg. Tarnat.* c. 7.) Even passing wayfarers were to be pressed to eat before going on; if they could not wait for the usual hour, the dinner was to be served three hours sooner than usual; or, if they could not stay even so long, they were to have their meal separately (*Reg. Mag.* c. 72). Everything was to be done in courtesy, and for the comfort of the guests. The prior (or some others of the brethren), was to meet them, and, after a few words of prayer by way of salutation, as well as by way of precaution against any Satanic illusion, was to give and receive the kiss of peace; on their arriving and departing he was to make obeisance to them, as recognising in them a visit from the Saviour (*Bened. Reg.* c. 53). He was to lead them straightway on arrival to the oratory or sacristy, (usually in Benedictine monasteries close to the entrance-gate), and after praying together (cf. *Reg. Pachom.* c. 51) awhile, was to sit with them, reading aloud, first some holy book (*lex divina*), the Scriptures especially (*Mart. loc. cit.*), and then, these primary duties attended to, conversing amicably ("Omnis humanitas praebeunda," *Bened. Reg.* v. s.) The abbat himself was to bring water, this was to be done at bedtime, and the footsore were to be rubbed with oil, according to the rule (c. 10) of Fructuosus, and with certain brethren in rotation (so Martene understands "omnis congregatio") was to wash the feet of all without distinction, repeating a verse of the Psalms (*Bened. Reg.* v. s.). In compliment to the guests, the prior, though not the other monks, was excused from observing a fast day, unless one of special obligation (*ib.*). If sick or delicate, some dainties ("pulmentaria") were to be provided for them (*Fruct. Reg.* c. 10). Nor were the guests to leave the monastery empty-handed; for the journey, the best that the monastery could afford was to be supplied as a parting gift (*viaticum*).

In the annals of the monastery of Micy (*Micianum*), it is recorded in praise of an abbat in the 6th century, that, though the monastery was then very poor, its guests were always regaled with wine, without being allowed to see that the brethren were drinking only water (*Mab. A. A. O. S. B. I. ad fin.*). Caesarius of Arles is similarly extolled by his biographer for keeping open house as abbat (*Vit. Caes. Arelat.* i. 37, ap. *Mab. ib.*).

Such hospitality was sure to be largely used in days when travelling was so difficult and so dangerous. Benedict wisely provides for a constant influx of strangers ("nunquam desunt monasterio," *Reg.* c. 53). Nowhere indeed in his rule is its tenderness and forethought more remarkable than about the reception of guests. In some of these arrangements he had been anticipated. Cassian speaks of one of the older monks being stationed by the abbat, with the advice of the seniors, near the entrance of the

monastery, to receive strangers as they arrived (Cass. *Instit.* iv. 7). Benedict placed them under the general supervision of the cellarer, or house-steward (*Reg. c.* 31), and his deputies. Subsequently, a distinct officer was created, the "hospitalarius," corresponding to the eastern "ξενόδοχος" (Mart. *ad loc. cit.* Alteserr. *Ascticon*, ix. 9; Du Cange, *s. v. v.*), whose duties, however, did not extend to the refectory. One of the brethren, selected as a specially God-fearing man ("Cujus animam timor dei habeat") was appointed by Benedict to look after the guests' dormitory ("cella hospitum") (Bened. *Reg. c.* 53) (usually on the east side of the Benedictine quadrangle, over the "hospitium"<sup>a</sup>); and two others were told off annually for the guests' kitchen, which adjoined the abbat's kitchen (usually on the south side of the quadrangle<sup>a</sup> with a window between (Mart. *ad loc.*); these officials were to have extra assistance, as occasion required (*ib.*). Every precaution was taken, lest the influx of strangers should either disturb the placidity of the "house of God" (*ib.*), or lead to the propagation of silly rumours about it (*ib.*). Their sitting-room, dormitory, and kitchen were all to be separate from those of the monks (*ib. cf. c.* 56). None of the monks, unless expressly ordered, might exchange even in passing a word with a guest, except to ask a blessing (*ib. cf. Reg. Mac. c.* 8). Nor were the guests to be trusted to themselves without supervision. Care was to be taken that the monks' wallets were not left about in the guests' dormitory; and two of the monks, whose turn it was to help in the kitchen and otherwise for the week ("hebdomadarii"), were to keep close to the guests night and day (*Reg. Mag. c.* 79). It is not clear whether Benedict intended the guests to be entertained in the refectory at a separate table with the abbat, or with him in a separate table (Bened. *Reg. c.* 56); Martene thinks in the refectory (*Reg. Comment. ad loc. cit.*; *cf. Conc. Aquisgr. c.* 27). The abbat on these occasions might invite a few of the brethren to his table, leaving the charge of the rest to the prior, and might make some addition to the ordinary fare (Bened. *Reg. c.* 56; Mart. *ad l.c.*; Mab. *Ann. O. S. B. v.* xiii.). It was strictly forbidden by the council of Saragossa, A.D. 691, for lay persons to be lodged in the quadrangle of the monastery ("intra claustra"), even with the abbat's special permission, lest contact with them should demoralise the brethren or give rise to scandals; they were to be lodged in a separate house within the precincts (intra septa) (*Conc. Caesar-august. A.D.* 691; *cf. Mab. Ann. O. S. B. xviii.* xv.)

Benedict orders, that monks coming from another country (peregrini) may, if orderly, prolong their stay in the monastery (*Reg. c.* 61) for one, two, or even three years (Mart. *Reg. Comment. l. c.*); and that any suggestions which they make for its better management are to be welcomed as providential (Bened. *Reg. ib.*). They are then either to be dismissed kindly ("honeste") or formally admitted, not, however, unless they bring commendatory letters from their former abbat, or otherwise give proof of his consent. Once admitted, they may be promoted without delay at the abbat's discretion, to places

of authority; as may clergy similarly admitted (*ib.*). Laymen, willing to stay on, are either to take the vow, or to make themselves useful to the monastery in some sort of work in return for board and lodging (*Reg. Mag. c.* 79).

It was part of the discipline of candidates for the novitiate to wait on the guests in their sitting-room ("cella hospitum," or "hospitium"), according to the rule of Benedict, for some days (*Reg. c.* 58), or, according to some later rules, for three months (Isid. *Reg. c.* 5; Fruct. *Reg. c.* 21; Menard *ad Bened. Anian. Concord. Regal. lxii.*) [see NOVICE].

History shows how the simple and frugal hospitality enjoined by Benedict and monastic lawmakers degenerated in time into luxury and display, burdensome to the revenues of the monasteries, demoralising to their inmates, and one of the proximate causes of their fall. [I. G. S.]

HOST, from the Latin *Hostia*, a victim. It was applied to sacrifices, or offerings of various kinds in the ecclesiastical language of the West. *E.g.* in the Vulgate version of Rom. xii. 1, we have "Ut exhibeatis corpora vestra hostiam" (E. V. sacrifice) "viventem, sanctam, Deo placeantem, rationabile obsequium vestrum:" and similarly in the *Missale Gothicum*, the people are bid to pray that God "may cleanse the hearts of all the offerers unto (*i.e.* that they may become) a sacrifice (hostiam) of sanctification, reasonable and well-pleasing unto Himself" (*Liturg. Gall. ed. Mabill. p.* 237). In the Vulgate of Phil. iv. 18, it is used of almsgiving, "Hostiam acceptam, placentem Deo." Christ, the one true victim, is called hostia, as in Eph. v. 2, "Tradidit semetipsum pro nobis oblationem et hostiam." Similarly Heb. x. 12: "Unam pro nobis offerens hostiam." Compare Heb. ix. 26. This is frequent in the old Latin liturgies. Thus in the Gothic Missal, "Suppliant to Thee who wast slain a victim (hostia) for the salvation of the world, we pray, &c." (*Lit. Gall. p.* 235); and "Whom Thou didst will to be delivered up a sacrifice (hostiam) for us" (*ibid. p.* 257; *comp. p.* 198). In the following example the church commemorates and pleads that sacrifice:—"We offer unto thee, O God, an immaculate victim (hostiam), whom the maternal womb brought forth without defilement to virginity" (*Missale Mozar. Leslie, p.* 39). As the thank-offering (Eucharist) of the Mosaic law had been called hostia laudis (Ps. cxvi. 17), or hostia gratiarum (Lev. vi. 13), so was the Christian thank-offering, the sacramental commemoration of the death of Christ. *E.g.* "Receive we beseech thee, O Lord, the sacrifice (hostiam) of propitiation and praise, and these oblations of Thy servants" (*Miss. Goth. u. s. p.* 253).

As the word properly expresses a concrete notion, it would readily pass from the last meaning to attach itself to the material symbols offered in the rite. In the *Missale Gothicum*, in a prayer said after the consecration, we read, "We offer unto thee, O Lord, this immaculate host, reasonable host, unbloody host, this holy bread and salutary cup" (*u. s. p.* 298). The following example is from the Mozarabic Missal:—"This host of bread and wine, which have been placed on Thy altar by me unworthy" (Leslie, *p.* 445). It will be observed that in these extracts the bread and wine (after consecration)

<sup>a</sup> Whitaker's *History of Whalley*, 4th ed. 1874, p. 121.

eration) are together called the host. Even in the 11th century Anselm affirmed correctly, "One host in bread and wine. . . . They call both together by one name, oblation or host" (*Ad Walerannum*, c. 2). Long before this, however, it was sometimes restrained to the bread alone, as in the three earliest *Ordines Romani*, which range from the 7th to the 9th century:—"The acolytes (carrying the consecrated bread) go down to the presbyters that they may break the hosts" (*Musæum Ital.* tom. ii. pp. 13, 49, 59). In these ancient directories the unconsecrated loaves are always, and the consecrated more frequently, called by the older name of "oblates."

When the phrase "immaculate host" was introduced into the Roman Missal towards the 11th century (Le Brun, *Explic. de la Messe*, P. iii. art. 6) from that of Spain, the mistake was made of applying it to the unconsecrated bread. See Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 370. [W. E. S.]

**HOST, THE ADORATION OF.** In the modern church of Rome, the worship of *latria*, i.e. such worship as is due to God, is paid to the consecrated symbol of our Lord's body in the eucharist, under sanction of the dogma, that the bread is, in all but appearance and other "accidents," converted into that body, and that His human soul and His divinity, being united to His body, are therefore in that which has become His body; so that whole Christ, God and man, is in it, and in every particle of it (*Catech. Trident.* p. ii. de Euch. cc. 33, 35). Of such adoration of the host the church knew nothing, and could know nothing, before the opinions which at last shaped themselves into that dogma had taken possession of the minds of men. But the Latin word *adoratio*, and the Greek *προσκύνησις*, like the old English *worship*, have a great latitude of meaning, and are applied to the simplest outward tokens of respect, no less than to that highest homage of the body, soul, and spirit, which is due to God alone. For example, in Gen. xxxvii. 7, 9, where the English has "did obeisance," the Septuagint gives *προσεκύνησαν* and *προσεκύνουν*; the Latin Vulgate, *adorare*. Exod. xi. 8: Eng. "Thy servants . . . shall bow down to me"; Sept. *προσκυρήσουσίν με*; Vulg. *adorabunt me*. See Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 844. In this lower sense, we find the word "adoration," and its equivalents, employed within the period which it is our part to illustrate, to denote the expression of reverence to the bread and wine, which are the sacramental body and blood of Christ.

With this previous explanation, we give, in chronological order, a catena of passages, which will exhibit sufficiently, as we hope, both the feelings of reverence which the early Christians had for the sacred symbols, and the manner in which they expressed it by words, or gesture, or careful handling, and the like. Among these are several which have often been mistakenly adduced as affording testimony to the antiquity of the Roman worship of the host.

Tertullian, A.D. 192, "We are distressed, if any of our cup, or even bread, be cast on the ground" (*De Cor. Mil.* c. iii.). The context shows that the allusion is to a religious rite. Origen, A.D. 230: "Ye who are wont to be present at the Divine Mysteries, know how,

when ye take the body of the Lord, ye keep it with all care and reverence, lest any particle fall therefrom, lest aught of the consecrated gift be spilled. For ye believe, and rightly believe, yourselves to be guilty, if aught fall therefrom through negligence. But if ye use, and justly use, so great care about the keeping of His body, how do ye think it involves less guilt to have been careless about the word of God, than to have been careless about His body?" (*Hom. in Exod.* xiii. § 3). St. Cyril of Jerusalem, A.D. 350: "When thou drawest near, do not draw near with hands expanded or fingers wide apart; but making thy left hand a throne for thy right, as about to receive a king, and making the palm hollow, receive the body of Christ, answering *Amen*. Partake, therefore, having heedfully sanctified thine eyes with the touch of the holy body, taking care that thou drop nought of it. . . . Then, after the communion of the body of Christ, approach thou also to the cup of His blood, not stretching forth thy hands; but with head bowed, and with gesture of adoration (*προσκύνησας*) and reverence, saying *Amen*, be thou sanctified, partaking also of the blood of Christ. And while the moisture is still on thy lips, touching them with thy hands, sanctify both eyes and forehead, and the other organs of sense" (*Catech. Myst.* v. §§ 18, 19). Pseudo-Dionysius, who may have written as early as 362, in a highly rhetorical passage, makes the following apostrophe to the sacrament: "But, O most divine and sacred celebration (*τελετή*; in the Latin translation, *Sacramentum*), do thou, unfolding the enigmatic wrappings that with symbols enshroud thee, manifest thyself to us in clear light, and fill our mental vision with the only and unshrouded light" (*De Eccl. Hier.* cap. iii. n. iii. § 2). Owing to the word *τελετή* (celebration of mysteries) having been rendered by *Sacramentum*, this passage has been often brought forward as an address to "the Sacrament;" i.e. to the consecrated host (Bellarm. *Disput.* tom. iii. l. iv. c. 29 compared with l. ii. c. 3). Had the word been capable of that meaning, it would still have been only an apostrophe, not an example of adoration directed to the sacred element. Gorgonia, the sister of Gregory Nazianzen, A.D. 370, is said by him, in a dangerous illness, to have "prostrated herself before the altar, and called with a loud voice upon Him who is honoured thereon" (*Orat.* viii. § 18). This has been understood (Bellarm. *u. s.*) to mean that she worshipped the host on the altar; which for several centuries after that time was not reserved there. St. Gregory himself goes on to tell us that "she mingled with her tears whatever her hand had treasured of the antitypes of the precious body and blood." St. Ambrose, A.D. 374, commenting on the words of the 98th Psalm, *adorate scabellum pedum Ejus*, considers that "by the footstool the earth is meant, and by the earth, the flesh of Christ, which to this day we adore in the mysteries, and which the apostles adored in the Lord Jesus" (*De Spir. S.* lib. iii. c. 11, n. 79). Here it is implied that a reverence is due to the consecrated earthly elements, not equal to that which is due to Christ Himself, but in such proportion to it, more or less, as our loyal respect for the insignia of royalty has to that which we entertain for the person of the king himself. St.



Augustine, A.D. 396, explains the same passage at greater length, but does not lead us to a different view of the adoration intended: "He took earth of the earth; for flesh is of the earth, and He took flesh of the flesh of Mary. And because He walked here in the flesh itself, and gave His flesh itself to be eaten by us unto salvation, but no one eats that flesh unless he has first adored, we have found out how such a footstool of God may be adored, and how we not only do not sin by adoring, but sin by not adoring" (*Enarr. in Ps. xcvi. § 9*). Commenting on Ps. xxi. 29 (Lat. 30), the same father says: the rich of the earth "have themselves been brought to the table of Christ, and take of His body and blood; but they only worship,—are not also satisfied, because they do not imitate" (*Ep. cxi. ad Honoratum, cxxvii. § 66*; *Sim. Enarr. i. in Ps. xxi. v. 30*). Here, however, it is doubtful whether the writer had at all in view the reverence paid to the sacramental body. He rather, perhaps, is thinking of communion as accompanied by prayer, and as the crowning act of the eucharist, or thanksgiving. The following words of St. Chrysostom, A.D. 398, have been supposed (Bellarm. u. s.) to refer to the adoration of the eucharist: "Are thy garments filthy, and it concerns thee not? But are they clean? Then recline (*ἀνάσσεαι*, rendered improperly *adore*) and partake" (*Hom. iii. in Ep. ad Eph. c. i. vv. 20–23*; often quoted from the cento known as *Hom. lxi. ad Antioch.*). Again, a worship of the elements has been inferred (Bell. u. s.) from this sentence: "This table is in the place of the manger, and here also will the body of the Lord lie; not, indeed, as then, wrapped in swaddling-clothes, but clothed all around with the Holy Ghost. The initiated understand. And the Magi then did nothing but adore; but we will permit thee both to receive, and having received to return home, if thou draw near with a clean conscience" (*De Beat. Philogono, § 3*). Other passages, to which controversialists refer, in the works of St. Chrysostom (as *Hom. lxxxiii. in St. Matt. ; xxiv. in Ep. i. ad Cor. &c.*), only exalt the sacrament, do not speak of any adoration. Theodoret, A.D. 423: "The mystic symbols do not, after the consecration, pass out of their own nature; for they remain in their former substance, and form, and appearance, and are visible and palpable, as they were before; but they are mentally perceived as what they have become, and are believed to be, and are adored as being what they are believed to be" (*Dialog. ii. tom. iv. p. 85*). Here the worship of *latria* cannot possibly be intended, because the author, in the same sentence, teaches that the "creatures of bread and wine" are, after consecration, bread and wine still. It may be remarked also, that although many, or perhaps all, of the foregoing extracts may be seen quoted in favour of the modern cultus of the host, there is not one that is really to the purpose. Nor is it until the 7th century, an age in which the outward observances of religion multiplied rapidly, that we find any definite gesture of respect to the host mentioned. It was the custom at Rome then to reserve a portion of the eucharist [see *FERMENTUM*], to be put into the chalice at the next celebration. The earliest *Ordo Romanus* (§ 8, *Musae. Ital. tom. ii. p. 8*) directs that when this

is brought out for use, "the bishop or deacon salute the holy things (*sancta*) with an inclination of the head." In *Ordo II.*, which is a revision of the first, and perhaps a century later, the bishop, "his head bowed toward the altar, first adores the holy things," &c. (§ 4, p. 43). See also the *Ecloga* of Amalarius, who comments on this *Ordo* (§ 6, p. 550). The significance of the action may be estimated by the similar respect paid in some churches to the gospel, *eg.* "The priests and bishops standing by uncover their heads, lay down their sticks, and worship the gospel by an inclination of the head" (*Rituarius Gabriel, Renaud. tom. i. p. 211*). The last passage to which we shall call attention, occurs in the Acts of the council of Constantinople, A.D. 754: "As that which He took of us is only the matter of human substance, perfect in all things, without expressing the proper form of a person, that no addition of person may take place in the Godhead, so also did He command the image, chosen matter, to wit the substance of bread, to be offered, not, however, fashioned after the form of man, lest idolatry should be brought in" (in *Act. vi. Conc. Nic. ii. Labb. tom. vii. col. 448*). It is evident that the adoration of the host, in its modern sense, could not have been known when this was written.

As elevation is often supposed to imply adoration, it should be mentioned that there was no elevation of the consecrated elements in the West before the twelfth century; and that the so-called elevation of the East was merely a "showing of the gifts," designed to second the invitation to communicate conveyed by the proclamation, "Holy things for the holy" (see *Notitia Eucharistica*, pp. 546, 595). [W. E. S.]

**HOURS OF PRAYER.** I. This phrase was inherited from the elder church. "Peter and John went up together into the temple at the Hour of Prayer, being the ninth hour" (Acts iii. 1). At first the observance of the hours was of devotion only, but it was afterwards made obligatory by canon on the clergy and monks, and they began to be called Canonical Hours. The earliest use of this expression is found, we think, in the rule of St. Benedict (c. 67; in *Holstenii Codex Regularum*, P. ii.); but it does not appear to have been very common within the period of which we treat. It occurs in the *Regula* of St. Isidorus of Seville who died in 636 (cap. 7; *Holst. u. s.*). St. Eloy, A.D. 640, employs it: "To whom should it be said that 'men ought always to pray and not to faint' (St. Luke xviii. 1), if not to him who daily at the Canonical Hours, according to the rite of ecclesiastical tradition, praises and beseeches the Lord without ceasing in the accustomed psalmody and prayers" (*Hom. xi. in Biblioth. PP. tom. xii.*). Bede in our own country (A.D. 701), in his commentary on those words of St. Luke, copies this sentence from St. Eloy. The "Canonical Hours" are mentioned in the excerpts of Ecgbriht, A.D. 740 (can. 28; *Johnson's Engl. Canons*), and in the canons of Cuthbert, 747 (c. 15; *ibid.*).

II. *What is meant by an Hour.*—By an hour was understood a twelfth part of the natural day, reckoned from sunrise to sunset, of whatever length it might be. Upon the use of this natural measure of time by the Jews is founded

that saying of our Lord: "Are there not twelve hours in the day? If a man walk in the day, he stumbleth not; because he seeth the light of this world" (St. John xi. 9). The Romans are said to have adopted this division of the day about B.C. 291. Martial refers to it as in use among them, when he tells a friend that he might read his book in less than an hour, and that not one of summer's length (*Epigr. lib. xii. n. 1, ad Priscum*). In the *Pseudolus* of Plautus an "hour in winter" is said to be "shortest" (Act V. sc. 2, l. 11). The Greeks had learnt this method in the 6th century before Christ, when the sun-dial became known to them probably through Anaximander (see Diogenes Laert. lib. 1. c. 7); and they retained it during their subjection to the Roman empire. Thus in the *Sentences* ascribed to Secundus of Athens in the time of Hadrian, a day is defined to be "the space given to toil, the course of twelve hours" (*Sent. 4*). As the time of labour varied, so must the hours have been longer or shorter. It is employed beyond our period by Cassianus Bassus, A.D. 940, as when he tells the tiller of the land at what hour the moon sets and rises on each day of the month (*Geoponica lib. i. c. 7*). St. Augustine speaks as if he knew of no other, "The hour in winter, compared with the hour in summer, is the shorter" (*De Verd Relig. c. xliii. § 80*). Hence we infer that the natural day and hour were also employed by the church in his day. Amalarius at the close of our period uses the same division of time with express reference to the Hours of Prayer; prefacing his account of them thus: "The people properly call the presence of the sun above the earth the complete day. From this definition it may be understood that a day of twelve hours ought to begin at the rising and end at the setting of the sun" (*De Ordine Antiphonarum, c. 6*; see also cc. 16, 70). By the first hour, then, we are to understand that twelfth part of the natural day which began at sunrise; by the sixth that which ended when the sun crossed the meridian; the twelfth that which immediately preceded the sunset.

The day and the night were further divided into four equal parts. Each quarter of the day consisting of three hours was named after the last hour in it. Thus the first quarter, containing the first, second, and third hour, was called the third hour (*Tertia, Terce*), that is to say, by the "third hour" we often have to understand the whole interval between sunrise and the beginning of the fourth (smaller) hour. Similarly Sext is the space of the three hours that follow, viz. the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth, ending at noon, or twelve o'clock. None embraces the seventh, eighth and ninth hours; and the last, called Duodecima, contains the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth, ending at sunset. This is satisfactorily shown by Francolinus (*De Temporibus Horar. Canon. c. xxi.*; Romae, 1571). Hence St. Benedict (*Regula, c. 48*) was free to direct that from Easter to the Kalends of October None should be said "in the middle of the eighth hour," and that from the latter time to Ash-Wednesday "Terce should be performed at the second hour."

III. *The Prayers called Hours, &c.*—By the Hours of Prayer and the Canonical Hours were also understood the devotions themselves, con-

sisting for the most part of psalms and prayers, which were used at the stated times more properly so called. Equivalents in this secondary sense within the first eight centuries were *Officium Divinum*, or *Officia Divina* (see e. g. Bened. *Regula*, cc. 8, 43; Isidore of Seville, *De Eccl. Off. lib. i. c. 19*), *Cursus (sc. Divinus)* (Greg. Turon. *de Gloria Mart. lib. i. c. 11*; *Hist. Franc. l. viii. c. 15*; ix. c. 6, &c.); *Cursus ecclesiastici* (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc. l. x. c. 31*; n. 19); *Missa (Conc. Agath. A.D. 506, cap. 30*; Cassian. *De Coenob. Instit. L. ii. c. 7*); and *Missa nocturna* (Cass. u. s. l. ii. c. 13), *Vigiliarum Missa (ibid. l. iii. c. 8)*, &c.; *Missa Canonica (ibid. c. 5)* (though it may be doubted whether in Cassian's time the thought of *dismissal* was entirely absent when that word was used); *Orationes Canonicae (ibid. l. ii. c. 12)*. We find used also the more general terms *Diurna Celebritas*, *Solemnnitas*, *Agenda*, or, from the staple of the devotions used, *Psalmodia*. The word *synaxis* (assembling) employed by the Egyptian, Syrian, and Grecian monks, conveyed to the mind alike the notion of the times at which and of the purpose for which they assembled (*ibid. lib. ii. c. 10*; *Collat. viii. c. 16*, &c.). It was often thus used in the West, but at first needed explanation. Hence in the rule of St. Columban, abbot of Luxeuil in Burgundy, and afterwards of Bobio in Italy from 589 to 615, we read, "concerning the synaxis, that is, the course of psalms and the canonical method of prayers" (cap. 7, Holst. u. s. sim. *Regula Donati, c. 75*, Holst. P. iii.). In England the following example occurs in 740, "These seven synaxes we ought daily to offer to God with great concern for ourselves and for all Christian people" (*Excerptions of Ecgbriht, c. 28*). It was Latinised by *Collecta*, as in the version of the rule of Pachomius (ad calc. Opp. Cassiani), and by St. Jerome, who says "Alleluia was sung, by which sign they were called to collect" (*Epitaph. Paulae, Ep. lxxxvi.*). By the Greeks the daily course was also called the canon, because it was the prescribed rule or norm of prayer. Thus Antiochus, A.D. 614, "Our canon is called Psalmody" (*Hom. CV. Auct. Gr. Lat. Biblioth. PP. tom. i.*). Compare John Moschus, A.D. 630, *Limonarion, c. 40*. There is perhaps a much earlier instance in St. Basil, A.D. 370, "Every one keeps his proper canon" i. e. observes the prayers assigned to him (*Regulas Breviores, Resp. ad Qu. 147*). St. Benedict gave to the daily offices of his monks the expressive name of *Opus Dei*, God's Work (*Regula, cc. 43, 44, &c.*), a title soon adopted by others (*Caesarii Regula ad Mon. c. 19*, Holst. P. ii.; *Aureliani Regula, c. 29, ibid. &c.*). It was used conventionally as a complete equivalent to *Officium Divinum*; e. g. *Opus Dei, celebratur, expletur (Reg. Bened. cc. 44, 52)*; *dicitur, canitur (Regula, SS. Pauli et Stephani, cc. 8, 11, Holst. P. ii.)*. *Opus Divinum* is also found as in Benedict (*Regula, c. 19*), Cassiodorus, A.D. 562 (*De Instit. Div. Litt. c. 30*), &c. *Obsequium Divinum* also occurs at the beginning of the 9th century (*Conc. Aquisgr., A.D. 816, cap. 131*). This use of obsequium, service, may be traced to the Vulgate. See St. John xvi. 2; Rom. ix. 4; xii. 1; xv. 31; Phil. ii. 17, 30.

IV. *The several Hours of Prayer and their various Names.*—Three hours of prayer, the third, the sixth, and the ninth were observed by

the Jews. "Evening and morning and at noon will I pray," was the resolve of David (Ps. lv. 17). Daniel "kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed and gave thanks before his God" (Dan. vi. 10). Two of these hours were determined by the times of the daily sacrifices (Joshua ben Levi in Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* in Act. Apost. iii. 1), which were offered "in the morning and about the ninth hour" (Josephus, *Antiq. L. xiv. c. 4. § 3*). The force of St. Peter's argument in Acts ii. 15, "These are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day," depends on the fact familiar to his hearers that the Jews generally did not break their fast (See Grotius and others in *loc.*) before the morning sacrifice and prayer. This therefore was about the third hour. We are expressly told that "the hour of prayer" at which Peter and John went up to the temple was the "ninth hour" (Acts iii. 1). At the ninth hour Cornelius, a proselyte of the gate, "prayed in his house" (Acts x. 30). St. Peter "went up upon the house-top to pray about the sixth hour" (*ibid.* v. 9). "We read," says Ardo Smaragdus, and he may speak for many, "that the third, sixth, and ninth hours were observed by the apostles" (*Comm. in S. Bened. Regulam*, c. 16).

The three hours of the apostolic church were transmitted to the succeeding ages. Tertullian, A.D. 192, speaks of "those common hours which mark the divisions of the day, the third, sixth, and ninth, which we may observe in Scripture to be more solemn than the rest" (*De Orat.* c. 25. See *De Jejun. adv. Psychicos*, c. 10). Clemens Alex., A.D. 192, "If some assign stated hours to prayer, as the third, sixth, and ninth, the man of knowledge prays to God throughout his whole life" (*Strom.* l. vii. c. 7, § 40). "There are three times," observes St. Jerome, "in which the knees are to be bent to God. Ecclesiastical tradition understands the third, the sixth, and the ninth hour" (*Comm. in Dan.* c. vi. v. 10).

In the 3rd century, however, we begin to hear of five stated times of prayer. St. Cyprian, A.D. 252, after citing the Scriptural examples given above, goes on to say, "But beside the hours observed of old, both the durations and sacraments of prayer have increased for us now. For we ought to pray in the morning . . . . Also when the sun withdraws and the day fails, we must by a necessary obligation pray again" (*De Orat. Dom. sub fin.*). St. Basil in Cappadocia speaks of these hours of prayer as necessary and suitable for monks; the morning, the third hour, the sixth, the ninth, and the evening (*Regulae fusius Tract. Resp. ad Qu. 37, §§ 3-5*).

The morning office now introduced is called by Cyprian (*u. s.*) *matutina oratio*; *matutinae orationes* by Aurelian (*Regula* c. 28); by Cassian *matutina solemnitas* (*De Coenob. Inst.* lib. iii. c. 3). By others it was called *laudes matutinae*, from the use in it of the three last psalms, which were called emphatically by the Latins "laudes," and by the Greeks *αινοι*. Hence the later common appellation of lauds. From this the office also took the name of *matutinae* (Greg. Turon. *Hist. Franc.* l. ii. c. 23: *Vit. Patr.* c. 4, &c.; Ferreoli *Regula*, c. 13 in Holsten. P. ii.; Guidonis *Reg.* c. 39 in Hergot, *Vet. Discipl. Mon. Par.* 1726). It was also called *matutinum sacrificium*, as by Fructuosus (*Reg.* c. 3; Holsten.

*u. s.* and *matutinum officium*; Isidor. *Reg. c. 7 Conc. Bracar.* A.D. 560, can. i.); whence also simply *matutinum* (Isid. *ibid.*). *Matutinale officium* is also found (*Vita S. Joann. Gorz.* in *Act. SS. Ben.*, saec. v. p. 392) and *matutinus* (*sc. cursus*) (*Regula Magistri*, c. 34, Holsten.); also *matutinarium* (*Caesarii Reg.* c. 21), and *matutinari canonici* (*Aurel. Ord. post Reg.*). But the most common name was *matutini*, from the psalm, which formed the chief part of the office. This was employed by Benedict (*Regula*, cc. 12, 13, &c.) and was naturally adopted by many in the same age (*Pseud.-Aug. Reg.* § 1; *Caes. Reg.* c. 21; *Aurel. Ord. u. s.* &c.).

Among the Greeks this office is called by St. Basil (*Regulae fus. Tr. u. s.*) *τὸ ὄρθρον*, the office of dawn, a name which it retains to this day; by St. Epiphanius, A.D. 368, "morning (*ἑσπέρη*) hymns and morning prayers" (*De Fide*, c. 23), in the so-called *Apostolical Constitutions* the "prayers of dawn" (lib. viii. c. 34), and the "thanksgiving at dawn" (c. 38).

The evening office was generally called *vespers* in the West (*Bened. Reg.* c. 41; Isidor. *Hisp. de Eccl. Off.* lib. i. c. 20), and *vesperinum officium* (Isid. *Reg.* c. 7). St. Ambrose (*De Virginibus*, lib. iii. c. 4, § 18) calls it the "hour of incense" in allusion to the Jewish rite (*Exod.* xxx. 8; *Ps.* cxli. 2; *St. Luke* i. 10). It was sometimes called *lucernarium*, as in a comment on the 119th Psalm ascribed (incorrectly, we think) to St. Jerome. "We (monks) pray at the third hour. We pray at the sixth hour; at the ninth. We make the *Lucernarium*. We rise in the middle of the night. Finally we pray at cock-crow" (*ad fin. Breviar. in Psalm.* See also *Regul. Tarnat.* c. 9, in Holst. P. ii.). Another form was *Lucernarii*, as in *Regula Magistri*, (c. 36, Holst. *u. s.*). In Spain, as we shall see, the *Lucernarium* was only considered the first part of *vespers*. *Vespers* were also called the twelfth (hour), as in the *Regula Magistri* (c. 34). "Prime ought to be said in the same manner as Twelfth, which is called *vespera*." The 2nd council of Tours, A.D. 567, says, "The statutes of the fathers have prescribed that . . . twelve psalms be said at the Twelfth with Alleluia, which moreover they learnt from the showing of an angel" (can. 18). A reference to Cassian (*De Coenob. Inst.* l. ii. c. 5), who tells the story, proves that the Twelfth is here an equivalent to *solemnitas vespertina*. Compare the *Ordines* at the end of the *Regulae* of St. Aurelian in Holsten. P. ii. pp. 110, 112; P. iii. pp. 69, 72. St. Columban does not use the words *vespers* and *completorium* in his rule, but (c. 7) orders a certain service to be said "*ad initium noctis*." It appears more probable that this refers to *vespers*, the older office which must certainly have been said in his monastery, though Menard and others think that *compline* is meant. In the Greek church, as partially in the Latin, the lighting of the lamps gave the office its common name *τὸ λυχνικόν*, though it is also called more properly *τὸ ἑσπερινόν* (Goar in *Euchologio*, p. 30). In the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. viii.) the whole office is called *τὸ ἑσπερινόν* (c. 35). It begins with a Psalm (the 140th) called *ἐπιλόγιος*; prayers are then said for the catechumens, *energumens*, &c. These are then dismissed, and the faithful say a prayer and thanksgiving by themselves, both of which are qualified by the title

Ἐπιλόχνιος (cc. 36, 37). At the council of Constantinople A.D. 536, on one occasion the patriarch announced τὸ λυχνικόν on Saturday evening in the oratory of St. Mary (Act V. Labb. Conc. tom. v. col. 212). The council held there in 691 (in *Trullo*) ordered that there should be no kneeling from Saturday evening until Sunday evening, "on which they again knelt" ἐν τῷ λυχνικῷ (can. 90).

St. Jerome at Bethlehem mentions at least six hours as kept by the religious women whom he advised: "There is no one who knows not the third, the sixth, the ninth hour, the dawn also and the evening . . . . In the night we should rise twice or thrice" (*Ad Eustoch.* Ep. xviii.). To Demetrias he says, "Beside the order of the Psalms and prayer, which thing is to be always practised by thee at the third hour, the sixth, the ninth, at even, midnight, and morning, settle at how many hours thou shouldst learn the Holy Scripture," &c. (*Epist.* xcvi.). Of Paula and her community he says, "They sang the psalter in due course at the morning hour, at the third, the sixth, the ninth, at even, at midnight" (*Ad Eustoch. Epitaph. Paulae*, Ep. lxxxvi.), and he advised that one preparing for that mode of life be trained "to rise in the night for prayers and psalms, to sing hymns in the morning, to stand in the field like a good soldier of Jesus Christ at the third, sixth, and ninth hour . . . . and to render the evening sacrifice when the lamp is lighted" (*Ad Laetam*, Ep. lvii.). The author of the *Apostolical Constitutions* says, "Make prayers at sunrise, at the third hour, the sixth, the ninth, at evening, and at the cock-crow" (i.e. evidently at midnight) (lib. viii. c. 34).

The ordinary night office of the monasteries is called by Cassian *solemnitas nocturna* (*Instit.* lib. ii. c. 4), and *nocturni psalmi et orationes* (*ibid.* c. 13); by Pseudo-Augustine (*Regula*, App. i. ad Opp.) and others *nocturnae orationes*; whence simply *nocturnae*, as in the rule of S. Ferreol, c. 13. *Nocturni* (sc. *psalmi* as in *Bened. Regula*, c. 15; Aurelian *Ordo Regulae* affix.; *Regula Magistri*, c. 33; &c.) was common. It was also called *Nocturnum Officium* (*Reg. Mag. u. s.*); *Officium Vigiliae* (*Isidori Regula*, c. 7); and apparently the word *vigiliae* itself conveyed the notion of the service used in the nightly vigil (*Benedicti Regula*, c. 9; *Isid. Reg.* c. 7; &c.). The Greek name for the nocturnal office is μεσονυκτικόν (*Ordo Philothei* in *Euchol.* Goar, p. 7; *Typicon Sabae*, c. 5; see Leo Allatius, *De Libr. Eccl. Grasc.* Diss. i. p. 65).

In the 4th century there appears a desire to conform the rule of prayer to the standard which was supposed to be set up in the 119th Psalm, "Seven times a day do I praise thee" (v. 164). St. Ambrose, A.D. 374, asks, "If the prophet says, Seven times, &c., who was taken up with the affairs of a kingdom, what ought we to do, who read, Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation? Certainly solemn prayers are to be offered with giving of thanks when we rise from sleep, when we go forth, when we prepare to take food, when we have taken it, and at the hour of incense (St. Luke, ii. 10), lastly when we go to bed" (*De Virginitas*, lib. iii. c. 4, n. 18; *Comm. in Luc. Ev.* lib. vii. § 88). If such were to be the practice in private life, it would be felt, how much more signally should monks observe the Psalmist's

rule? The argument had weight even with those who understood, as St. Augustine (*Serm.* xxxi. in *Ps.* cxviii. § 4) and St. Hilary (*Tract. in Ps. eund.* lib. xxi. § 4) did, the Scriptural use of that number. Because it is "universitatis indicium," therefore (argues the former) "the church with reason has praised God for His righteous judgments seven times a day." Cassian, A.D. 424, claims for his monastery, the foundation of Paula at Bethlehem, the honour of having settled the rule. This was by the addition of a matin office, afterwards called prime, between the matin lauds and terce. The lauds were "said in the monasteries after a short interval of time when the nocturn psalms and prayers were over;" i.e. shortly before sunrise, while the new matin office, or prime, was said after it. We are not told when it was introduced, but in Cassian's time, though of Eastern origin, it was observed "chiefly in the regions of the West" (*De Coenob. Instit.* l. iii. c. iv.). Nevertheless there is no mention of prime in the rules of St. Caesarius (bishop of Arles, A.D. 506) for monks and nuns on week days, and only in one MS. of the latter is it prescribed for Sundays (*Martene, De Ant. Monach. Rit.* l. i. c. iv. n. 2); nor does he mention it in his homilies, though he entreates the devout to rise early in Lent for vigils, and before all things to assemble for "terce, sext, none" (*Hom.* cxi. § 2, in App. Opp. Aug.). He assumes of course that they would be present at matins and evensong; and in the duties proper to litany days we find him including attendance at church at "the six hours" (*Hom.* clxxv. § 3). Some sixty years later Cassiodorus omits prime in his enumeration of the seven hours observed by the monks (*Expos. in Ps.* cxviii. v. 164). Nor is it recognised by St. Isidore of Seville a century later either in his rule (*Holstenii Codex Regul. Monast.* p. ii.), or in his work *De Officiis*. In the latter (lib. i. c. 23) he even quotes what Cassian says of prime as if it referred to the older matin lauds, thus showing ignorance of the institution of another matin office. It was however already known in France, being ordered (and that as if already known) in the rule of Aurelian, a successor of Caesarius at Arles, A.D. 555 (*Ordo Regulae* affix. *Holst.* P. ii. p. 111; P. iii. p. 71). Before the middle of the 7th century it had found its way into Spain; for it is mentioned in the rule of Fructuosus (*Holsten.* P. ii.; *Regula*, c. 2) the founder of the Complutensian monastery and many others, who died in 675. It had been introduced in Italy, and an office for it prescribed by St. Benedict, A.D. 530 (*Holst. u. s. Regula*, c. 17). It appears also in two other Western rules of unknown authorship and country; one (*Pseudo-Aug. u. s.*) of the 6th century, and the other (*Regula Magistri*, c. 35, *Holsten.* P. ii.) belonging to the 7th. It was without doubt largely owing to Benedict and his followers that it now became universal in the Latin church.

The use of seven offices for the day and night, and where prime was adopted, of seven for the day alone, was attained in the 6th century by erecting the last brief prayers said before going to bed into a formal and common service under the name of *Compline*. St. Ambrose, as already quoted, probably referred to private prayer only; but St. Chrysostom, though the Greek monks did not adopt any set service answering to the



Western Compline, appears to speak of hymns sung together when he describes the life of monks in his day. He says that they rise at cockcrow for psalmody and prayer, going to rest again a little before light, that after completing the morning prayers and hymns they turn to the reading of the Scriptures, . . . then observe the third, sixth, and ninth hours, and the evening prayers, and, dividing the day into four parts, honour God in each part by psalmody and prayer; . . . and after sitting (at table) a short time, closing all with hymns, take their rest (*Hom. xiv. in 1 Tim. § 4*). St. Basil again, referring to the custom of monks:—"When the day is ended, thanksgiving for the things that have been supplied to us and been prosperously ordered, and confession of omissions voluntary or otherwise, &c., are made (i.e. in the evening office) . . . and again, at the beginning of the night, prayer (*αἰτήσεις*), that our rest may be undisturbed and free from illusions" (*Reg. Fus. Tract. Resp. ad Q. 37, § 5*). John Climacus, A.D. 564, in his *Liber ad Pastorem*, says that a certain abbot when vespers were over would order one monk to say ten psalms (*psalmorum odaria*), another thirty, a third a hundred, before they went to sleep. The present writer has observed no trace in the East within our period to secure any such last act of devotion by appointing a form of prayer for constant use; but in the Latin church the rule of St. Benedict, A.D. 530 (cc. 16, 17), speaks of Compline as if it were already as well known as Terce or Sext. He does not claim to introduce it; nor does he offer any explanation. At the same time, his adoption of the new hour would cause it to be widely received. Cassiodorus, who probably borrowed from St. Benedict (see Garet's *Dissert.* appended to the *Life* in Cassiod. *Opp.*), in his commentary on the 119th Psalm, written about 560, remarks on the words, "Seven times a day," &c. (v. 164), "If we desire to understand this number literally, it signifies the seven times at which the pious devotion of the monks solaces itself; i.e. at matins, terce, sext, none, lucernaria (vespers), completoria, nocturns."

The word completorium has been said to refer rather in its origin to the completion of the ordinary acts of daily life (*Amalarius De Eccl. Off. lib. iv. c. 8; De Ordine Antiph. c. 7*) than to the completion of the daily round of devotion. This is the name of most frequent occurrence, owing evidently to its adoption by St. Benedict (cc. 16, 17); but completa is also found as in the *Ordines* of Aurelian (*Holst. P. ii. p. 112; P. iii. p. 72*), and in the work of Isidore *De Eccl. Off.* (lib. i. c. 21); though in his rule (c. 7) completorium is used. A corrupt reading in the 2nd canon of Merida, A.D. 666, which orders that vespers be said on feasts prius quam sonum has led to the conjecture that in Spain compline was sometimes called somnum. No name is given to the office by Fructuosus of Braga, 656, who appears however to refer to compline when in his rule (c. 2) he says, "In the night season therefore the first hour of the night is to be celebrated with six prayers, &c." After describing the office, he speaks of the manner in which the monks shall retire to rest. When the Greeks at length prescribed a constant form answering to the Latin completorium, they called it ἀπὸδευρον because it followed the last meal of the day.

Perhaps the earliest authority is the *Typicon* ascribed to St. Sabas, who died in the 6th century, but which cannot in its present form be earlier than the 11th.

In some monasteries a ninth office was said, called *Lucernarium*. There was from an early period a pious custom of praying when lamps were lighted in the evening, an action so marked among the old Romans as to give name to that part of the day (*prima fax, or prima lumina*). "It seemed good to our fathers," says St. Basil, "not to receive in silence the gift of the evening light, but to give thanks as soon as it appeared. But who was the author of those words of thanksgiving at the lighting of lamps we are unable to tell. The people, however, utter the ancient saying, and by no one have they ever been thought guilty of impiety, who say, 'We praise the Father and the Son and Holy Spirit of God'" (*De Spir. Sanct. c. lxxiii.*). In the Mozarabic Breviary are the following directions for the performance of this rite:—"A commencement is made by the invocation of JESUS CHRIST (the Lord's Prayer preceding it, 'Lord, have mercy, Christ have mercy, Lord have mercy; Our Father' being said in a low voice) in a loud voice, 'In the name of Jesus Christ, light with peace;' that is, the light offered. Those who stand round respond 'Thanks be to God.' And the presbyter says, 'The Lord be with you always.' *Resp.* 'And with thy spirit.' And the order of vespers whether it be a festival or not, follows in this manner. This may be illustrated from other Spanish sources. *E.g.* the rule of St. Isidore says, "In the evening offices, first the lucernarium, then two psalms, one responsory and lauds, a hymn and prayer are to be said" (cap. 7). The lucernarium is here considered the first part of vespers. The second canon of the council of Merida, 666, mentions that vespers were said "after the offering of the light." In the East the 140th Psalm, called the psalm at the lighting (*ἐπιλάχνιος*) was said before vespers (Compare *Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 35, with lib. ii. c. 59*). St. Jerome at Bethlehem:—"Let her be trained to offer the evening sacrifice when the lamp is lighted" (*Ad Lactan. Epist. lvii.*). Socrates says that "in Greece and at Jerusalem, and in Thessaly they say the prayers at the lighting of lamps very much in the same manner as the Novatians at Constantinople" (*Eccl. Hist. lib. v. c. 22*). Naturally, vespers which followed these prayers came to be called in some churches by the name of lucernarium, which appeared to be the first part of it; but sometimes the lucernarium was enlarged into a distinct office, said some little time before vespers. Thus the rule falsely ascribed to St. Augustine (*Opp. App. i.*), after prescribing the psalm for matins, prime, &c., says, "Let the same thing be observed at vespers and compline; but at lucernarium let there be the (proper) psalm, one responsory, three antiphons, three lessons." So in the rules of Aurelian:—"At lucernarium let there be said in the first place at all seasons, both on festivals and ordinary days, a psalm in monotone (directaneus), then two antiphons. In the third place let there be said with Alleluia, one day the hymn *Deus, qui cœlis legibus*; another *Deus creator omnium*, and a little chapter. At Twelfth (vespers) eighteen psalms, an antiphon and hymn, a lesson and little chapter. When ye are

about to take your rest, let compline be said in the school in which ye remain" (*Regula ad Mon.* Holst. P. ii.; Sim. *ad Virg. ibid.* P. iii.). Here a distinction is clearly made between the *lucernarium* and vespers. They are distinct offices. It is probable, however, from the paucity of such notices, that the former was treated as a separate service on the same footing with the ancient hours only in a very few communities.

V. *Grounds of Observance.*—For *Matins*, reasons of natural piety were often urged, as by St. Basil, "That the first motions of the soul and mind may be dedicated to God, and we admit nothing else into our mind before we have rejoiced in the thought of God" (*Reg. Fus. Tr. Resp. ad Q. 37, § 3*); and in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. viii. c. 34), "To give thanks because the Lord, causing the night to pass away and the day to come on, hath given us light."

There was the Scriptural reason too, "That the resurrection of the Lord, which took place in the morning, may be celebrated by prayer" (Cyprian, *De Or. Dom.* u. s.). Similarly, Isid. Hispal. *De Eccl. Off.* l. i. c. 22; *Conc. Aquisgr.* cap. 130.

There was a practical reason for the institution of *Prime*, as well as the ground of religious sentiment, to which we have already had occasion to refer. It was found that the long interval between the matin lauds and terce was often spent in comparative idleness and sloth. The new office was therefore introduced to prevent this (Cassian, *Coenob. Inst.* l. iii. c. 4). With this statement compare the provision of a Western rule: "After morning prayers let it not be lawful to return to sleep; but when matins are finished let prime be said forthwith. Then let all employ themselves in reading to the third hour" (Aurel. *Reg. ad Monach.* c. 28).

The third, sixth, and ninth hours, which were observed earlier than any other, were thought to have been selected in honour of the Holy Trinity. Thus St. Cyprian—"We find that the three children with Daniel, strong in faith and conquerors in captivity, observed the third, sixth, and ninth hours for a sacrament of the Trinity, which was to be manifested in the last time; for the first hour coming to the third exhibits the full number of a Trinity, and again the fourth proceeding to the sixth declares another Trinity, and when the ninth is completed by three hours from the seventh a perfect Trinity (i. e. a Trinity of Trinities) is numbered" (*De Orat. Dom.* sub fin.). Similarly Isid. Hispal. *De Eccl. Off.* lib. i. c. 19; *Concil. Aquisgr.* A.D. 816, c. 126. The significance of these hours taken separately will be shown below.

*Terce*, as we have seen, was the continuation of a Jewish custom, as were *Sext* and *None*. But there were Christian reasons of great weight for retaining it. "The Holy Ghost," says Cyprian, "descended on the disciples at the third hour" (*De Or. Dom.* u. s.; Sim. Basil. u. s.; *Resp. ad Q. 37*; Hieron. *Comm. in Dan.* vi. 10; Isid. Hisp. u. s. &c.).

Another ground alleged was that "at that hour the Lord received sentence from Pilate" (*Cons. Apost.* l. viii. c. 34). St. Mark x. 25 refers the crucifixion to the third hour, i. e. to the third of the twelve hours between sunrise and sunset; but if the condemnation took place between that and sunrise, it was also correctly

said in ecclesiastical language to have been at the third hour. So John xix. 14, reckoning apparently from midnight, places the condemnation at "about the sixth hour," which brings it down to the third hour understood of the larger space of time, and reckoned from sunrise.

With reference to *Sext*, it was observed that St. Peter "at the sixth hour went up to the house-top, and was both by sign and by the voice of God warning him, instructed to admit all to the grace of salvation" (Cypr. u. s. comp. Hieron. u. s.). Another and more important reason was that "The Lord was crucified at the sixth hour" (Cypr. u. s. Sim. *Constit. Apost.* u. s. Isid. Hispal. u. s. *Conc. Aquisgr.* u. s.), a statement, which if taken to the letter, can only be reconciled with that of St. Mark, by supposing the "sixth hour" to cover the fourth, fifth, and sixth of the smaller hours. If however it means no more than that our Lord hung on the cross at that hour, it needs no explanation.

*None* was said to be observed because "Peter and John went up to the temple at the ninth hour of prayer" (St. Basil. u. s.; St. Jerome, u. s.); but more than all because "at the ninth hour Christ washed away our sins with His blood" (Cypr. *Constit. Apost.* &c. as before).

The pious sentiment which dictated the prayers developed in some religious houses into a distinct office, called *lucernarium*, came before us while we traced the origin of that rite.

*Evensong* was especially an office of thanksgiving. St. Basil—"Is the day ended? Thank Him who hath given us the sun to minister to the works of the day" (*Hom. in Mart. Julittam*, § 2). "In the evening giving thanks that God has given us the night for a season of rest from the labours of the day" (*Const. Apost.* u. s.).

Another thought is connected with it by St. Cyprian:—"Because Christ is the true sun and the true day, when, at the departure of the sun and day of the world, we pray and beseech that the light may come on us again, we are praying for the coming of Christ, who will give the grace of everlasting light" (*De Orat. Dom.* u. s.). A third ground of this observance is suggested by Cassian, viz., that the eucharist was "delivered to the apostles by the Lord the Saviour in the evening" (*Instit.* l. iii. c. 3; so Isidore, *De Eccl. Off.* l. i. c. 20; *Conc. Aquisgr.* c. 127); and with this was associated the completion of the passion on the following day towards the evening, and about the time of the evening sacrifice (Isid. &c. u. s.).

For *Compline* there was the strong natural reason, often alleged for private prayer before going to sleep at night, as e. g. in a tract doubtfully ascribed to St. Chrysostom:—"With what hope wilt thou come to the season of night; with what dreams dost thou expect to converse, if thou hast not walled thyself round with prayers, but goest to sleep unprotected?" (*De Precat. Or.* l. sub fin.). The zeal of David (Ps. cxxxii. 3-5) was held up as a model:—"This thing ought powerfully to admonish us that, if we wish to be 'a place for the Lord' and desire to be accounted His tabernacle and temple, we should follow the examples of the saints, lest that which is read should be said of us, 'They have slept their sleep, and none of the men of might have found their hands'" (Isid. u. s. l. i. c. 21; *Conc. Aquisgr.* c. 128).

Raban. u. s. l. ii. c. 7). "Every one," says Amalarius (*De Eccl. Off.* l. iv. c. 8), "who has even a little sense, knows how many dangers may assail a man from without when sleeping more than when waking. This office is in some sort analogous to that commendation, by which a man commends himself to God, when he is passing away from this world. Sleep is the image of death," &c.

Nocturns originated in the pious custom of prayer when one woke in the night. Tertullian says of the meals of Christians, "They are so filled as they who remember that even in the night God is to be worshipped by them" (*Apol.* c. 39). St. Cyprian:—"There can be no loss from the darkness of night to those who pray; for there is day even in the night to the sons of light" (*De Orat. Dom.* sub fin.). Clemens of Alexandria (*Paedag.* l. ii. c. 9, § 79):—"Often in the night should we rise from bed and bless God; for happy are they who watch unto Him, thus making themselves like the angels whom we call watchers" (*Dan.* iv. 13, &c.). "Without this prayer" (i.e. prayer expressed in words), says Origen, "we shall not pass the season of the night in a fit manner" (*De Orat.* c. 12). He refers to David (*Ps.* cxix. 62), and St. Paul and Silas (*Acts* xvi. 25). St. Cyril of Jerusalem asks, "When is our mind more intent on psalmody and prayer? Is it not in the night? When do we most frequently come to the remembrance of our sins? Is it not in the night?" (*Catech.* ix. § 4). St. Ambrose cites the example of Christ:—"The Lord Himself passed the night in prayer, that by His own example He might invite thee to pray" (*Expos. in Ps.* cxviii. v. 62; *Serm.* viii. § 45). Elsewhere he says:—"In thy chamber itself I would have psalms by frequent alternation interwoven with the Lord's Prayer, either when thou hast waked up or before sleep bedews the body, that sleep may find thee at the very entrance on rest free from care of worldly things and meditating on divine" (*De Virginibus*, lib. iii. c. iv. § 19). "David every night watered his couch with tears; he rose also in the middle of the night that he might confess to God, and dost thou think that the whole night is to be assigned to sleep? Then is the Lord to be the more entreated by thee; then is protection to be (more) sought, fault to be (more) guarded against when there appears to be secrecy, and then above all, when darkness is round about me and walls cover me, must I reflect that God beholds all hidden things" (*in Ps.* cxviii. *Expos. Serm.* vii. § 31). The example of our Lord was urged:—"The day is not enough for prayer. We must rise in the night and at midnight. The Lord Himself passed the night in prayer; that He might invite thee to pray by His own example" (*ibid.* *Serm.* viii. § 45). St. Hilary, after dwelling on the words of David, adds, "The mind is not to be released by the dangerous idleness of wakefulness in the night, but to be employed in prayers, in pleadings, in confessions of sins; that when occasion is most given to the vices of the body, then above all those vices may be subdued by the remembrance of the divine law" (*Tract in Ps.* cxviii. lit. vii. § 6). To these motives St. Basil adds, "Let the night supply other grounds of prayer. When thou lookest into the sky and gazest on the beauty of the stars," &c. (*Hom. in Mart. Julitt.* § 3).

VI. *The Times of the Offices.*—For Nocturn some rose at cockcrow, as prescribed in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (lib. viii. 34). So St. Chrysostom:—"As soon as the cock crows the prefect is standing by (the sleeping monk), and strikes him as he lies lightly with his foot, and so wakes all straightway" (*Hom.* xiv. in 1 *Tim.* § 4). St. Columban's rule says the "middle" of the night (c. 7); and in Gregory of Tours one speaks of himself as rising "about midnight ad reddendum cursum" (*Hist. Franc.* lib. viii. c. 15). St. Benedict orders his monks to rise for vigils "at the eighth hour of the night in winter; i.e. from the Kalends of November to Easter," but during the rest of the year the time of vigils was to be regulated by that of matins, which it was to precede by a "very short interval" (*Reg.* cap. 8). Another rule, of the 7th century, orders nocturns to be said before cockcrow in winter, and after it in summer, when it was to be "soon" followed by matins (*Regula Magistri*, c. 33). In Spain the severe rule of St. Fructuosus prescribed two or three offices for the night according to the season, one "before midnight," and a second "at midnight," throughout the year, and in winter a third "after midnight" (*Reg.* cap. 3); thus carrying out to the letter the exhortation of St. Jerome to Eustochium, "You should rise twice or thrice in the night" (*Epist.* xviii.).

From the union of nocturns with matins, of which we have seen the beginning, the double office was at a later period called indifferently, nocturns or matins, or lauds.

Matins, properly so-called, were said in the morning watch, or fourth watch of the night; that is to say, at any part of that space of three natural hours which preceded sunrise. They were to be over by dawn: Post matutinum tempus sequitur diluculum (*Amal. de Ord. Antiph.* c. 5). St. Benedict ordered matins to be said "when the light began" (*Reg.* c. 8). If it surprised them at nocturns, the latter were to be shortened (c. 11). So early as the beginning of the 5th century, matins (solemnitas matutina) were "wont to be celebrated in the monasteries of Gaul a short interval of time after the night psalms and prayers were finished" (*Cassian, Instit.* lib. iii. c. 4).

Prime was said in the first natural hour after sunrise. This appears from Cassian's account of its origin. The monks were to be allowed to rest after matins, "usque ad solis ortum," and were then to rise for the new office (*Instit.* u. s.). And so, four centuries later, Amalarius:—"We begin the first of the day from the rising of the sun" (*De Ord. Ant.* c. 6); and Rabanus fixes it "at the beginning of the day when the sun first appears from the east" (*De Instit. Cler.* lib. ii. c. 3).

Terce might originally be said at any part of the three hours which began at sunrise (see before § ii.); but after the institution of prime it could only be said during the two last. It was not in practice always confined to the last; for in the rule of an unknown author, formerly ascribed to St. Jerome, it is expressly provided that on fast-days, terce, sext, and none, be each said an hour earlier than usual (cap. 34; inter Opp. S. Hieron. tom. v. ed. Ben.). See also the rule of St. Benedict, as cited in § ii.

As the lamps were lighted in preparation for evening prayer, the *Lucernarium*, as a merely

preliminary act of devotion would be said immediately before that; and it was in fact as we have seen, often considered an actual part of the office. Where it became a distinct service, there would, we presume, be an interval of some length before vespers began; but we have no information on the subject.

"It becomes evening when the sun sets" (St. Aug. in *Ps.* xxix. v. 6, *Enarr.* ii.). Nevertheless vespers were more generally said in the hour before sunset. This is why the office was called Duodecima (see before § iv.). "We celebrate the evening synaxis," observes Amalarius, "about the 12th hour, which hour is about the end of the day" (*De Ord. Antiph.* c. 6); "most frequently before sunset" (*ibid.* c. 70; comp. c. 16; *Isid. Hisp. de Eccl. Off.* lib. i. c. 20; Raban. Maur. *De Instit. Cleri*, lib. ii. c. 7). Benedict, in fact, made a rule, which must have influenced the custom greatly, that vespers should be said at all seasons while it was yet daylight; and that in Lent, when refectio followed vespers, they should be said at such an early hour that the meal might be over before the light failed (*Reg.* cap. 41). Another authority says, "Vespers ought to be said while the rays of the sun are still declining." "In summer, on account of the short nights, let lucernaria (here vespers) be begun while the sun is still high" (*Regula Magistri*, c. 34).

The history of compline has shown the proper time of saying, viz. before retiring to rest; and this was the time observed by the monks within our period. Thus a MS. of the *Regula* of pseudo-Augustine, now 1200 years old:—"After this (i.e. after certain lessons read at night) let the usual psalms be said before sleep" (Note of Bened. editors, App. i. Opp. Aug.). St. Isidore:—"Compline being ended, the brethren, as the custom is, having wished each other good night before sleeping, must keep still with all heed and silence until they rise for vigils" (*Reg.* c. 7). St. Fructuosus, after prescribing the office of "the first hour of the night," orders his monks to bid each other good-night and retire to their dormitories (*Reg.* i. c. 2). Another rule forbids the monks to speak, eat, drink, or do any work after compline (*Regula Magistri*, c. 30). Amalarius (*De Eccl. Off.* lib. iv. c. 8) tells us that compline was said in the conticinium; i.e. in the third part of the night, reckoning from sunset, when it was divided, as by the Romans, into seven.

When vespers were said earlier compline was put earlier too, and one writer at the close of our period gives it the name of Duodecima (Smaragdus, *Comment. in S. Ben. Reg.* c. 16). It had already taken possession of the hour so long occupied by vespers. At length it became the common opinion that it ought to be said at the twelfth hour (Francolinus, u. s. cap. 18).

For a description of the several offices, see OFFICE, THE DIVINE. [W. E. S.]

HOUSE. In Aringhi, i. p. 522, ii. 658, are woodcuts of houses from ancient tombs [TOMB]. This, perhaps, refers to the grave as the house of the dead, an idea or expression inherited from heathenism (Horace *Carm.* i. iv. 19, and Boddetti, p. 463; even Domus Aeterna, Perret v. pl. 36, x. 110), or to the deserted house of the soul, the buried body (2 Cor. v. i.), "For we know that

if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God," &c. In one of the plates from Aringhi above referred to (ii. 658) there is a house of the grave, with a small mummy of Lazarus; laid up alone (depositus or repositus) to abide the resurrection. The houses of Jerusalem and Bethlehem, representing the Jewish and Gentile churches, occur frequently in ancient paintings and mosaics. [BETHLEHEM.] How far the word Beth, as part of Bethlehem ("house of bread"), may be connected with the Christian import of this symbol, is hard to say. [R. St. J. T.]

HOUSE OF CLERGY. [MANSE.]

HOUSE OF PRAYER. [CHURCH; ORATORY.]

HRIPSIMA, and companions, virgin-martyrs under Tiridates; commemorated June 3 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

HUBERT (HUCBERTUS), bishop and confessor (†727 A.D.); commemorated May 30 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

HUCKSTERS. The mind of the church has of course always been against all unprincipled gain in traffic, even when permitted by law and custom. Adulterators or fraudulent dealers (κάρηλοι) are enumerated (*Apost. Const.* iv. 6, § 2) among those whose oblations are not to be received.<sup>a</sup> And again (*ib.* viii. 32, § 5) the κάρηλος is classed with the stage-players and dancers, among those who must abandon their profession before they can be admitted to the church. Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* V. c. 16) emphatically rejects the doctrine of Carneades, that the seller is not bound to declare the faults of the article which he has for sale, and insists that the Christian conscience requires perfect frankness and openness in such a matter. In the same spirit St. Augustine (*Tract.* 41 in *Joan.*) puts fraud on the same level as fornication and theft, and gives high praise (*De Trin.* xiii. 3) to one who, in buying a book, declined to overreach the seller, who was ignorant of its value. So, too, Hilary (on *Ps.* cxix. [cxviii. Vulg.] 139) enumerates cheating (falsitates) among the things which make our bodies a den of thieves. In short, all kinds of unprincipled dealers (βαδίουργοί) and sorcerers, all who give short weight or measure (ζυγοκροῦσται καὶ δολομέτραι) are condemned (*Apost. Const.* iv. 6, § 1).

Tertullian (*De Idolol.* c. 11; cf. Epiphanius, *Expos. Fid.* c. 24) and some others regard with disfavour all gain derived from mere buying and selling of goods, considering the labour of the hands the proper means of earning a living. But Leo the Great (*Epist.* 92, ad *Rustic.* c. 9) reasonably distinguishes between honest and unprincipled gain (quæstus honestus aut turpis); the culpability or innocence of gain (he holds) depends upon its character; there is no harm in profit not derived from fraudulent practice. Compare COMMERCE.

(Bingham's *Antiq.* XVI. xii. 17). [C.]

HUESCA, COUNCIL OF (*Oscense c.*), at the town so called in the north of Arragon, in Spain, A.D. 598, or the thirteenth year of king

<sup>a</sup> The word does not seem to be used here in the limited sense of the Latin *Caupe*, a tavern-keeper.



Recoared. No further particulars are preserved of it, than that it provided for the holding of a synod every year in each diocese, to inquire into the morals of the monks and clergy, and prescribe rules for their conduct (Mansi, x. 479-83). [E. S. FL.]

### HUMERALE. [AMICOR.]

**HUNTING.** Field-sports have been under the censure of the church from an early period, and in the many canons relating to them there is very little trace of any disposition to relax the severity of absolute prohibition, or to allow exceptional cases in which they might be necessary or desirable.

By the 55th canon of the council of Agde (C. Agathense), A.D. 544, bishops and presbyters are forbidden to keep hawks and hounds for the chase under penalty of three months' excommunication in the case of bishops, and of two months' in the case of priests, and of one in the case of deacons. The same abstinence is enjoined on bishops, presbyters and deacons, under the same penalty by the 4th canon of the council of Epaon. By the 3rd canon of the council of Soissons, not only bishops, presbyters and deacons, but all ecclesiastical persons (clerici) are forbidden to hunt with hounds or to take out hawks. In the 8th canon of the third council of Tours, priests are cautioned against the hunting of birds and wild animals, and the second council of Châlons (c. 9) addresses a similar warning against devoting their time to "hounds, hawks, and falcons," to laity as well as to clergy. It seems that certain bishops kept dogs under the pretence that they were necessary for the defence of their houses; but they are reminded by the 13th canon of the second council of Maron, A.D. 585, that not "barks but hymns, not bites but good works" are the proper protection of a bishop's house, which ought to welcome and not repel men, and certainly not subject any who came for the relief of their sorrows to the risk of being torn by dogs.

Among prohibitions against the same pursuits issued by individuals, is to be found a letter of Boniface, bishop of Mayence (Epist. 105), probably written on the authority of pope Zachary, forbidding "hunting and excursions with dogs through the woods, and the keeping of hawks and falcons;" and the same prohibition is repeated, *totidem verbis*, in the 2nd canon of the council of Liptine, A.D. 743, over which Boniface presided. In the *Liber Penitentiarum* of pope Gregory III. one year's penance is decreed against one in minor orders (clericus), two years' against a deacon, and three years' against a priest, for hunting.

Ferroolus, bishop of Uzès, in his Rule (about A.D. 558), forbids his monks to hunt and hawk on the ground that such pursuits dissipate the mind; he allows them however to set dogs at the wild animals which waste their crops, but only that they may "drive them away, not that they may catch them." Jonas, bishop of Orleans, A.D. 821-844, (*de Institut. linc. ii. 23*, quoted by Thomassin), vents his indignation against the nobles for spending so much money on hawks and hounds instead of on the poor; and is even more fierce against them for the hardships and cruelties which for the sake of their sport they inflicted on the poor. The

frequent recurrence of these prohibitions and the number of years over which they extend, show how rooted was the taste for field-sports among the Teutonic clergy; and the language of some of the canons indicates that these sports sometimes became as oppressive as the Feud Law of the Middle Ages.

Looking on, or being present at the hunting, or baiting, or fighting of wild animals in the amphitheatre is just as strictly forbidden. The council in Trullo (Quinisextum), can. 51, orders both laity and clergy to avoid "the spectacles of hunting," on pain of excommunication, and hunting is so frequently mentioned in connection with games, dances, and dramatic performances, that it must be concluded that the sports of the amphitheatre are intended. The *Codex Ecd. Africane* (c. 61) entreats the emperors to put an end to spectacles on great festivals, such as the octave of Easter, and begs that no Christian may be compelled to attend them. By the council of Mayence (addit. 3, c. 27) it is ordered that if any ecclesiastical person attend any spectacle he is liable to three years' suspension. By the 3rd council of Tours and the second council of Châlons, quoted above, the condemnation of hunting is coupled with that of theatrical spectacles, so that to look at a spectacle of hunting in the amphitheatre would be by the same act to commit two offences against the canon. The 8th canon of the council of Friuli (*Faventinum*) issued a canon against the worldly pomp and vanities in vogue, in which "hunting" was mentioned with other amusements manifestly scenic.

Theodosius the younger abolished contests between men and brutes in the circus on the ground that "cruel sights made him shudder" (Socratus, H.E. vii. 23).

(Thomassin, *Vet. et Nova Ecclesiæ Disciplina*, III. iii. cc. 42, 43.) [E. C. H.]

**HYACINTHUS, or JACINTHUS.** (1) Martyr at Rome with Amantius, Irenæus, and Zoticus; commemorated Feb. 10 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedæ, Adonis, Usuardi).

(2) Martyr at Rome; commemorated July 26 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(3) Martyr with Alexander and Tiburtius, in the Sabine district; commemorated Sept. 9 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi).

(4) Martyr at Rome with Protus under Gallienus; commemorated Sept. 11 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedæ, Adonis, Usuardi, Cal. Bucher., *Fructuosus, Sacramentarium Gregorii*).

(5) Martyr at Caesarea, A.D. 108; commemorated July 5 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(6) Of Amastria in Paphlagonia, martyr; commemorated July 18 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**HYDROMANTIA.** The *Deverbum Gratiani* (can. 28, qu. 5, c. 14, § 3) has the following in the enumeration of magic arts which are condemned:—"Hydromantici ab aqua dicti; ut cum Hydromantis in aqua inspectione umbras daemonum evocare, et imaginem ludificationum eorum videre, ibique ab eis aliqua audire, et adhibito sanguine etiam inferos perhibere suscitare." The chapter from which this is extracted is taken wholly from Rabanus De

*Magorum Praestigiis*, which is again a compilation from Augustine and Isidore of Seville. The passage of Augustine on which the account of Hydromantia is mainly founded is *De Civ. Dei*, vii. 35, and is to this effect; that Numa, having no real divine inspiration, was compelled to practise hydromancy so as to see in water images, or rather false semblances (ludificationes), of the gods, and learn from them what he was to ordain with regard to the *sacra* of his people; and from this use of water for divining purposes (says Varro) Numa gained the reputation of having consulted the nymph Egeria.

It is evident (as indeed Augustine says) that this hydromancy was a form of necromancy. What was its exact nature is not apparent, but it was probably similar to the divining by means of a mirror, or of a dark fluid poured into the palm of the hand, which is frequently mentioned in accounts of magic. [C.]

**HYDROMYSTA** (ὕδρομύστης), the person who had the care of the holy water in a church, and sprinkled with it those who entered (Synesius, *Epist.* 121, quoted in Macri *Hierolox.* s. v.). [C.]

**HYMN** (the Cherubic). A hymn so called from the reference to the cherubim which it contains, which occurs in the chief eastern liturgies shortly after the dismissal of the catechumens, and immediately preceding the "great entrance" (i.e. that of the elements). It is found in the same position in the liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. Mark; and also in the Armenian, in which however it is only sung on special occasions, other hymns being appointed in its place on other days. It is not found in the "heretical liturgies;" which, inasmuch as these underwent less alteration than the orthodox, is an argument against the antiquity of the hymn. Cedrenus (Dupin *Bibl. des Aut. Eccles.* 11me Siècle) a Greek monk who flourished towards the middle of the 11th century, and who wrote "annals" from the creation of the world down to the reign of Isaac Comnenus, says that Justinian first ordered it to be sung in the churches; and it appears to have been composed about that time. Its object is described as being to excite the minds of the faithful to a devout attention to the mysteries about to be celebrated. While it is being sung, the priest says secretly a prayer called "the prayer of the cherubic hymn." The words of the hymn are: οἱ τὰ χερουβὶμ μυστικῶς εἰκονίζοντες, καὶ τῷ ζωοποιῷ Τριάδι τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον ᾄδοντες, πᾶσαν τὴν βιωτικὴν ἀποθώμεθα μέριμναν, ὡς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν ὄλων ὑποδεξάμενοι ταῖς ἀγγελικαῖς ἀοράτως δορυφορομενον τάξεσιν. Ἀλληλούια. [H. J. H.]

**HYMNARIUM**. The book containing the hymns sung in the services of the church. Genadius (*De Script. Eccl.* c. 49) says that Paulinus of Nola composed "Sacramentarium et Hymnarium;" see Gavanti, *Thes. Sacr. Rituum*, ii. 115. Pelliccia (*Politia*, i. 159) gives *Cantionum*, *Libri Chorales*, as common designations of such books, but supplies no instances of their use. [C.]

**HYMNISTA**, a singer of hymns in the church. Thus Prudentius (i. 118):

"Stat nunc hymnistae pro receptis parvula,"  
where the irregularity of the metre is not  
CHRIST. ANT.

perhaps a sufficient reason for arbitrary correction (Macri *Hierolox.* s. v.). Obbar, however, reads,

"State nunc, hymnite matres pro receptis parvula."

[C.]

**HYMNOLOGIA** (ὕμνολογία) seems to be equivalent to the service chanted at the Hours. Thus Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Rem.* c. 25) says that St. Remi with the brothers, "horarum laudes persolvebat hymnologiarum," meaning (seemingly) that he observed the course set down in the Hymnologies, the term being used so as to include psalms, canticles, antiphons, etc. Macro (*Hierolox.* s. v.) supposes that Dionysius, the Pseudo-Areopagite (*Hierarch. Eccl.* iii. 2), when he speaks of ἡ καθολικὴ ὕμνολογία having been uttered as a confession (προσμολογηθείσης) before the elements were placed on the altar, meant the Creed. This is of course possible, and Pachymeres (*Paraphr.* in loco) seems to have taken it so; for they had, he says, even then, μᾶθημά τι καὶ συμμᾶθημα πίστεως [CREED]. [C.]

**HYMNS**. In the following article no attempt will be made to deal with the literary or theological history of Christian hymnody. All that can be here undertaken is to give a sketch of what is known respecting the liturgical use of hymns within the limits to which this work is restricted. Much of the difficulty connected with the subject arises from our uncertainty as to how much was covered by the word ὕμνος in early Christian writers. Almost everything sung, or rhythmically recited, which was not one of the Davidic Psalms, was called a hymn, or said to be "hymned." Even as late as the middle of the ninth century, Walafrid Strabo (*De Rebus Eccl.* c. 25) warns us that by "hymns" he does not mean merely such metrical hymns as those of Hilary, Ambrose, Prudentius, or Bede, but such other acts of praise as are offered in fitting words and with musical sounds. He adds that still in some churches there were no metrical hymns, but that in all "generales hymni, id est laudes," were in use. The well-known passage of St. Augustine (*Enarr. in Ps.* lxxii.), which was for centuries the formal definition of a hymn in every ritual writer, gives us the same rule. A hymn might or might not be in verse; but it was always something meant to be sung, and sung as an act of divine worship. So Gregory Nazianzen defines a hymn as αἶγος ἐμμελές. Further, Christian writers gradually learned to use the term in contradistinction to the Psalm of the Old Dispensation; though both words were for a time interchangeable.

It is obvious that from the very first, Gentile disciples must have sought and found some further expression for the praise of God than the translation of Hebrew Psalms, or of the canticles from the Hebrew prophets, could afford. But at what period Christian songs of praise first found their place in common worship, it is impossible to say. None can tell in what words Paul and Silas "ὕμνον τὸν Θεόν" in prison (Acts xvi. 25); nor can we say with certainty that the rhythmic passages in the Epistles (e. g. Eph. v. 14; 1 Tim. iii. 16, vi. 15, 16; 2 Tim. ii. 11-13) are quotations from

hymns, though this has been frequently maintained. The parallel passages, again, Eph. v. 19, 20, and Col. iii. 16, 17, though evidently pointing to some form of Christian song, yet appear to connect these with social and festive gatherings rather than with worship. Probably they bore the same relation to the forms used in public worship, which the Spiritual Songs of Luther, the "Ghostly Psalms" of Coverdale, or the early Wesleyan hymns, did to the existing forms of service in their day; and it may be that, like some of the first and last of these, they were subsequently adopted into divine service. This we know to have been the case at a later period with the *ὦς ἱκανόν* referred to by St. Basil (*De Sp. Sancto*, c. 29) as being (in his time) of ancient use; it is still, as is well known, a part of the daily office of the Greek church. If this hymn were really the work of Athenagenes († 169), it would doubtless be the earliest hymn now in use; but a reference to the passage in St. Basil will show that he did not believe Athenagenes to be the author. This hymn, with the early form of the *GLORIA IN EXCELSIS*, the latter being given as the morning hymn of the church in the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii. 48 (Coteler)), probably represent in their rhythmic but non-metrical structure many early Christian hymns now lost. Of the existence of such hymns, from the time of Pliny's well-known letter to Trajan (*Epist.* 97), we have abundant evidence. The "hymning to God the giver of all good things," by the Roman Christians after the martyrdom of Ignatius (*Mart. S. Igm.* vii.), may have been a burst of extemporaneous thanksgiving; but early in the following century a Roman writer cited by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 28) tells us how *ψαλμοὶ δὲ ὕμνοι καὶ ᾠδαὶ ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὡς πιστῶν γραφεῖσιναι, τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑμνοῦσι θεολογοῦντες*, and again the Clementine Epitome *De gestis Petri*, § 152, refers to *ἱερῶν ὕμνων εὐχὴν* as a part of worship. Of Alexandria, again, Origen testifies (*c. Celsam*, viii. c. 67) *ὕμνους γὰρ εἰς μόνον τὸν ἐν πάσι λεγόμενον Θεόν καὶ τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτοῦ Θεόν λόγον* [nl. τ. κ. α. λόγον καὶ Θεόν]. (Cf. also *Enigm.* in *Ps.* 148.)

Again, an early tradition reported by Socrates (*H. E.* vi. 8) attributes to Ignatius the introduction of antiphonal singing at Antioch, as the result of a vision of the angelic worship which was revealed to him [ΛΥΤΙΜΩΝ]. The monks of the Syrian deserts, in the time of Sozomen (*H. E.* vi. 31, 2) continued in prayers and hymns according to the rule of the church (*θεσπίων τῆς ἐκκλησίας*). The point to which all these allusions tend is the very early use of hymns both in the East and West. Of the East, indeed, we can speak more positively. The Epistle of the second council of Antioch (A.D. 268) to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, against Paul of Samosata, makes it one of the charges against him, that he had "put a stop to the psalms that were sung to our Lord Jesus Christ, as being innovations, the work of men of later times;" while, to the horror of every one, he had appointed women to say psalms on Easter Day in his own honour (*εἰς ἐαυτοῦ*) (Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 30). This last expression may simply refer to his position on a throne of unusual height and dignity in the church; and it is not unlikely that Paul sought to confine the singing strictly

to Jewish | ducible from | hymns were | a disputed | divine service | probabilities | it must have | which will | hymns are | church, but | eighth cento | accentual, lik | It is impossibl | hymns found | so-called "ea | of Clement o | not, except i | all. The san | of Gregory | approach ne | unlikely that | found its way |

The fourth | impulse give | successively | West, under | and with the | feeling on t | fierce contro | ments was t | metres and | either by Ba | or CHA. Bi | son Harmoni | to be so p | counteract t | tion of orth | to the same | life of St. I | trained choir | hymns whic | Nativity, Ba | rection and A | divine myste | the martyrs, | The young v | divine servic | of martyrs, | standing in | Sozomen, H. | that time fo | fixed elemen | speaking ehu | place not on | Eucharistic, | not so easy | effected in t | because we | already in us | (*H. E.* ii 24) | phonal singi | under Consta | In most ritu | the lead of A | been an imit | there. We can | of Chrysosto | Arians, as rel | led to a man | hymns in div | expelled by T | city; but it

and they had places of assembly outside the walls. On Saturdays and Sundays they assembled in crowds in the open spaces of the city, singing Arian hymns and antiphons, and went in procession, with these hymns, to their churches. Chrysostom determined to organize rival processions of the orthodox. The empress Eudocia entered into the scheme, and a eunuch of the imperial household was instructed to furnish the necessary materials for the ceremonial, at her expense. It is curious to find that these included not merely crosses and torches, but also *hymns*; so unimportant did the words sung appear to Chrysostom in reference to the end in view. But whether the hymns were good or bad, the midnight processions popularised their use; and from the night offices of the church they seem to have passed into other hours. The midnight singing of the "Golden Canon" of St. John Damascene, so graphically described by Neale (*Hymns of Eastern Ch.* p. 35), which forms so marked and picturesque a feature of the Greek Easter, is doubtless the true historical representation of Chrysostom's nocturnal processions (cf. Socrates, vi. 8; Cassiodorus, *Hist. Trip.* x. 8; Nicephorus, viii. 8, 9). It was not, however, according to Neale (*u. s.* p. 13), till the period of the Iconoclastic controversy (A.D. 726-820) that Greek hymnology reached its full development. Its great names are Andrew of Crete (660-732), John Damascene († 780), Cosmas the melodist († 760), Theophanes (759-818), Theodore of the Studium († 826), and Methodius († 836). How marvellous its development was may be gathered from the fact alleged by Neale that out of the five thousand quarto pages, which he computes to be the contents of the whole body of Greek office-books, at least four thousand are poetry. For a full and elaborate account of the structure and contents of a Greek canon, or group of odes, which forms the staple of the morning office, the reader is referred to the articles CANON (p. 277) and ODE. The other subsidiary forms of hymn are explained in the same volume.

By a singular coincidence the establishment of hymnody as a constant element of divine service in the West, had been brought about, a few years before, by similar disputes between Arians and Catholics. The facts are related by Augustine, who, with his mother Monica, was at Milan at the time (*Conf.* IX. vii.), as well as more briefly by Paulinus, St. Ambrose's deacon (*Vita S. Amb.* p. 80; ed. Bened. Paris, 1632). St. Ambrose, in consequence of his refusal to give up to the empress Justina one of the basilicas of Milan for Arian worship at Easter, A.D. 385, had incurred her resentment. In the following year sentence of exile was passed upon him. He refused to obey; and the population, who were devoted to him, guarded the gates of his house, and kept watch night and day in his church, to defend him from capture by the imperial troops. This company of perpetual watchers Ambrose organized into a band of perpetual worshippers. A course of offices, psalmody, prayer, and hymns, was established, and once established, became a permanent institution [HOURS OF PRAYER]. Augustine expressly says that this was an imitation of the Eastern custom; by which he probably means the course of daily and nightly psalmody and prayer—the practice of

Oriental ascetics, both Jewish (cf. Philo *de Vita contemplativa*, c. x. [ii. 484, Mangey] quoted by Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 17) and Christian.

But it is especially to these services organized by St. Ambrose, as all subsequent writers agree, that we of the Western churches owe the incorporation into our offices of metrical hymnody (cf. Isidore of Seville, *de Eccl. Off.* i. 6; Walafriid Strabo, *de Rebus Eccl.* xxv. &c. and Paulinus, l. c.). Unlike Chrysostom, Ambrose was able to supply his congregations with words, and himself to set them to music (see AMBROSIAN MUSIC, and Koch, *Kirchenlied*, vol. i. pp. 61, sqq.). Of the metrical hymns which are undoubtedly his, Biraghi (*Inni Sinceri di Sant' Ambrogio*) enumerates eighteen, Koch twenty-one. But Milan became a school of Ambrosian hymnody, which has left its mark upon the whole of the West. Ninety-two hymns of this school are given by Daniel (*Thes. Hymn.* vol. i.). Yet, though Ambrose is the true founder of metrical hymnody in the West, it is possible that hymns were already in use elsewhere. Hilary of Poitiers is sometimes spoken of as the first to introduce them; he certainly was a hymn writer, and his hymn "Lucis largitor optime (al. splendide)," sent from his exile in Phrygia, as early as A.D. 358, to his daughter Abra, found its way into church use. Pseudo-Alcuin (*de Div. Off.* § 10) attributes to him the completion, in its present Western form, of the "Gloria in Excelsis," and it is at least possible that he may have introduced other innovations, especially as some of his hymns (notably a well-known Lenten one, "Jesu quadragenariae)," though common in Germany and England, were not in use in Italy. The work of St. Gregory the Great is not, as a hymnographer, distinct from that of St. Ambrose; he introduced no new species of hymn, nor, it would appear, any new use for hymns; his ritual and liturgical work lay in other directions, though he made many important contributions to the now rapidly increasing stock of metrical hymns. But the progress of hymnody for the next four centuries will be best illustrated by a table of the sources from which the leading Breviary hymns have been derived. In the subjoined list, the numbers in the first column are from Daniel, who, without attempting perfect accuracy, arranges under the name of each author the hymns traditionally assigned to him; those in the second column from Koch, who has endeavoured to assign to each author the hymns known to be his, but has not consulted so wide a range of breviaries as Daniel:—

Hymns assigned to	D.	K.
Hilary of Poitiers († 368)	7	2
Damasus .. ..	2	1
Ambrose and the Ambrosian school	92	—
Augustine (incorrectly)	1	—
Sedulius .. ..	2	2 or 3
Prudentius .. ..	15	10 (centon)
Ennodius .. ..	16	—
Elpis .. ..	1	—
Venantius Fortunatus ..	7	7
Gregory the Great .. ..	0	19
Isidore of Seville (636) ..	2	(?)
Flavius of Châlons (580)	—	1
Cyrilla .. ..	1	—
Eugenius of Toledo (606-658)	1	1
Ildefonsus (658-660)	—	some
Julian (680-690)	—	3 & 2



Musica assigned to	..	..	D.	K.
Bede .. ..	..	..	11	11 (several doubtful)
Paulin Diaconus ..	..	..	3	Several
Aluin .. ..	..	..	1	Several
Charlemagne .. ..	..	..	1	—
Anonymous hymns } .. 15	{ v. cent. 10 vi. cent. 12 vii. cent. 1 viii. cent. 2			
quasi vi. ix.				

The use of Ambrosian and other hymns of Italian origin was much extended by the establishment of the monastic orders, each with its own set of offices for the hours. Benedict especially is expressly mentioned by Walafrid Strabo as having inserted in his offices many Ambrosian hymns. Other countries began, as the above lists will show, to produce hymnographers of their own, especially Spain, of whose rich store of hymns the Mozarabic Breviary is an evidence. There are signs, however, that this influx of hymns did not everywhere meet with favour. The complaint made by the orthodox against heretics that they had innovated, could now be turned against themselves (Ambrose, *Ep.* 873, 72); and among Catholics there were some who doubted, like the Genevan reformers later, whether it were right to use in worship any but the words of Scripture. Others, as time went on, became accustomed to the Ambrosian hymns, but hesitated to receive fresh ones. At the second council of Tours (567-8), by canon 23, the admission of other hymns of merit, in addition to the Ambrosian, was formally sanctioned. At Toledo, again, complaints were made that some still rejected the hymns of Hilary and Ambrose, as not scriptural (Walafrid Strabo, l. c.). At length, on Dec. 5, 633, at the fourth council of Toledo, under the presidency of Isidore, a canon (c. 13) was passed threatening with excommunication all in France or Spain who opposed the use of hymns in divine service. Yet, as we have seen, there were still some churches, even in the ninth century, which did not admit metrical hymns into their offices.

Two points remain to be noticed—the metre of Latin hymns, and the offices to which they were restricted.

Ambrose found in the Iambic Dimeter (our present L. M.) a metre admirably adapted to the concise and solemn language of his hymns, and equally well fitted for singing. This accordingly has been the normal metre of Latin hymnology, down to the invention of sequences. But it was by no means used in strict conformity to classical models; accent and quantity, it must be confessed, were both at times disregarded. Some attempts were made, however, at other metres. Among the so-called Ambrosian hymns appears one on St. John Baptist, in four-line stanzas of Alcaic hendecasyllables—

— — — — | — — — — | — — — —

"Alui prophetae | pregar | o piñ."

and four others, one for fair weather, one for rain, and two in time of war, in a peculiar form of the lesser Asclepiad, with spondee instead of dactyl in the last place.

— — | — — — — | — — — — | — — — —

"Oculare potum nobis oculi."

The poems of Prudentius, not being originally intended for church song, supply other irregularities, as Iambic Trimeter—

"O Mater, lux totius, verbum Patris."

## HYPAOCOE

and the Anacreontic (Iamb. Dim. Catal.)—

"Cuius Dei memore."

The first cento from his "De puer plectrum" beginning—

"Corde natus ex Parvato ante mundi conitium,"

first introduced into church song the Trochaic Tetrameter Catalexions of Greek tragedy, which has been so great and permanent a gain. It has also a hymn in stanzas of four Sapphic lines (without the final Adonias)—

"Inventor recti dux bone luminis."

Two cantos from Fortunatus—

"Crux benedicta nris, dominum qui curat prope,"

and the well-known "Salve festa dies," are the earliest instances of elegiac verses in church song. It is to be noted that both were processional. St. Gregory the Great wrote Sapphic hymns for the hours—

"Necesse surgentes vigilamus omnes,"

and

"Ecce jam noctis truncatur umbra,"

and thenceforth their use was not infrequent.

A few other irregularities may be mentioned, but they are unimportant.

The use of hymns till now was threshold: (1) as processional; (2) in the canonical hours; (3) at certain special offices, such as the Benediction of Paschal tapers, &c. As yet no metrical hymns were used in any part of the Eucharistic office. Walafrid Strabo mentions, however, that Paulinus "Patriarcha Forojuliensis" (Paulinus of Aquileia) had frequently, especially in private masses, introduced hymns either of his own or of others, "circa immolationem sacramentorum" (i.e. at the Illation or Preface following the *Sacrum cordi*). He adds that no great man would not have done this without authority or reason. It is possible, therefore, that there were other instances of the interpolation of hymns into the Mass. One such is known to us, the verses attributed by Daniel to Egmont of Toledo—

"Saceri venit, corpus Christi sumit,"

sung as a *Communio*, or *Antiphona ad consecrationem*, before the reception of the elements; Neale (*Chr. Remembrancer*, Oct. 1853) assigns this to the seventh or eighth century. These exceptional uses were foreshadowings of the great outburst of sequences in the beginning of the tenth century, which was destined to add so much to the splendour and variety of Latin hymnody.

(Daniel, *Theatrum Hymnologicum*, vol. i-v. Leipzig, 1855-6. Mone, *Hymni Latini Medii Aevi*, Freiburg, 1855. Koch, *Geschichte der Kirchenhymnen und Kirchengesänge der Christlichen* (4 vols.) vol. i. (part i. treats of hymns of the first eight centuries), Stuttgart, 1856. He gives ample lists of authorities on special points. Augusti, *De hymnis Syrorum sacris*, Writslan, 1841. Neale, *Hymns of the Eastern Church*, London, 1863. *Moharad Hymns and Sequences*, 1863. Biraghi, *Sani Saceri e Carmi di Sant' Ambrogio*, Milan, 1862. Ebert, *Geschichte der Christlich-Lateinischen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1874.]

**HYPACOE** (*hymnos*). Certain rhythmic compositions, or hymns, which follow upon and echo (as it were) the sense of that which pre-

and, are called *δρακόνες*, because they depend upon (*δρακονέω*) that which has gone before, as a servant on a master. This is the explanation of Corni. Gaur, however (quoted in Daniel's *Order*, iv. 723), prefers the explanation, that such hymns relate some wonderful work of God, by listening to which the church may be edified. Neither explanation is perhaps quite satisfactory, but the latter can scarcely be considered to give any reason at all why these hymns should be called *Hyapante* more than many other parts of the office. [C.]

**HYAPANTE** (often written **HYPANTE**), a name given to the festival of the Purification of the Virgin Mary, from her meeting (*ὑμνωτή*) with Simeon and Anna in the Temple. [**MARY THE VIRGIN, FESTIVALS OF.**] [C.]

**HYPATIUS**, bishop of Gangra in Paphlagonia, *κατακροῦντος*; commemorated March 31 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**HYPOCAUSTORIUM**, a room warmed by a hypocaust, or furnace under the floor. Thus Thiedsild, abbess of Frockenhorst, in Westphalia, is said to have built in her monastery "refecturium hiemale et aestivale, hypocaustorium, dormitorium, cellarium, domum arcarum, etc." (*Vita S. Thied.* c. 7, in *Acta Sanctorum*, 30 January, App. vol. ii.). [C.]

**HYPOPHALMA** (*ὑποφάσμα*), a particular manner of chanting the Psalms. The *Apostolical Constitutions* (ii. 57, § 5) give the direction, "after every two lections let some other chant (*ψαλλέτω*) the hymns of David, and let the people chant responsive (*ἀντιφάλλετω*) the ends of the verses." Such a replication of the body of the congregation to the voice of the single chanter was called *ὑποφάσμα*. Compare **ANTI-RISON** (Bingham's *Ant.* xiv. i. 12). [C.]

# I

**IXOTC.** (Compare **FISH**, p. 673.) The fish is found in an allegoric or symbolic sense in the ancient remains of almost every nation. Among the Assyrian fragments discovered by Mr. Layard, for instance, are frequent instances of monsters partly formed of fish. See, as examples, *Monuments of Nimrod*, pl. 38, 67 B, 68, 71, 72, &c. The gem figured on p. 674 of this work, in which a man appears covered with the skin of a fish, is probably a representation of this kind of monster, rather than of the Apostolic fisherman. The coins of Tyre and Phœnicia, maritime nations, show on their coins fish, or monsters ending in fish. The same object is found on Egyptian monuments, though much more sparingly, for the fish was an abomination to the Egyptians (Clement Alex. *Strom.* vii. 6; p. 850, Potter; compare v. 7, p. 670). Nor is the symbolic fish wanting in the remains of the Indo-Germanic races (Sir W. Jones in *Asiatic Researches*, i. p. 230; *Ann. de Philosophie Christ.* v. p. 430). The dolphin in particular is continually represented in art and lauded by the poets; and we not unfrequently meet with allusions to a mysterious fish, the *αἰχμή*, from the presence of which all noxious things fled away: "Ἐν τοῖς αἰχμή τοῖς δολφίνεσσι, ἵππῳ ἰχθῆς" (Ulpian. *Habent.* i. 185).

When we find it in Christian symbolism, the question arises, whether the fish, like so many other symbols and formulas, was adopted by the early Christians from the already existing art? Looking at the general character of early Christian art, considering its constant adoption even of symbols and representations obviously pagan, it would seem probable that a special sense was given to an already existing mode of representation. And this particular symbolism seems to have been determined by the discovery of the acrostic *ΙΧΘΥΣ*, from which the fish, many times mentioned in the gospels, received a mystic significance.

It is quite uncertain when it was first observed that the word *ΙΧΘΥΣ* is formed of the initials of the sentence 'Ιησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτὴρ. We may perhaps assume, that whenever the fish was recognised as the symbol of the Lord, it was in consequence of the acrostic meaning having been discovered, and, if this was the case, it must have been recognised from the very earliest days of Christianity. The *Chios* attributed to Melito of Sardis, which, if genuine, belongs to the middle of the second century, lays it down that *Πῖς*=*Χριστός* (c. iv. § xl.; *Spicil. Solesm.* ii. 173); but the date and character of that work, although Dom Pitru seems to entertain no doubts, cannot be considered as beyond question. The Sibylline verses give (lib. viii. 217-250) the famous acrostic on the letters of the sentence 'Ιησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτὴρ, *εὐαγγέλιον*. At the time when this was written, the mystic meaning of *ΙΧΘΥΣ* was clearly recognised, but the date of the verses is by no means certain. Clement of Alexandria (*Pædag.* iii. 11, § 59; see *GEMM*, p. 712) numbers the fish among Christian symbols, but does not state its special significance; elsewhere (*Strom.* vi. 11, § 94) he regards the "five barley loaves and two small fishes" as typical of the preparatory discipline of Jews and Gentiles. In Clement's contemporary Tertullian we arrive at firmer ground; he writes (*De Baptismo*, c. i.) "Nos pisciculi, secundum **ΙΧΘΥΝ** nostrum, in aqua nascimur." Here we have both the primary and the secondary application of the fish-symbol. First, the Fish is Christ, and that clearly as **ΙΧΘΥΣ**, showing that Tertullian had the acrostic in his mind; secondly, they who are born of Christ are in their turn "smaller fishes," a symbolism which also took a firm hold on the mind of the early Church, and is often alluded to [**FISHERMAN**, p. 674]; thirdly, a fresh significance is added to the conception of the believer as the fish, inasmuch as it is through the water of baptism that they are born from above. It is to be observed that Tertullian gives no explanation of the **ΙΧΘΥΣ** which would be intelligible to the uninitiated; the symbol, whether written or pictured, was part of the secret language of the early Church. This reticence was probably maintained during the centuries of persecution; but when the need of concealment ceased, we find the true significance of the symbol proclaimed. Thus, the writer of the work *De promissionibus et benedict. Dei*, attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine (ii. 39), seems to give positive testimony on this point. "**ΙΧΘΥΝ**, latine piscem, sacris litteris majores nostri interpretati sunt, hoc ex sibyllinis versibus colligentes." Augustine, too, speaking of the Sibyl, says (*De ciuit.*

Dei, xviii. 23), "If you join the first letters of the five Greek words Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, Θεοῦ, Υἱός, Σωτήρ, you will have ΙΧΘΥC, fish, in which word Christ is mysteriously designated. Compare Optatus c. Donatist. iii. 2. And when the Empire became Christian, and it was no longer necessary for Christians to conceal the great object of their faith under a symbol, its use began to decline. De Rossi, the highest authority on such a matter, assures us 'that at Rome, at least, it is scarcely ever found in a cemetery formed after the age of Constantine, but is almost confined to the catacombs, and to the most ancient portions of these. It was, he believes, growing obsolete in the 4th century, and was scarcely ever used merely as a symbol, whether at Rome or in the provinces, in the 5th. The symbolic fish, indeed, is found on an ambo in the church of St. John and St. Paul at Ravenna, which is shown by an inscription to be of the year 597; and the ΙΧΘΥC is found on the large cross in the apse of St. Apollinaris in Classe, near the same city, which Ciampini\* (Vet. Monum. ii. 79, ed. 2) maintains to be a work of the year 567. These, however, are rather instances of the use of ancient symbols by an artist for decorative purposes, than of the continued use of the symbol, as such. When the symbols occur in inscriptions, where mere ornament is evidently not intended, we may be sure that they are still used as a sign for believers. In representations of scenes from the gospels, or from hagiology, fish are of course found in all ages of Christian art.

Although the ΙΧΘΥC was originally an acrostic, there is only one ancient inscription known in which it actually appears as such. In all other cases it stands separate, at the beginning or end of an inscription, or both; generally it is written horizontally in the ordinary manner, but sometimes vertically (Fabretti, *Inscript. Expl.* p. 329; compare *Grec. p.* 714). It would indeed be impossible to arrange ΙΧΘΥC as an acrostic in a Latin inscription, and all the ΙΧΘΥC monuments which have come down to us are Latin, with the one exception just referred to. This famous slab was found in the year 1839, beneath the surface, in an ancient cemetery<sup>a</sup> near Autun, and was first published by Dom (now Cardinal) Pitru (*Annales de Phil. Chrét.* 2<sup>e</sup> sér. t. xix. p. 195). Since that time a considerable literature has gathered round it. It is a sepulchral inscription over one Pectorius, son of Aschandius. It is imperfect, but as to the restoration of the first six lines there is no very great difference of opinion among palaeographers and scholars. Mr. W. B. Marriott (*Testimony*, p. 1:8) gives the inscription thus:

Ἰχθύς ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐγὼς γένησθε ἀσπασί  
Χρῆς λαβὼν (ὡς) ἑμπερὸν ἐν ἁγίοις  
θεοῦ τῶν ἁγίων τῶν σφρ, φίλε, ἑλάνω  
ψυχῆς

\* Ciampini misreads the ΙΧΘΥC; but Gori (*Dizion. III.* 201) gives the correct reading.

<sup>a</sup> It is noteworthy that this cemetery is locally called, not *claustrum*, but *polyandre*, i.e. *polyandrium*—a curious relic of the time when Greek was spoken at Autun. Probably this was the very name used in the time of Gregory of Tours, who, in his ignorance of Greek, took it for a Gallic word (*De Glor. Conf.* c. 72, quoted by Marriott, *Testimony*, p. 129).

Ἰχθύς ἑλάνω πλουτέοντες σφρ  
Σωτήρ ὁ ἰσχυρὸς λαβὼν ἁγίους  
ἑμπερὸν τῶν ἁγίων τῶν σφρ  
Ἰχθύς χε . . . . . ὡς λαβὼν ἑλάνω  
Σωτήρ  
Εν)  
Σω) . . . . . τῶν σε λαβὼν σφρ τὸ ἁ-  
γίον.  
Ἀσχαδίς πάτερ, τῷ ῥῳ ἀσχαδίῳ ἑμπερὸν  
ἐν μ' . . . . . οἷον ἁγίον  
I . . . . . μῆσος Πεκτορίου.

For (ὡς) we should perhaps read *ὡς*  
The word *ὡς* may be taken either for *ὡς*,  
or for *ὡς*, as *λαβὼν* for *λαβὼν* is  
the latter part of the inscription. *Πλου-*  
is for *πλουτέοντες*. The hiatus in the last line but one  
may perhaps be filled by the words *ἐν ἁγίοις* (Franks), or  
something equivalent; and the last may perhaps  
run *Ἰχθύς ἑλάνω οἷον μῆσος Πεκτορίου*. Mr.  
Marriott translates the whole as follows:—  
"Offspring of the heavenly Ichthus, see that a  
heart of holy reverence be thine, now that from



The Autun Inscription.

divine waters thou hast received, while yet  
among mortals, a fount of life that is to immor-  
tality. Quicken thy soul, beloved one, with the  
ever-flowing waters of wealth-giving wisdom,  
and receive the honey-sweet food of the Saviour  
of the saints. Eat with a longing hunger,  
holding Ichthus in thy hands.

To Ichthus . . . come nigh unto me, my  
Lord [and] Saviour [be Thou my guide] I entrust  
Thee, Thou light of them for whom the hour of  
death is past.

Aschandius, my Father, dear unto mine heart,  
and thou (sweet mother and all) that are mine  
. . . remember Pectorius."

The first portion seems to be an admission to  
the Christian passer-by who reads . . ., the second  
a prayer of the deceased himself; the third an  
address to his parents and friends.

This inscription has been referred to very  
various dates, from the end of the 2nd century  
(Pitru) to the end of the 6th (Rossignol). Pro-  
bably the judgment of Meers, Franks and C. I.  
Newton, of the British Museum (in Marriott's

<sup>a</sup> For the tracing from which this engraving was made  
the writer is indebted to Prof. Churchill Hilditch.

Testimony, etc. p. 133), who assign it to the 6th or 5th century, is not far from the truth. With this agrees the decision of Kirchoff, the editor of the fourth volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, which contains this inscription (No. 9080).

Mr. Marriott (u. a. p. 141) conjectures that the space at the lower corner of the marble, to the spectator's right, was occupied by a sculptured fish, whether alone or in combination with some other symbol.

Costadoni (la. 35) gives a gem (no. xi. in his plate) engraved with two fishes, with this inscription in three lines: IX § CoTHP § ØV: evidently the IXOTC, differing from the form common elsewhere in having CoTHP written at full length, instead of being separated by its initial letter like the other words of the acrostic. The CoTHP is probably placed between the IX and the ØV because that shape of the inscription best suits the space.

Of seventy-five sculptured slabs containing the symbol which De Rossi has examined, not more than eight contain the IXOTC alone, and only twenty—of which four are fragments of slabs which may have contained other symbols—the sculptured fish alone; the rest give also other symbols. Seventeen join with the fish the dove and olive-branch; a conjunction which seems clearly equivalent to *Spiritus in pace in Christo*; or—if the olive-branch be omitted—*Spiritus in Christo*. *Spiritus in pace* is a common form of acclamation in Christian epigraphy. Twenty-three add the anchor to the fish, whether separate or intertwined; a conjunction also extremely common on OSMs (p. 714). As the ANCHOR (p. 81) unquestionably symbolizes Hope, we may read these symbols *Spes in Christo*, one of the most common of Christian sepulchral formulas. A sepulchral slab from the catacombs, now in the Kircher Museum, exhibits an anchor between two fishes, with the inscription IXOTC ZONTON. (See further under OSMs, p. 715). Of the fish swimming in the water and supporting a ship on its back, clearly signifying that Christ bears up the church, De Rossi has seen three instances.

There remains the conjunction of leaves and fishes. That these in some instances simply form part of a representation of the Lord's miracle of the loaves is clear from the fact that in at least one of De Rossi's *Monumenti* (No. 71, from the cemetery of St. Hermen, now in the Kircher Museum) there are five loaves and two fishes; but there can be no doubt that the fishes and loaves conjoined were intended to convey the further meaning that Christ is the Bread of Life, and that with special reference to the Eucharist [CASSIUS, p. 284; EUCARIST IN ART, p. 625]. This is well illustrated by the Autun inscription, given above, where, according to the most probable restoration, the fish is spoken of as in the hands. We can scarcely doubt that these words refer to the receiving of Christ in the Eucharist. So when Augustine (*Confess.* xiii. 23, § 34), after mentioning the sacrament of baptism, goes on to speak of that other "solemnitas . . . in qua ille pascu exhibetur quem levatum de profundo terra pascuit," he undoubtedly refers to the sacrament of the Eucharist. It ought however to be noticed, that some at least of the paintings

commonly supposed to be Eucharistic are intended rather to represent the heavenly marriage-supper which Christ makes for his faithful ones (Polladori, *De consuetudine offitii a simbolo monumenti Christiani*. Milano, 1844).

Ample information on this curious subject may be found in Costadoni, *Supra et Passio come simbolo di Gesù Cristo presso gli antichi Cristiani*, in Calogieri's collection, vol. xii. p. 247 ff.; in J. B. De Rossi's treatise, *De Christianis Monumentis IXOTC archæologicis*, and in Pitts's *De Passio Allegorico et Symbolico*, both in Pitts's *Spectilegium Salsumense*, vol. iii.; and in the late Mr. Wharton Marriott's Essay on the Autun inscription, in his *Testimony of the Catacombs*, p. 115 ff. (London, 1870). [C.]

ICONIUM, COUNCIL OF. The date generally assigned to it is A.D. 378 (Mansi, III. 503-10), this being the year in which St. Basil died; and Amphilocheus, bishop of Iconium, who presided, speaking of him as having been expected there, but kept away by severe illness. St. Basil himself (*Ep. cccii. al. cccxvi.*) had asked to have it put off in the hope that his health might improve. But it may be doubted whether this is not the meeting of which he speaks in a subsequent letter (*cccvi. al. cccxii.*), when illness equally compelled him to return home. Mansi thinks his words here prove that he actually was at this meeting: they may mean no more than that he had commenced his journey with that intention, but after he had got as far as Neo-Cæsarea, which he may have gone to first, he was taken ill and had to return. This, according to Mansi, took place A.D. 375; and the question is, whether Amphilocheus must necessarily be supposed to have been speaking of a later illness. To make up for his absence, his treatise on the Holy Spirit was read there, to attest his sentiments on the subject of which it treats, says Amphilocheus: in all probability, therefore, this council had to do with the followers of Macedonius. [E. S. H.]

ICONOSTASIS. In the ecclesiology of the Eastern church this designation is given to the screen or partition wall, *tabernaculum*, which cuts off the laos or *ecclesia* from the *Sacra* and the choir. From its general similarity in form to the chancel screens of Western churches, the iconostasis is often identified with them. This, however, is based on an erroneous idea. The screen of western ecclesiology separates the nave, the place of the laity, from the choir, the place of the clergy. The iconostasis, on the other hand, invested with far greater dignity and importance, has its position further eastward, and corresponds in locality to the altar rails. Thus it divides the choir, or place of the clergy, into two parts, separating "the holiest of all," containing the holy table and the place for the celebrant and his assistants, from the "holy place," on either side of which are arranged the stalls for the clergy. The iconostasis in its original construction was a comparatively light and open screen, the *aryballos*, *epistaurion* or *canastis* of primitive times, very much resembling the ordinary type of western chancel screens. The present arrangement, by which it has been converted into a close partition with carved doors, entirely concealing the holy mysteries from those who stand outside it, cannot be carried higher than the 8th century, and in its existing




development is probably later still. The name *encladonarius* is derived from the icons (*enklones*) or sacred pictures painted on it.

These screens in the larger and more dignified churches were of the richest materials attainable, and were adorned with all the resources of art. The elaborate description given by Paul the Silentary, enables us to realize the form and character of that in St. Sophia, as rebuilt by Justinian, in the middle of the 6th century. The material was silver. It consisted of a *spacos*, or partition,

## ICONOSTASIS

described as being of ivory, tortoise-shell, and silver.

According to Goar, the iconostasis owes its present close form to a reaction against the iconoclastic fury of the 8th century, as affording a more ample space for the exhibition of sacred pictures. His words are, "*Reticula illa lignea*" (the wooden trellis work, such as that in Paulinus' church at Tyre) "*mutavit Ecclesia Orientalis in tabulata solida a tempore quo iconoclastarum furor turbata plures et frequen-*




Iconostasis at Tepekermann: from Ferguson.

formed by a stylobate, ornamented with arabesque flower work. On this stood pairs of twisted columns, twelve in number, surmounted by an architrave of chased metal. The spaces between the columns were filled in with panels, bearing in oval medallions the icons of Our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, the apostles and prophets. In the centre, above the "holy doors," the inter-twined monogram of Justinian and Theodora was to be seen, surmounted by the crucifix in an oval panel (Paul Silentary, part ii. v. 265, sq.)

The Church of the Apostles, erected by Constantine at Constantinople, had its screen of gilt

tores sanctorum imagines ibi depictas et voluit" (*Eucholog.* p. 18). Early examples of the solid iconostasis are hard to find. The partition has been invariably removed by the Turks in the churches converted by them into mosques, so that not a single instance appears in the churches of the Holy Land, and of Central Syria, drawn by De Vogüé, nor in those given in Texier and Pullan's *Byzantine Architecture*, or in Hübsch's *Altchristliche Kirche*. The earliest example known to Dr. Neale is that in the Arme crypt church, at Tepekermann, in the Crimea, which he thinks "may be referred to about A.D.



Cave-Church of the Apocalypse in Patmos, from Calmet.

copper (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iv. 59). They were often of brass, or bronze. In that rebuilt by Paulinus, at Tyre, the screen was a trellis work of wood of the most slender and graceful workmanship (Euseb. *H. E.* x. 4, § 14). That of St. Peter in the Palace, built by Basil the Macedonian (A.D. 807-886), was of marble (Theophan. *Ceram. Homil.* iv.). The screen in the convent church of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, is

350," of which a woodcut is annexed. This is not a close screen, but consists of four pillars standing on a solid stylobate, the panels of which are ornamented with boldly incised crosses. The columns reach to the roof of the cave. The openings between them may have been probably closed with curtains (Neale, *Hist. of East. Church*, vol. i. p. 186). According to Guénebaud (*Dict. des Monuments, Art. Iconostase*), one of the most

ancient examples of a closed screen known is also in a cave church, the Grotto of the Apocalypse, at Patmos. From the woodcut given, taken from Calmet (*Dict. de la Bible*), it will be seen to be a plain boarded partition, reaching, in two divisions, from the floor to the spring of the vault, and very much resembling a Jacobean chancel screen in England. It has a central arched door, and two arched windows on either side, surrounded with arabesque work, and closed with curtains. The upper division exhibits an icon of Our Lord to the right, and of the Blessed Virgin to the left, with the crucifix above.

According to the normal arrangement, an iconostasis had three doorways, that to the right hand leading to the *disconicon*; that to the left to the

the present day. The iconostasis, according to Dr. Neale, is "now generally made of wood; what would be the pierced part in a western rood screen being panelled and painted. In Attica they are found of plain deal." (Neale, *u. s.*, Texier and Pullan's *Byzantine Architecture*, p. 62.) The iconostasis in the churches of Russia is always a feature of considerable magnificence, which, from its size and elaborate decoration, is the object that first attracts attention on entering, being rather an architectural feature of the edifice than a mere piece of church furniture. It is very possible that more complete acquaintance with the ecclesiology of Russia will bring to light earlier examples of the *iconostasis* than those hitherto known. The annexed example from a church near Kostroma, in Eastern Russia,



*prothesis*, through which the "Great Entrance" was made. The central doorway, *kyrie thronos*, always the largest, and most highly decorated with carvings, opened on to the *deira*. It was protected in the lower part by two gates, about the height of a man, meeting in the middle, the upper portion, as well as the two side doorways, being closed with curtains [CURTAINS, HANGINGS]. On the right of the holy doors was invariably the icon of Our Blessed Lord; on the left that of His Virgin mother. On the panels on either side, and on those above, other icons were depicted, according to the taste or devotion of the founders of the church, and to the saints under whose invocation it was placed. This arrangement remains on the whole unchanged to

given by Mr. Fergusson in his *History of Architecture*, is not of very early date, but is pronounced by him to be "a favourable specimen of its class." [E. V.]

ICONOSTASION, *εικονοστασιον*, in the Greek church, a moveable stand for the suspension of icons or sacred pictures. Such a piece of church furniture is mentioned by Codinus (*de Off. Aul. Constantinop.* c. vi. § 2), when describing the imperial ceremonial of Christmas Day. After matins the canonarchs brought out the *iconostasion*, and set it in its place, with an *analogion*, or reading desk, bearing a copy of the gospels in front of it. On it they suspended an icon of the nativity, and three or four others

The emperor on entering the church kissed the icons, and again on leaving. Ducange, s. v. identifies the iconostasis generally with a small domestic chapel, or oratory, and considers that that described by Codinus was a portable shrine. Grotefend is more correct in defining it as "omne illud in quo stant, vel ex quo pendunt sacrae imagines." Goss strangely interprets it of a carved picture frame. [E. V.]

**IDIOMELA** (ἰδιόμηλα *Idiomela*). These are *Stichera* or *Strophes*, which have no *hirmos* (*elpos*), the rhythm of which they follow, but which are independent as to rhythm. They are usually said at lauds and at vespers on days of special observance. At lauds one only is said as a rule, though not invariably, as in the Holy week when there are several, after the *evangelium* following the *alms*: (s. v. *Pos.* 148, 149, 150). At vespers we find sometimes one only, as on certain week-days in Lent. Sometimes several, four or five being the usual number; and occasionally more, e. g. nine on St. John-Baptist's day, and of these one or more is often repeated. The tone to which they are said is specified, and the name of the author is often given. Their character is that of other *troparia* used in the Greek offices; but they are often, though not invariably, longer than others. *Idiomela* are also used in other offices, e. g. in the office for the burial of a priest. [H. J. H.]

**IDIOTA** (ἰδιώτης). 1. An illiterate person, as contrasted with a "clerk." Thus, Gregory the Great (*Epist.* ix. 9) speaking of the use of pictures from sacred history, says that pictures are the bible of the uneducated—"quod legentibus scriptura, hoc idiotis praestat pictura commentibus." Bede (*Epist. ad Ebert.*, *Migne's Patrol.* sciv. 859c) wishes the *idiotas*—that is, he explains, those who have no knowledge of any tongue but their own—to learn by heart the Apostle's Creed and the Lord's Prayer in their own tongue. In the Middle Ages, when an educated man was almost of course in holy orders, the word "idiot" came to mean simply a layman.

2. The word *idiotas* was also used to designate those who attached themselves to some convent as helpers, without being regular members of the brotherhood, i. e. lay-brothers [*CONVENTUAL*] (Ducange, *Gloss. Lat.* s. v.). [C.]

#### IDLENESS. [MENDEICANCY.]

**IDOLATRY** (*Idolatria*, *εἰδωλολατρεία*). The object of this article is to describe the laws of the ancient church relating to idolatry, or any rites or customs connected with it. The treatment of Christians who went back altogether to heathenism, belongs to *APOSTASY*; of those who succumbed for a time under pressure of persecution, to *LAPSED*.

Few canons directed against idolatry appear in the councils, until Christianity had become the dominant religion in the different countries of Europe. The first law which interfered with the free exercise of Paganism, was an edict of Constantine, A. D. 319, against private sacrifices (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. xvi. 1, 2), but it is questionable whether this was issued solely in the interest of Christianity. Later laws were undoubtedly levelled against idolatry. In A. D. 324, Constantine forbade (*Ensch.* 122.

## IDOLATRY

*Const.* ii. 45) the erection of images of the gods, or (*ibid.* lv. 10) of his own statue in the temple; he (*ibid.* ii. 44-5) prohibited all state sacrifices, and (*ibid.* iii. 54-8) shut up many of the temples, converted others into churches, and destroyed some which had been the scene of immoral rites. Laws of Constantine forbade (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. x. 4, 6) all sacrifice whatever on pain of death; but it does not appear that the penalty was ever exacted. But that which is considered to have given the death-blow to Paganism, is a comprehensive law of Theodosius, A. D. 392 (*Cod. Theod.* XVI. x. 12): sacrifice and divination were declared treasurable and punishable with death; the use of lights, incense, garlands, and libations, was to involve the forfeiture of house or land where they were used; and all who entered heathen temples were to be fined. But that Pagan rites lingered after this appears, among other proofs, from a petition addressed to the emperor by a Carthaginian council (A. D. 399), requesting him to destroy some rural temples, and forbid certain idolatrous banquets, which were held on Saints-Days, and which the Christians were compelled to attend (*Cod. Eccl. Afric.* cc. 58-60). And two centuries later Gregory has occasion (*Epp.* iv. 23-6) to rebuke some landowners in the remote parts of Italy, who suffered their peasants to continue in heathenism; and in a letter (*Epist.* ix. 65) to the bishop of Cagliari, he recommends that if the rustics will not listen to preaching, they shall be fined, imprisoned, or chastised. On the disappearance of Paganism, see Robertson, *Church Hist.* iii. 5.

2. *Local Edicts*.—In the Gallic church, a fragmentary letter of Childbert, A. D. 534 (*Har-douin, Conc.* iii. 334), commands all landlords who have images or idols on their estates, to remove them, and assist the priests in destroying them. The worship of sacred trees or groves, or stones or fountains, is frequently forbidden, and the bishops are admonished to be more zealous in checking it (2 *Conc. Arles.* c. 23; 1 *Conc. Taron.* c. 22; *Conc. Francoford.* c. 43). A Frankish council presided over by Boniface, A. D. 742 (*Conc. German.* c. 5, in Hartshorn's *Conc.* i. 49) prohibits incantations and auguries, and sacrifices which were offered to martyrs in place of the old Pagan deities; other councils forbid the "sacrilegious fire-burnings which are called *Neifrates*" (*Conc. Liptin.* c. 4; *Conc. Osnab.* c. 6). Appended to the council of Liptina (probably Leutina, Hartshorn, i. 51), A. D. 743, is a curious list of forbidden Pagan superstitions. It contains mention of the widespread worship of sacred trees and stones; of sacrificing to saints; of various omens and charms, such as observing tempests, horns, and snails, and the brain and dung of animals, and fire on the hearth, or superstitions connected with the state of the moon, particularly women hoping to attract men

\* On the Teutonic religion of worshipping in groves, see Milman, *Lat. Christ.* iii. 2. The most recent and satisfactory investigation into the history and meaning of sacred groves will be found in Fergusson's *Study about Monuments*.

† On the derivation and meaning of *neid-fre*, or *Neifrate*, s. v. *Neifrate*. It appears to have been a superstitious practice in certain parts of Germany of setting fire from dry wood on the eve of St. John (June 24. *Fin* or).

by lunar influences. Compare a similar superstition in England, where people are warned against trusting to cries and sorceries during an eclipse of the moon (Egbert. *Penit.* viii. 3). An edict of Charlemagne issued after the conquest of the Saxons, A.D. 785, contains some severe enactments against the heathen practices of the vanquished (*de Partibus Saxon.* in Baluze's *Capitularia*, i. 250). Death is to be the penalty of (c. 4) ostentatiously and defiantly eating meat in Lent; of (c. 6) burning a witch because of supposed cannibalism, and then superstitiously eating her flesh; of (c. 7) burning a dead body and collecting the ashes; the bodies of the dead (c. 22) are to be buried in cemeteries and not in the Saxon tumuli. A more merciful clause (c. 14) contains a singular provision that if any one who has exposed himself to death by such crimes, shall confess his offence to the priest, and be willing to do penance, the extreme penalty may be remitted on the testimony of the priest. This capitulary was to some extent repealed by a more lenient one, A.D. 797, which, according to the general practice of the Teutonic races, allowed a money payment to compound for the capital offence.

The Spanish councils contain evidence of the lingering of the old heathenism at the end of the 7th century, and that even the clergy were not free from complicity with it. The 3rd council of Toledo, A.D. 589 (c. 16), complains that the "sacrilege of idolatry" was prevalent through both Spain and Gaul, and declares that the bishops and priests neglecting to assist in its extirpation shall be excommunicated. The 12th council, A.D. 681 (c. 11), threatens death to slaves worshipping idols or stones or fountains or trees, or lighting torches; but if their masters will be answerable for their abstaining from such rites for the future, the extreme sentence may be commuted to a flogging or to being shackled with iron: if the masters decline such responsibility, they lose all rights over the slaves, and are themselves subject to excommunication. The same practices are enumerated by the 16th council, A.D. 693, and the bishop or priest who is negligent in searching them out, is sentenced (c. 2) to a year's penance; and further, anyone who puts obstacles in the way of priest or officer is to be put under anathema, and if a noble, pay 3 pounds of gold to the treasury, if low born, receive 100 stripes, have his head shorn, and forfeit half his property.

In England, Gregory had given directions to Augustine (*Epist.* xi. 76) that heathen idols were to be destroyed, but the temples preserved, that the fabric should be sprinkled with holy water, that altars should be constructed in them and relics deposited, and so the building be converted to the worship of God on spots already consecrated in the popular imagination; even the sacrifices of oxen were to continue, but transferred to Saints Days. Gregory defends this policy on the ground that he who aspires to the highest place, must be content to ascend step by step, and not at one bound. The English Penitentials disclose the idolatrous customs which seem to have had the most tenacious hold on the people. Those who sacrifice to devils on slight occasions are to do penance for a year, on great occasions for ten (Theod. *Penitent.* I. xv. 1; Egbert. *Penitent.* iv. 12). Any woman who places her daughter on the roof of a house, or in an oven,

to cure her of a fever, is sentenced to seven years (Theod. *Pen.* I. xv. 2; Egbert. *Pen.* viii. 2). Burning grain in any house where a dead body has been deposited, as a charm to protect the survivors, is punished by five years (Theod. *Pen.* I. xv. 3). The witches who invoke storms are to be penitents seven years (Egbert. *Pen.* iv. 14). In the laws of Wihtred of Kent, A.D. 696 (c. 12), it is decreed that if a husband without his wife's knowledge makes an offering to a devil, he shall be liable in all his substance; and if they both agree, they shall both be liable; but that if a "theow" makes the offering, he (c. 13) shall make a "bot" of six shillings or his hide. There are intimations that ecclesiastical law extended to other practices which, though not connected with religion, were regarded as badges of idolatry. The Legatine Synod held in A.D. 787 (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Eccl. Documents*, iii. 458), in its report to Adrian I., complains (c. 19) that the people dress after the manner of the heathen; that they follow the heathen custom of mutilating their horses by clipping their tails and splitting their nostrils and joining their ears; and also that they eat horse-flesh, which no Christian does in the East (Orientalibus, Italy and Germany). In the previous century the eating of horse-flesh, though not prohibited was regarded with disfavour (Theod. *Penitent.* II. xi. 4). A prohibition against heathen dress is also found in the ancient Welsh code of the 7th century (*Canones Wallici*, c. 61). "If any Catholic let his hair grow long after the manner of the heathen, he shall be expelled Christian Society."

3. *Idolatrous offices or customs.*—The council of Elvira, A.D. 305 (c. 4), orders Flamens who wish to become Christians to undergo two years' additional probation as catechumens; if after baptism they wear the sacrificial garland (c. 55), to do penance two years; if they provide a public spectacle (munus) (c. 3), to be denied communion till death; and if they sacrifice (c. 2), to be excommunicated for ever. The same council requires a Duumvir to separate himself from the church during his year of office. See also ACTORS, GLADIATORS. The grounds of such prohibitions are stated by Tertullian (*de Spectac.* c. 12). The same father condemns (*de Spectac.* cc. 20-22) the actors in each of the four sorts of shows.

The social festivities of the heathen were not regarded with the same suspicion. Tertullian (*de Idolol.* c. 16) sees no harm in a Christian being present at the solemnity of assuming the *toga virilis*, or of espousals or nuptials, or of giving a name to a child. But this toleration was not extended to festivities of a less innocent character. [HEATHEN, § 5, p. 763.] The superstitious lighting of torches and burning of lamps is forbidden both in the 4th and 7th centuries (*Conc. Eliber.* c. 37; *Conc. in Trull.* c. 65). Another canon of Elvira (c. 34) prohibits the burning of wax candles in the cemeteries lest the spirits of the saints should be disturbed; a reference probably to the idolatrous practices associated with lighting lamps on heathen festivals (Tert. *Apolog.* c. 35; *de Idolol.* c. 15). The irregularities attending the observance of the feast of the Kalends of January (the new year) form the subject of one of Chrysostom's Homilies (*in Kalend.* t. i. p. 697, ed



Bened.), from which it appears that Christians set up lamps in the market place, and adorned their doors with garlands, and gave themselves up to excess and made divinations of their future. "You will prosper," says Chrysostom, "in the coming year, not if you make yourself drunk on the new moon, but if you do what God approves" (*Tert. de Idol.* c. 14; Ambrose, *Serm.* 17; Conc. Autus. c. 1; Conc. in Trull. c. 62). The 2nd council of Tours, A.D. 567, states (c. 17) that it was a custom in the church to have special Litanies on the three days of the Kalends of January, as a protest against the heathen licentiousness [CIRCUMCISION]. The observance of the heathen festivals lingered long after heathenism itself was extinct; at the end of the 7th century the Trullan council (c. 62) after denouncing the Kalends, declares that the church will excommunicate any who keep the solemnities of the Bota (Vota), or the Brumalia (the winter feast), or the 1st of March; and forbids the heathenish customs of those festivals, the public dancing of women, the interchange of dress between men and women, wearing comic or satyric or tragic masks, calling on the name of Bacchus and simulating a Bacchic frenzy while treading the grapes.

Making gain from Idolatry was considered idolatrous. No artifice might assist in making an idol. "Canst thou," says Tertullian (*de Idol.* c. 8), "preach the true God, who maketh false ones? 'I make them,' says one, 'but I worship them not.' Verily thou dost worship them, and that not with the spirit of any worthless savour of sacrifice, but with thine own; not at the cost of the life of a beast, but of thine own." Similarly he exposes (*ibid.* c. 8) the sophistries of those who made their livelihood by building or adorning heathen shrines; and (*ibid.* cc. 5, 6, 8, 11, 17) the dealers in victims and incense, and the guardians of the temples and the collectors of their revenues. A landlord who reckoned in his accounts any property of an idol, was subject to five years' separation (Conc. Elber. c. 40); a man or woman leading vestments to decorate idolatrous pomp, to three (*ibid.* c. 37).

The rule which was to govern Christians in eating food, which might have been previously offered to an idol, is laid down by St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 25, 30). A great part of the animals used in the sacrifices was frequently sold by the priests, and afterwards retailed in the public shambles. This the Christians were at liberty to eat. But any attendance at a temple for the sake of the sacrifice was strictly prohibited (Conc. Elber. c. 59). The council of Ancyra, A.D. 314 (c. 7), forbids any one to eat in a place consecrated to idolatry, even if he took his own food. But by the direction of Leo (*Ep. ad Nicet.*), a captive among the barbarians who from hunger or terror eat idol food, was to be leniently dealt with. Directions with regard to eating food offered to idols appear frequently in subsequent councils; it is the same as eating carrion, and exposes the offender to excommunication (4 Conc. Aurel. c. 20); offering food to the dead on the festival of St. Peter, and after receiving the body of Christ going home and eating meat consecrated to devils, incurs a like penalty (9 Conc. Turon. c. 22); other superstitious with food are to be reprimanded (Conc. Roman.

c. 14); not even the sign of the cross will purify an idol offering (Gregory II. *Con. Epist.* c. 6).

[G. M.]

**IGNATIUS.** (1) Bishop of Antioch, *Ignatius*, martyr under Trajan (A.D. 109); commemorated Feb. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vol., Adams, Usuardi*); translation to Antioch, Dec. 17 (18), and Jan. 29 (*Cal. Byzant.*); "Natale," Dec. 17 (*Mart. Bedae*); also commemorated Dec. 16 (*Cal. Armen.*); Dec. 20 (*Cal. Byzant.*); *Hank* i = July 1, and *Takae* 24 = Dec. 20 (*Cal. Ekkip.*)

(2) Martyr in Africa with Celerinus, deacon and confessor, Laurentinus, and Celerius; commemorated Feb. 3 (*Mart. Rom. Vol., Adams, Usuardi*).

[W. F. G.]

**ILERDENSE CONCILIIUM.** [LEANA, COUNCIL OF.]

**ILLATION.** This is the Mozarabic liturgy is the equivalent to the *Proface* (*Profection*) of the Roman and Ambrosian liturgies. In the Gallican liturgy the corresponding prayer is called *Immolation* or *Contentatio*. The Mozarabic *Illation* is usually much longer than the Roman *Proface*, and varies with each mass. It begins with the words "Dignum et justum est," and leads up to the *Sanctus*. [v. PREFACE.]

[H. J. B.]

**ILLIBERITANUM CONCILIIUM.** [LIVIRA, COUNCIL OF.]

**ILLITERATE CLERGY.** Pope Hilary (A.D. 461-468) decreed that an illiterate person (*litterarum ignarus*) incurred *irregularity*, i. e., disqualification for holy orders. And this rule was repeated, under varying phrases, by a council at Rome during his pontificate and by Pope Gelasius afterwards. But the standard of knowledge required does not appear to have been exactly defined. We learn from St. Augustine (*Epist.* 76), that the same rule applied to monks who were candidates for orders. In the time of Gregory the Great (A.D. 590-604) it was sufficient to be able to read. But the offices were repeated, it seems, to a considerable extent *memoriter*, especially by the clergy of the lower grades. He ordered the deacons from country cures to be examined as to how many psalms they could say by heart. Thus, too, the Second Council of Orleans (A.D. 545), in its 15th canon, forbids the ordination as priest or deacon of any man who could neither read nor repeat the Baptismal office. And the First of Mâcon (A.D. 581) ordered the clergy to fast every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from Martinmas to Christmas, and to employ those days in learning the canons. The Council of Narbonne (A.D. 589) even tried to enforce learning by suggesting that a cleric, obstinately illiterate, had no right to his share of the ecclesiastical revenues, and should be sent to a monastery, since he could not edify the people (Can. 10).

We find much the same state of things in Spain. The Fourth Council of Toledo (*canon* A.D. 630) describes ignorance as the "mother of all other errors," and orders that a bishop when he ordained a parish priest, should give him an office book to use (*Canon* 25, 26). It is implied that he would be able to read this.

Respecting the Eastern Church our information is much less precise. Justinian (*Synod*

7. c. 5) forbade the advancing to *any* grade of the ministry those who were unable to read. During great part of the 8th century the Iconoclastic controversy was raging, and destroyed almost entirely, says Balsamon, the habit of study among the Catholics. Therefore the Seventh General Council at Nicaea, in A.D. 787 ordered in its 2nd canon that no bishop should be consecrated who could not repeat the psalter; and who was not well acquainted with the gospels, the epistles of St. Paul, the whole scriptures, and the canons: a very considerable requirement for the time.

With the accession of Charlemagne a movement upwards began. In many capitularies of that sovereign, stringent regulations against ignorance in the clergy were laid down (for details see Thomassin, p. ii. lib. i. cc. 90, 96 *passim*). These details, by the moderation of the standard set up, serve to show the existing lack of knowledge. Even these it was impossible to enforce with any strictness. Lupus, Abbot of Ferrara, writing during this reign to Hincmar, apologises for a bishop, who was unable to teach his flock otherwise than by his good example, because of his ignorance. And Agobard, in a letter to Bernard of Vienne, concludes that ignorance in parish priests would do even more harm than an evil life. Charlemagne himself, lamenting this prevailing ignorance, writes to Alcuin: "Oh, that I had twelve clerks as learned and as perfectly taught in all wisdom, as Jerome and Augustine were!" Alcuin's reply is worth recording: "The Creator of heaven and earth had only two such, and you wish to have twelve!" The complaint of the English Alfred, reported by Asser, is well known, that "from the Humber to the Thames there were very few priests who understood the liturgy in their mother tongue, or who could translate the easiest piece of Latin; and that from the Thames to the sea, the ecclesiastics were still more ignorant" (*De Reb. Gest. Alfred.* apud Camden, *Anglica*, p. 25). We must not suppose, however, that there were no exceptions. Bede, Alcuin, John Scotus Erigena, and Hincmar, are proofs to the contrary. But this sudden blaze of learning was a good deal adventitious, rested on the personal influence of Charlemagne, and died out again after his decease (Muratori, *Antiquitates*; Thomassin, *Vetus et Nova Eccl. Disciplina*, Pars II. lib. i.; Maitland, *Dark Ages*). [S. J. E.]

#### ILLUMINATION. [MINIATURE.]

ILLYRIAN COUNCIL (*Illyricum* or *Illyricium Concilium* according to Cave). Held in Illyria, but it is not agreed in what year: Pagi contending for A.D. 373, others for 375, Cave for 367, and older authorities for 365. Pagi says it had been preceded by the second (he should have said rather the third) of the Roman councils under pope Damasus, in conformity with whose letter to the bishops of Illyria, a letter, asserting the consubstantiality of the three Persons in the Trinity, was now addressed by them to the bishops of Asia Minor. This view is at least countenanced by the letters themselves; and it must be allowed that the letter of Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian to the bishops of Asia Minor expresses the declaration of the Illyrian bishops on this occasion (Mansi, iii. 386-94; and 455-68. *Comp. Roman Councils*, 19).

Three more councils are given under this heading. 1. A.D. 415, according to Sir H. Nicolas (*Chron. of Hist.* 217), at which Peregrine was appointed bishop of Patras.

2. A.D. 515, according to Mansi (Sir H. Nicolas A.D. 516, as *Illyriense*) when the bishop of Thessalonica having joined Timothy of Constantinople, forty bishops, whose metropolitan he was, renounced his communion, and declared for communicating with pope Hormisdas (Mansi, viii. 538).

3. A.D. 550, according to Mansi, in defence of the three chapters (ix. 147). [E. S. Ff.]

IMAGES. From the time of the Maccabees the second commandment was generally understood by the Jews to forbid not only the worship of the likeness of any living thing, but even the making of it. It is probable that they were led to this view by their abhorrence of the acts of Antiochus Epiphanes, and his agents. Among other outrages these had set up "chapels of idols" in the cities of Judah (1 Macc. i. 47), and even "sought to paint the likeness of their images" in the book of the law (*Ibid.* iii. 48). Hence Josephus (*Antiq.* viii. c. 7, § 5) condemns Solomon for making the twelve oxen on which the molten sea was set in the temple (1 Kings vii. 25; comp. 29), and the lions that were about his throne (*Ibid.* c. x. 19, 20), though no degree of reverence was paid to either of them. In the days of Herod the Great a sedition was nearly caused in Jerusalem by his exhibition of trophies, such as the Romans display after their victories, the Jews supposing that the armour was put on the effigy of a man. They declared that they would never "endure images of men in the city, for it was not their country's custom" (*Jos. Antiq.* xv. c. 8, §§ 1, 2). In the same spirit a band of zealots destroyed a golden eagle which Herod had put over the great gate of the temple (*De Bello Jud.* i. c. 33, §§ 2, 3). When Vitellius was marching through Judaea to meet Aretas, the inhabitants entreated him to take another route on account of the figures which they observed on his standards (*Antiq.* xviii. c. 6, § 3). Origen, A.D. 230, even asserts of the Jews in general that "there was no maker of images among their citizens; neither painter nor sculptor was in their state" (*C. Cels.* iv. § 31).

It appears, then, that most of the Jewish converts would enter the church thoroughly imbued with a dislike to all images; and it is probable that many of the heathen would be similarly affected towards them out of mere horror at the idolatry which they had forsaken. There were some also of the latter who, even before their conversion, were prepared by the higher traditions of philosophy to renounce the use of images in connection with religion. Pythagoras, we are told, forbade his disciples to "wear rings or to engrave images of gods on them" (*Clem. Alex. Strom.* v. c. 5, § 28). Zeno, the founder of the Stoic school, maintained that men "ought not to make temples or images" (*Ibid.* c. 11, § 77). It was a tradition among the Romans that Numa had "forbidden them the use of any image of God in the likeness of man or in the form of any animal, and that there was among them previously no image of God either painted or fictile; but that for the first 170 years when

they built temples and set up chapels they made no images in any shape, on the ground that it was an unholy thing to liken the better to the worse, and impossible to reach God otherwise than with the mind" (Plutarch in *Numa*, c. viii.). Varro, in a passage preserved by St. Augustine (*Civ. Dei*, iv. c. 31), also affirms that for the period specified, the Romans "worshipped the gods without an image (simulachro)." He thought that if the law had continued, "the gods would have been more purely worshipped;" and after referring to the example of the Jews, he adds that "they who first set up images of the gods for the people relieved their states (civitibus, but probably civibus, their fellow-citizens), from a fear, and involved them in an error" (Opp. Varr. *Fragmenta*, p. 46; Amstel. 1623).

II. That many of the early Christians adopted the Jewish interpretation of the second commandment is evident. Tertullian, A.D. 192, even thought it wrong to make such masks as actors wore; for, if God forbade the likeness of any thing, "how much more of His own image?" (*De Spect.* c. 23). He thought painting a sin in Hermogenes (*Adv. Herm.* c. 1); and he teaches that "the law of God, in order to eradicate the material of idolatry, proclaims, *Thou shalt not make an idol*; adding also, *Nor the likeness of any thing* . . . Over the whole world hath it forbidden such arts to the servants of God" (*De Idololatr.* c. iv.). Clemens Alex., A.D. 192, appears to hold the same rigid view: "It has been manifestly forbidden us to practise deceptive art; for, saith the prophet, *Thou shalt not make the likeness of any thing that is in heaven or in the earth below.*" (*Protrept.* c. iv. § 62.) Origen says that painting and sculpture were disallowed among the Jews, lest the effect on senseless men should be to "draw the eyes of the soul off God on to the earth" (*C. Cels.* iv. § 31); a reason, which, if valid, ought to debar Christians from the exercise of them also.

III. All held that representations of God, even of the Second Person as man, were unlawful. Thus Clemens Al.: "It were ridiculous, as the philosophers themselves say, for man, who is the toy of God (Plato, *de Legibus*, vii. § 10) to make God, and for God to be made of sportive art," &c. (*Strom.* vii. c. 5, § 28). Origen: "The statues and ornaments that become God are not made by handicraft artisans, but are those wrought by the word of God and formed within us, the virtues (to wit) which are imitations of the first-born of every creature" (*C. Cels.* viii. § 17). Minutius Felix, A.D. 220: "What image should I make of God, when, if you think aright, man is himself the image of God" (*Octav.* c. 9). Lactantius, A.D. 303: "An image of God, whose spirit and power being diffused everywhere, can from nowhere be absent, must be always superfluous" (*Instit.* ii. c. 2; see also the *Epit.* c. 25). Arnobius, A.D. 303, after ridiculing the images of the heathen, says, "So far are we from attributing corporeal features to God, that we even fear to ascribe to so great a being the ornaments of minds, and the virtues themselves in which excellence has been hardly ascribed to a few. For who would say that God was brave, constant," &c. (*Adv. Gent.* iii.). Eusebius, the historian, in a letter to Constantia Augusta (the daughter of Constantine and

wife of Caesar Gallus), who died in 354: "Since thou hast written about some image, it seems of Christ, wishing the said image to be sent to thee by us, what, and of what kind, is this image which thou callest that of Christ? . . . Has this Scripture alone escaped thee, in which God by law forbids to make the likeness of any thing in heaven, or on the earth beneath? Hast thou ever seen such a thing in a church thyself, or heard of it from another? Have not such things been banished throughout the whole world, and driven far off out of the churches; and has it been proclaimed to us alone among all men that it is not lawful to do such a thing?" (*Epist.* put together from fragments by Boivin, in note to Niceph. Gregoras; *Hist. Byzant.* tom. ii. p. 130, ed. Bonn). Eusebius proceeds to say he had taken from a woman two pictures of persons dressed like philosophers, which she called portraits of Christ and St. Paul, "lest," he adds, "we should seem to carry our God about in a representation like idolaters." St. Augustine writing in 393: "It is not to be thought that God the Father is circumscribed by human form . . . It is unlawful to set up such an image to God in a Christian temple. Much more is it wicked to set it up in the heart where the temple of God truly is" (*De Fide et Symbolo*, c. 7; comp. in *Ps.* cxiii.; *Enarr. Serm.* ii. § 1, &c.). Asterius of Amasea, A.D. 401: "Do not depict Christ. For the one humiliation of the Incarnation sufficeth Him, which He took on Himself by choice for our sake. But bear and carry about the incorporeal Word mentally, in thy soul" (*Hom. in Div. et Lazar.* Auctar. Græc. Combef. tom. exeg. col. 5). A writer quoted as Epiphanius Cyprius (the famous bishop of Constantia) by the council of Constantinople in 754: "Remember, dear children, not to bring images into churches, nor into the cemeteries of the saints; but have God ever in your heart: through remembrance of Him; nor indeed into a common house" (*Act. vi. Conc. Nic. ii.*). Even in the 8th century there were no representations of God the Father, but unhappily not always from principle. "Why," says Gregory II. in 726, "do we not represent and paint the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ? Because we do not know what He is, and it is impossible to represent and paint the nature of God. But if we had seen and known Him, as we have His Son, then should we have been able to represent and paint Him also, that you might call His image too an idol" (*Ep. I. ad Leon.* Labb. *Conc.* tom. vii. col. 13). John Damascene in the East at the same period, A.D. 728, who is equally vehement on the general question, says to the same effect: "We should indeed be in error if we made an image of the invisible God" (*Orat. de Sacris Imag.* ii. § 5).

After the period in which all painting was condemned, it is not so common to find passages which forbid pictures of saints, or deny that the church used them. There are such, however: although, as we shall see, such pictures were then looked on only as lessons in history. For example, St. John Chrysostom, A.D. 398: "We enjoy the presence of the saints through their writings, having images not of their bodies but of their souls. For the things said by them are images of their souls" (*Act. vi. Conc. Nic. ii.*; sim. Amphilochius of Iconium, *ibid.*). An author whom the council of Constantinople already mentioned,

sites under the name of Theodotus of Ancyra: "Concerning them he teaches thus, that we have not been taught by tradition to form the likenesses of the saints in images out of material colours; but we have learnt, through those things which are written of them, to copy their virtues, which are, as it were, living images of them" (Labb. *Conc.* tom. vii. col. 492).

IV. There was a consensus against the worship of images, in every sense of the words *προσκύνησις* and *adoratio*. At first this extended to material representations of the cross. "We neither worship crosses," says Minutius, "nor wish to do so" (*Octav.* c. 9). With regard to images of our Lord and the saints, the evidence is ample. Thus Irenaeus, A.D. 167, condemns the error of some Gnostics, who crowned images painted in colours, and of other materials, which they asserted to be likenesses of our Lord (*Adv. Haer.* i. c. 25, § 6). Epiphanius who repeats this (*Haer.* xxvii. § 6) says that some of the images were of gold and silver, and that they "set them up and worshipped them." (See also Aug. *De Haer.* n. 7.) Origen: "We do not honour statues, that as far as in us lies we may avoid falling into the notion that the statues are other gods" (*C. Cels.* vii. § 66). The council of Eliberis, about the year 305, decreed "that pictures ought not to be in a church, lest that which is worshipped and adored be painted on walls" (Can. xxxvi.). St. Augustine: "Who worships an image (simulachrum) or prays looking on it, that is not so affected as to fancy that he is heard by it, as to hope that what he desires is granted him by it? . . . Against this affection, by which human and carnal weakness can be easily ensnared, the Scripture of God sings [as a nurse waking infants] things very familiar, by which to stir memory, and to rouse, as it were, the minds of men asleep in custom of their bodies. The images of the heathen, it says, are silver and gold" (*Enarr. in Ps.* cxiii. *Serm.* ii. § 5). Elsewhere, when he dwells on the feeling excited by images, he speaks also of its contagious nature: "Who doubts the idols being destitute of all sense? Yet when they are set in their places, exalted for honour, so that they may be attentively regarded by those who pray and sacrifice, then through the very resemblance of living limbs and senses, though senseless and lifeless themselves, they affect weak minds, so that they seem to live and breathe; especially when there is besides the veneration of a multitude, by whom a worship so great is paid to them" (*Ad Doctr. Ep.* cii. *quaest.* 3, § 18). It is undeniable that the objection here urged is as applicable to the image of a Christian saint as to that of a heathen god. Other testimonies will occur in the following sections.

V. The figures first used among Christians in any reference to their faith were merely symbolical. The earliest was the momentary sign of the cross made by the hand. "At every journey and movement," says Tertullian, "at every coming in and going out, at the putting on of our clothes and shoes, at baths, at meals, at lighting of candles, at going to bed, at sitting down, whatever occupation employs us, we wear our forehead with the sign" (*De Cor. Mil.* c. iii.; compare *Ad Uxor.* ii. 5; S. Cyrill. *Hier. Cat.* iv. c. 10: xiii. cc. 11, 18, and others). The first permanent representation of the cross is

probably that set up at Rome beside the statue of Constantine after the defeat of Maxentius in 312 (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* ix. 9); but Eusebius tells us also that "the symbol of the salutary passion composed of various and precious stones was set up" by Constantine in a room in his palace (*De Vit. Const.* iii. 49). The same prince had the arms of his soldiers marked with a cross (Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* i. 8). Julian the emperor, A.D. 361, says to Christians in reproach: "Ye worship the wood of the cross, making shadowy figures of it on the forehead, and painting it at the entrance of your houses." St. Cyril of Alexandria in his reply justifies the practice of painting "the sign of the precious cross" (Lib. VI. ad calc. Opp. Jul. 194). From St. Jerome we learn that the sign of the cross was made in the 4th century, as it is now, in witness to written documents (*Comm. in Ezek.* ix. 4). St. Chrysostom: "This shines at the sacred table, at the ordination of priests, and again with the body of Christ at the mystic supper. It may be seen everywhere displayed, in houses, in market-places, in deserts, on roads, on mountains, in groves, on hills, on ships and islands in the sea, on beds, on dresses, on arms, on couches," &c. (*Contra Judae. et Gentil.* § 9). Severian, A.D. 401, calls the cross "the image of the immortal king" (*Hom. de Cruce*, inter Opp. St. Chrys. ed. Saville, v. 899). Paulinus of Nola, writing in 403, speaks of "the ensign of the cross," surmounted with the crown of thorns, painted on the walls of his churches at Nola and Fundi (*Ep.* xxxii. *ad Serer.* §§ 12-17). Nilus, A.D. 440, recommends Olympiodorus, who was about to erect a martyrium, to "set the figure of a single cross in the sacrarium on the east of the most sacred precincts; for by one saving cross is mankind completely saved" (*Ep.* iv. 61).

Tertullian is the first witness to the use of other symbolical figures: "We may begin from the parables in which is the lost sheep sought by its owner, and brought home on his shoulders. Let the very pictures of your chalices stand forth" (as witnesses). "The Good Shepherd whom thou paintest on the chalice" (*De Pudic.* 7, 10). Clemens Alex. (*Paedag.* iii. 11, § 59) mentions several devices which he considered permissible on seals. [GEMS, p. 712.] "Symbols of the Good Shepherd" were placed by Constantine in the fora of Constantinople (Euseb. *Vita Const.* iii. 49). A mosaic in the church built by Paulinus at Nola represented Christ by a lamb, the Spirit by a dove, while "the voice of the Father thunders from the sky" ("This is My beloved Son" [Matt. iii. 17], being probably in letters). The APOSTLES [p. 107] were figured by twelve doves round a cross, and the church was seen set on a rock from which issued four streams, the doctrines of the four Evangelists (*Ep. Paulini* xxxii. § 10). At Fundi the picture of a shepherd separating the goats from the sheep suggested the Day of Judgment (*Ibid.* § 17).

VI. (1) When religious art advanced from symbolism to portraiture, its works of the new type were at first, perhaps in every instance, partly historical and partly ideal. There was, for example, in the cemetery of St. Priscilla at Rome, a picture of the Virgin and Child, accompanied by the figure of a man, whose dress and action (he is pointing to a star) are so clearly suggestive of a symbolical meaning that he is



supposed by De Rossi to represent the prophets who foretold the coming of Christ (Marriott's *Vestiarius Christianum*, p. 234, and pl. x.). Other pictures belonging to this period of transition, being apparently of the 5th century, show our Lord blessing a child, or raising Lazarus, but with "the rod of His power" (Ps. cx. 2) in His hand (Aringhi, *Roma Subterr.* ii. 33, 37, &c.; De Rossi, *Roma Subterr.* ii. tav. 14, 24). In one of the same class and probably of the same age, our Lord appears with an open book in His hand, and an Apostle and rolls of writing on either side (Aringhi, ii. 91; Marriott, pl. xii.). The rolls evidently represent the Old and New Testaments; and the Apostles are probably St. Peter, the great converter of the Jews, and St. Paul, whose chief mission was to the Gentiles. The thought conveyed is that Christ is the great teacher. He "opened the Scriptures" to the Apostles, that they might instruct the world. Works of this twofold character are frequent after the strictly historical treatment of religious subjects had quite established itself. See examples in Aringhi, ii. 83, 88, 129, &c.

(2) We come now to pictorial images, which were, so far as appears, of a purely historical character. St. Augustine writing about the year 400, says of some misbelievers who had forged epistles as from our Lord to SS. Peter and Paul, that he supposed those Apostles "occurred to them because they saw them painted together with Him in many places" (*De Consensu Evang.* i. x. n. 16). He speaks also of the offering of Isaac as a "noble deed sung by so many tongues, painted in so many places" (*C. Faust.* xxii. 73). A painting on this subject is described by St. Gregory of Nyssa: "I have often seen the image of his suffering in a picture, and passed the sight not without tears, so vividly did the art of the painter bring the story before the eyes" (*De Deit. Fil. et Sp. Orat.*; compare Greg. II., *Ep. I. ad Leon.* Labb. *Conc.* vii. 11.). It was a favourite subject, because it symbolised the death of Christ, which as yet men did not venture to represent directly. St. Gregory tells us also that the martyrdom of Theodore in all its circumstances was depicted on the walls of a church built to his memory (*Encom. Theodori*). The people of Antioch in the time of St. Chrysostom had the figure of St. Meletius "in the besils of rings, on stamps, on bowls, on the walls of chambers, and everywhere" (Chrysost. in *St. Melet.* § 1). Paulinus, in a poem written about the year 402, describes several scenes from the Old Testament, which he had caused to be painted in his church at Nola. He owns that it was an unusual thing (*raro more*, line 544), and explains his reason for it at length. It was an experiment by which he hoped to interest and instruct the rude converts of that neighbourhood, and especially to keep them from the excesses which prevailed among them, when they assembled in great numbers on the festivals (*Poema* xxvii. *De S. Fel. Nat.* carm. 9). Pictures of Paulinus himself and St. Martin had been placed by Sulpicius Severus in the baptistery of his church at Primuliac, near Beziers. Paulinus, hearing of this, sent him some verses to be set over them, in which he describes St. Martin as an example of holiness to the newly baptized, and himself of penitence (*Ep.* xxxii. §§ 2, 3). From Asterius we learn that at the beginning of the 5th cen-

tury some persons had subjects from the New Testament, as Christ and the Apostles and miracles wrought by them, embroidered on their dress, a practice which he strongly condemns (*De Div. et Laz.* u. s.). The same writer describes at length the martyrdom of St. Euphemia as painted in a church (u. s. col. 207). Prudentius, A.D. 405, saw in the Forum Cornelianum at Rome a picture of the martyrdom of St. Cassianus, a schoolmaster, whom his pupils at the command of the heathen magistrate had stabbed to death with their *styli* (*De Coronis*, Hymn. ix. 9). He also describes a picture on the tomb of Hippolytus, in which that martyr was represented being torn asunder by horses (*Ibid.* x. 126). Heraclides of Nyssa, A.D. 440, wrote two epistles against the Messalianites, in the latter of which was a "testimony to the antiquity of the venerable images" (*εἰκόνων*, the Greek paintings) (Photius, *Biblioth.* cod. i.). We have reason to think that the custom of placing in churches the portraits, either painted, or in mosaic, of the patriarchs or other eminent men, was becoming common about this time. St. Nilus advised Olympiodorus "to fill the holy temple on all sides with stories from the Old and New Testament by the hand of the finest painter, that those who did not know letters and were not able to read the Holy Scriptures might by contemplating the picture be reminded of the virtues of those who served God truly," &c. (*Epist.* iv. 61). An author in Suidas, supposed to be Malchus, A.D. 496, says that in a church at Constantinople there was a mosaic, put up in the lifetime of Gennadius (A.D. 458 to 471), in which that patriarch and Acacius, who became his successor, were represented with our Lord between them, and that the clergy set up pictures of Acacius in the oratories (Suidas in *Acacius*, i. 76). We find incidentally that the partisans of Macedonius had portraits of him in their churches (Theodorus Lector, *Excerpt.* ii.). Evagrius, A.D. 594, mentions a picture on the ceiling of a church at Apamia, representing a miracle of which he had himself been witness when at school there (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 26). Gregory of Tours, his contemporary, mentions pictures (*iconicæ*) of the apostles and other saints, which were in an oratory at Arverna (*Vitæ PP.* xii. § 2). When Augustine and his companions had their first interview with Ethelbert in 597, they came "bearing a silver cross for banner, and an image of the Lord the Saviour painted on a board" (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* i. 25). But the earliest authentic account of pictures in an English church occurs in Bede's life of Benedict Biscop, his first abbot, who, in 648, "brought from Rome paintings of sacred images, to wit, of the blessed Mary and of the twelve Apostles, besides representations of the Gospel history, and of the visions of St. John the Evangelist, and placed them in his church; so that all who entered the church, even those ignorant of letters, whithersoever they turned their eyes, might contemplate the ever-lovely countenance of Christ, and of his saints, though in an image; or might more heedfully call to mind the grace of the Lord's Incarnation" (*Hagiogr.* sect. i.). In 685 (*Ibid.* 720) he brought other pictures from Rome, many of saints and Gospel subjects, as before; but some also illustrating the relation of the New Testament to the Old, as Isaac bearing the

wood beside Christ bearing His cross, the brazen serpent on the pole by Christ on the cross. Pictures of this character probably abounded in Rome at this time; for a great number are mentioned as to be seen there by Gregory II. in his first reply to Leo the emperor, A.D. 726 (*Lab. Conc.* vii. 16).

VII. Scarcely had portraits of holy persons become common, before pictures of fabulous origin were brought forward, and superstitious notions and practices began to abound. For example, Theodoret had heard that the Romans held Symeon the Stylite in such esteem, as to "set up small portraits of him in all the entrances of their workshops, deriving thence protection and safety for themselves" (*Hist. Relig.*, c. xxvi.). Theodorus Lector reports that Eudocia, the Augusta, sent to Pulcheria (about A.D. 456) a "likeness of the mother of God which the Apostle Luke painted" (*Excerpta*, i. prope init.). The same writer relates that a painter of Constantinople in the time of Genadius, had "dared to paint the Saviour as Zeus." For this his arm withered, but was restored at the prayer of the patriarch. The historian adds that "the other representation of the Saviour, with curling short hair, is the more correct" (*Ibid.* i. 554). When Edessa was besieged by Chosroes, king of Persia, about 544, the mound erected by him against the walls was, according to Evagrius (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 27), destroyed by fire, the heat and power of which had been miraculously intensified by water that had been sprinkled over a picture of Christ ("the God-made image which the hand of man wrought not"), sent by himself to Abgarus a former king of that city. Evagrius finished his history in 594. It is worthy of note that Procopius (*De Bello Persico*, ii. 27), who wrote soon after the Persian war, and from whom Evagrius took the rest of his account, does not mention the miraculous picture. In a later war with Persia, A.D. 590, another portrait of Christ, said also to be of divine origin, accompanied the Roman army, and gave courage to the soldiers (*Theophyl. Simoc. Historiarum* ii. 3, 70, ed. Bekker). At this time imagination readily connected miracles with the icons of the saints. Thus both Evagrius and Gregory of Tours tell the story of a Jewish boy at Constantinople, who, having with others of his age partaken of the remains of the Eucharist according to the custom there, was cast by his enraged father into a burning furnace. The next day he was found in it uninjured. Evagrius (*u. s. c.* 36) merely says that he declared that "a woman clothed in purple" had appeared to him and saved him; but in the version of Gregory of Tours (*Mirac.* i. 10), "the woman seated in a chair and carrying an infant in her bosom, who was in the basilic, where he received the bread from the table, had covered him with her mantle that the fire might not devour him." Another improvement of the same kind in a miraculous story should be mentioned here. Paulus Warnefridi, in his *History of the Lombards* (ii. 13), relates how the bad eyes of two persons were healed by oil from "a lamp set to give light" near the altar of St. Martin, in a church at Ravenna. When this story is told in France, as it is in some of the manuscript copies of Gregory (*De Mirac. S. Martini*, i. 15), the lamp stands

CHRIST. ART.

"under an image of the picture of the blessed Martin." Such variations appear to indicate the growth of a feeling which ascribed to the image a part of the supposed powers of the saint himself. Other stories told by Gregory of Tours are of a picture of Christ, which was said to have shed blood, when maliciously injured by a Jew (*Mirac.* i. 22); and of another at Narbonne, respecting which our Lord in a vision expressed His displeasure, because it represented Him on the cross, not fully clothed, but "girt with a linen" only (*Ibid.* c. 23). Such stories were quite as common in the East, e.g. Leontius, bishop of Neapolis in Cyprus, A.D. 590, speaks of the flow of blood from images as of frequent occurrence (*Apol. in Act.* iv. *Conc. Nic.* ii. *Lab.* vii. 240). At Constantinople there was a picture of our Lord "at which many miracles took place." This image Gregory II., writing in 726, calls without any qualification "the Saviour." When the emperor Leo ordered it to be destroyed, the officer sent to execute the decree was murdered by women, whom the pope describes as full of zeal, and honours with a title (*μυροφόροι*) which antiquity gave to those holy women who "prepared spices and ointments" wherewith to embalm the body of Christ (*Epist. ad Leon. I.*, *Lab. Conc.* vii. 19). The murder is equally approved by the Greek author of the 'Life of Stephen the Younger' (*Analecta Graeca Bened.* t. i. p. 415).

It is evident that men who had arrived at this stage of superstition were ripe for the practice of direct idolatry. Serenus, a bishop of Marseilles, contemporary with Gregory of Tours, found this so rife among his people that he had the images in his church destroyed. We learn this from an epistle of Gregory I., who concurred with him in principle, while he condemned the deed: "It hath reached our ears some time ago that your fraternity, seeing certain worshippers of images, has broken and cast forth the said images out of the church. And indeed we praise you for being zealous lest aught made by the hand should be worshipped; but we think that you ought not to have broken the said images. For painting is used in churches, that they who are ignorant of letters may at least read on the walls by seeing them what they cannot read in books" (*Epist.* vii. 111). "It is one thing to adore a picture, another to learn by the story of the picture what ought to be adored . . . If any one wishes to make images by no means forbid him; but by all means stop the worship of images" (*Epist. ad eund.* ix. 9). In both these epistles now quoted Gregory teaches, and in the second at great length, that pictures were placed in churches "only to instruct the minds of the ignorant" (*non ad adorandum, sed ad instruendas solummodo mentes nescientium*); but elsewhere he indicates another use which experience has shown to lead rapidly to direct worship: "We do not prostrate ourselves before it ('the image of our Saviour') as before the Godhead; but we worship Him whom by help of the image we call to mind as born, as suffering, or even sitting on His throne. And while the picture itself, like a writing, brings the Son of God to our memory, it either rejoices our mind by the suggestion of His resurrection, or consoles it by His passion" (*Ep. ad Secund.* vii. 54). In the Greek church, however, we find the worship of pictures already

avowed and defended; as by Leontius, above mentioned: "I, worshipping the image of God, do not worship the material wood and colours; God forbid; but laying hold of the lifeless representation of Christ, I seem to myself to lay hold of and to worship Christ through it" (*Apol. in Act. iv. Conc. Nic. ii. Labb. vii. 237*). He compares this worship to that which a Jew pays to the book of the law; but as he dwells much on miracles wrought by images, and, like Gregory, on the emotions which the sight of a cross or picture ought to raise in the beholder, it is clear that in practice the worship of them was very different from the reverence shewn to the law. Indeed it is very probable that the simple plea of instruction for the ignorant, however just when properly applied, was soon so extended as to cover practices which could not be distinguished from idolatry. For as Gieseler notices (*Eccl. Hist. per. i. div. i. p. i. § 1*) the only reply to the complaint, "This generation has made gods of the images," which a fanatical image-worshipper of the 8th century could offer, was that by which Gregory I. had defended the merely didactic use of them; viz., "You must teach the unlearned people" (*Orat. de Imag. Adv. Constantinum Cabul. c. 13; inter. Opp. S. Joann. Damasc.*).

VIII. By the beginning of the 8th century the worship of images had become such a scandal in the East that a Mahometan prince, Izid, or Jesid, the son of Omar, thought himself justified in interfering. In 715 he accordingly commanded all pictures to be removed from the churches of his dominion (Theophanes, *Chronographia* ad a. m. 6215). A little later, Leo the Isaurian, who became emperor in 716, made his hostility to the practice known. He claimed to be influenced by a horror of idolatry, and there is no evidence of any other motive. His sentiments were probably well-known from the first (Theophan. ad ann. 6217); but we gather from the testimony of two adversaries (Greg. II. *Epist. ad Leon. Labb. vii. 9; Vita Steph. Jun. u. s. p. 412*) that he had reigned ten years before he ventured on any overt act. In the year 726 he issued a declaration against the worship of images, but did not command them to be "destroyed, only placed higher, so that no one might kiss them, and thus bring discredit on that which was otherwise worthy of respect" (*Vita Steph. u. s.*). However, about the same time he seems to have ordered the image already mentioned, to which miracles were ascribed, to be removed from a public place in Constantinople. He also wrote to the bishop of Rome, who quotes his letter thus: "Thou sayest that the images occupy the place of idols, and that they who worship them are idolaters." "Thou hast written, that we ought not to worship things made by the hand, nor the likeness of any thing . . . and, inform me who hath taught by tradition the reverence and worship of things made by the hand, and I will confess that it is the law of God" (*Epist. Greg. II. u. s.*). In a most insolent and unchristian reply, the pope dwells much on his own feelings before a sacred picture (coll. 14, 16); but does not meet the complaint that such objects were abused to idolatry. About the same time John of Damascus wrote his three "Orations against those who reject the holy images." In his demand for adoration he does not go further

than "worshipping and kissing and embracing the image both with lips and heart; as the likeness of the Incarnate God, or of His mother, or of the Saints." He says that pictures are the "books of the unlearned" (*Orat. ii. § 10*). Leo, however, persevered. A second letter to the pope (Labb. u. s. col. 23) being met in the same spirit as the former, and Germanus of Constantinople proving equally impracticable, in 730 he ordered all images to be removed out of churches (Theophan. ad an. 6221). Constantine V., his son and successor, published another edict against images in the first year of his reign, 741; and is even said to have exacted an oath from his subjects that they would not worship them (Theophan. ad an. 6233; *Vita Steph. p. 444*). Such images as had been left were now effaced by scraping or whitewashing the walls (*Vita Steph. p. 445*); but merely decorative paintings of trees, flowers, birds, &c., were allowed. That the party of the image-worshippers was at this time strong and numerous, is clear from the fact that the rebel Artavasdes won many adherents by declaring himself in their favour, and setting up icons in the cities. Anastasius the patriarch went over to him (Cedrenus, *Hist. Compend. ii. 4; ed. Bonn*), and he was recognized by Zacharias of Rome, who dated letters from his assumption of the purple (*Ep. iv. v. Labb. vi. 1503-5*). From this time image-worshippers would naturally be suspected of disloyalty, and would suffer much in that age of cruelty on the suppression of the revolt in 743. In 754 Constantine convened a general council at Constantinople, at which 338 bishops (Labb. tom. vii. col. 417) were present, but none of the great patriarchs. At this synod it was maintained that the worship of images was in a great measure due to, and that in return it fostered, a tendency to those heresies respecting the nature of Christ which had been condemned by earlier councils (*ib. coll. 429-453*), their characteristics being either to lower the Divine nature, or to dwell on the human as apart from it, or to confound the two. After a careful review of the scriptural and patristic evidence (*ib. coll. 473-504*) the following decree was made:—"Whoever shall from this time present dare to make or worship or set up in a church or private house or conceal an image (*εἰκόνη*), if he be a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, let him be degraded; if a monk or layman, let him be anathematized and punished by the imperial laws, as contrary to the commandments of God and an enemy to the doctrine of the Fathers" (*ib. col. 508; see also 506*). At the same time it was forbidden, under pretence of compliance with this decree, to lay hands on sacred vessels, vestments, &c., that had any figure wrought on them, but they might be recast or made up afresh with licence from the patriarch or emperor (*ib. coll. 510, 511*). This caution was necessary, and only partially effectual. E. g., a fanatical bishop was accused to the council of having "trampled on the holy paten of the undefiled mysteries of God, because it was engraved with the venerable image of Christ, and of His mother, and of the Precursor" (*Vita Stephani, u. s. p. 480*). We read too that many books containing pictures were burnt or defaced by the "iconoclasts" (Labb. u. s. coll. 372-377); and a general complaint is made by Germanus of Constantinople that they were not



content with obeying the order for the removal of images, but must needs destroy "any symbolical ornament on the 'venerable vessels,' and 'defacing altar-cloths' embroidered in gold and purple, would put them up in their own houses," &c. (*De Synod. et Haeres.* § 42, in *Maii Spicil. Roman.* tom. viii. p. 1; comp. *Vita Steph.* p. 445). The decree is said to have been carried out with great cruelty, but we cannot believe all the charges brought by his enemies against Constantine; as, for example, that the governor of Natolia, with his approbation, having assembled at Ephesus in 770 all the monks and nuns of Thrace, gave them the choice of marriage or the loss of their eyes (Theophanes, ad an. Const. 30). However this may be, it appears certain that from the date of the council no images that could be made the object of worship were permitted in the churches of the East until after the death of Leo IV. (Chazarus), the son of Constantine, in 780.

In 786 the widow of Leo, Irene, who had been brought up an image-worshipper, being regent of the empire in the minority of her son Constantine VI., resolved, in conjunction with her creature Tarasius the patriarch (785-806), to make every effort for the restoration of the icons. A council assembled at Constantinople was dispersed by a tumult among the soldiers who were faithful to the convictions of their former master; but it met again the next year (787) at Nicaea. There were present 375 bishops. Two legates from Rome attended, and two represented jointly the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. In the second session a letter was read, addressed by Hadrian of Rome to Irene and her son, in which the pope maintained that a relative worship was due to images (*Labb.* tom. vii. col. 113). This had been the teaching of his predecessor Gregory II. in his letter to Leo (*οὐ λατρευτικῶς, ἀλλὰ σχετικῶς*, *ib.* col. 13), and it appears in several of the authorities read before the council (coll. 304, 353, 356, &c.). The principle was fully accepted by the synod, and stated in the conclusion at which it arrived, viz., that "the venerable and holy images should be set up in the same manner as the figure of the precious and life-giving cross; both those which are in colours or tessellated work, and those of other suitable material, in the holy churches of God, on sacred vessels and vestments, on walls and boards, on houses, and by the wayside; the images, to wit, of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the one undefiled Lady, the holy mother of God, and of the honourable angels, and all saints and holy men. For the more frequently they are seen in their pictured resemblance, the more are those who behold them stirred up to the recollection and love of their prototypes, and to render to them (the images) salutation and honorific worship; not indeed true supreme worship (*λατρεῖαν*), according to our faith, which is due to the Divine nature alone, but that, as the pious custom of the ancients held, an offering of incense and lights should be made in their honour in the same manner as to the figure of the precious and life-giving cross, and to the holy gospels, and to other sacred ornaments. For the honour of the image passes on to the original, and he who worships the image worships in it the person of him who is therein depicted" (*Labb.* u. s.

col. 556). If lights and incense had not been mentioned, we should hardly have suspected these words to demand a greater reverence for images than a devout mind naturally feels for a copy of the Bible, or indeed for anything that brings God immediately before it; but to arrive at their full significance, we must also take into consideration the habits of the age, and especially the arguments and testimonies on which the decree professed to be founded. Many pictures were deemed miraculous, and any one, in the belief of the people, might become so, while prayers were already addressed directly to the icons, and many superstitious practices existed in connection with them without rebuke from those who framed this decree. In a passage read with applause at the council from the *Limonarium* of Sophronius or John Moschus (A.D. 630), worshipping the image of Christ is spoken of as worshipping Christ, and not to do so as a deadly sin (*Labb.* col. 381). Such indeed was the constant language of the iconolaters. He, says Photius, "who does not worship the image of Christ, does not worship Christ, though he may think he worships him" (*Epist.* lib. ii. n. 102). In another passage from the *Limonarium*, also approved by the council, we are told that a certain anchorite, when about to visit any holy place, used to light a candle before a picture of the Virgin with Christ in her arms, and "regarding her picture to say to the Lady, 'Holy Lady, mother of God, seeing I have a long way to go, a journey of many days, take care of thy candle and keep it unquenched according to my intent; for I depart having thy aid on the way.' And having said this to the image he departed." The light burned on till his return (*ib.* col. 384). (For the direct address compare *Greg. II. ad Leon. Ep.* i. col. 13, and Germanus of Constantinople, *ad Thom.* col. 312.) Other important facts are recorded in a letter of Michael Balbus to Ludovicus Pius. "They not only sang psalms and worshipped them, and asked for help from the said images," but many, hanging linen cloths on them, placed their children in them as they came out of the font, thus making them sponsors; and monks receiving the tonsure had the hair held over them so as to fall into their lap. "Some of the priests and clerks, scraping the colours of the images, mixed them with the oblation and wine, and after the celebration of masses gave of this oblation to those who wished to communicate. Others put the Lord's Body into the hands of images, from which they caused those who desired to communicate to receive it. Some despising the church used the flat surface of pictures for altars in common houses and celebrated the sacred liturgy on them; and many other like things, unlawful and contrary to our religion, were done in churches" (*Imper. Decr. de Cultu Imag.* p. 618, ed. Goldast. Francof. 1608).

In 797 Constantine VI. was deprived of his kingdom and sight by the contrivance and command of his unnatural mother (Cedrenus, tom. ii. p. 27), who after five years of undivided power was supplanted by Nicephorus. He is said to have favoured the iconoclasts (*Cedr. u. s.* p. 49), but there is no evidence of any action in support of their cause. His death in battle, July 811, was in two months followed by that of his son and successor Stauratius, who had been wounded



at the same time. Michael Rhangaba, who deposed the dying Stauratius, seems to have punished with impartial hand both those who worshipped images and those who broke them. Leo the Armenian, who deprived him of his throne in 813, was a decided enemy to image-worship. He thought that the heathen were permitted on that account to obtain victories over the Christians. "I desire," he declared, "to overthrow them (the images). For observe, all the emperors who have received and worshipped them have died, some pursued to death, some falling in battle: and only those who did not worship them have ended their reigns each by a natural death, and been buried with honour," &c. (*Narratio de Leone Arm. Imp. auctoris incerti*, in *Opp. Theophanis*, p. 435, ed. Paris). The people generally seem to have been with him; for he is also reported to have remonstrated in this manner with the patriarch Nicephorus:—"The people are scandalized by the images, and say that we do ill to worship them, and that for this reason the heathen lord it over us. Condescend a little, and use management with the people, and let us pare away trifles. But if you are not willing to do this, give us the grounds on which you worship them, for the Scripture is by no means clear on the point" (*ib.* p. 437). In reply Nicephorus merely asserted the antiquity of the practice. In 815 Leo procured the condemnation of the second council of Nicaea by another, which he convened at Constantinople (*Labb. tom. vii. col. 1299*). The acts of this council are not extant; but an edict of Leo, issued at the time, is probably in complete accord with its decrees. In that the emperor alleges the unlawfulness and absurdity of image-worship, and the duty of removing the cause of offence (Michael Monach. in *Vita Theodori Stud.* c. 63; *opp. Sirmondi*, tom. v.). It is related of Michael II. (Balbus), A.D. 820, that "though he was of the heterodox party (an image-worshipper is speaking) he had nevertheless no wish to trouble those who did not defer to him, but allowed every one to do as he chose" (*Vita Theod. Stud.* c. 102). He also recalled those who had been banished by Leo. He at first contented himself with forbidding the word "saint" to be inscribed on images, wherever they might be (*Cedren. tom. ii. p. 110*); but it is probable that he afterwards became more severe (*ib.* p. 74). A letter is extant addressed by this emperor and his son Theophilus to Louis the Godly, in which he describes the course of action adopted by his predecessors of like mind:—"By common counsel they caused images to be removed from too low situations (in churches), and allowed those set in higher to remain where they were, that the painting might serve for Scripture, lest they should be worshipped by the more ignorant and weak; but they forbade the lighting of lamps or burning of incense to them" (*Epist. ad Ludov. apud Goldast. u. s. p. 619*). Theophilus, on his accession, required strict obedience to the law, and even forbade the painting of icons (*Theophan. Continuat. lib. iii. c. 10; Cedr. tom. ii. p. 110*).

On the death of Theophilus in 842, his widow, Theodora, who governed for her infant son Michael III., restored the icons and their worship, notwithstanding an oath that she would not do so, exacted by her dying husband (*Cedr.*

*tom. ii. p. 142*). The sanction of the church was obtained through a council held at Constantinople (*Labb. tom. vii. col. 1782*); and the triumph of images celebrated by the institution of an annual feast on the first Sunday in Lent, thence called by the Greeks *ἡ κυριακὴ τῆς ὁρθοδοξίας* (*Philothei Serræ in Dom. I. Quadr. in Gretser's note to Cod. nus De offic. c. xv., and Narrat. de Imaginibus Restit. in Combefis Auctar. tom. hist. col. 738*). From the *Typicon* of Sabas, c. 42, we learn that the occasion is marked by a procession of crosses and pictures, and the public reading of the decree of Nicaea (*Gretser, u. s.*). Opposition, however, was not wholly extinguished; for about the year 860 we find Photius, who had usurped the patriarchate of Constantinople, proposing to Nicholas of Rome that another general council should be held to complete the suppression of "the heresy of the iconomachi" (*Vita Ignatii a Niceta conscr. in Labb. tom. viii. col. 1204*). The council met the next year and pronounced the deposition of Ignatius, whom Photius had supplanted, but its action in regard to images is not recorded. In 869 another council, convened by the emperor Basil especially for the condemnation of Photius, denounced the iconoclasts, upheld pictures as useful in the instruction of the people, and declared that we ought to "worship them with the same honour as the book of the holy gospels" (*can. iii. Labb. tom. viii. col. 1360*). Here the history of the struggle closes in the East.

IX. The position of the Nestorians and Eutychians with respect to images is interesting and instructive. The former were cut off from the church in 431, before images of any kind were common. Their antagonism to the church would make them keen-sighted to the evil springing up within her, and naturally lead to their entire rejection. We find accordingly that "the Nestorians have no images or pictures in their churches, and are very much opposed to the use of them, even as ornaments, or as barely representing historical facts illustrative of sacred Scripture" (*Badger's Nestorians*, vol. ii. p. 132). The Eutychians, condemned in 451, were a very small body until the time of Jacob Baradaeus, who died in 588. They became very numerous, under the name of Jacobites, in the 7th century, and when they left the church they carried with them the custom of image-worship, as it was then understood and practised. At a later period the Greeks observing a difference and not knowing that they had themselves changed, accused the Jacobites of error: "They think it indifferent whether they worship or do not worship them, but if ever they chance to worship, they do not kiss the image itself, but touching it with a finger only, kiss the finger instead" (*Demetr. Cyzicen. de Jacob. Haeres. Max. Biblioth. PP. tom. 814*). One division of the Monophysites, whom some identify with the Armenians, were called *Chatzitzarii*, from the Armenian *Chatrus* a cross, because they revered the cross only (*ib.*). Of the Armenians Nikon says, "They do not adore the venerable images, and what is more, their Catholicus with the rest anathematizes those who adore them" (*De Armen. Actus. Max. Biblioth. tom. xxv. p. 328*).

X. We turn now to the West. In 767 Pippin held a council at Gentilly, at which legates from Rome and Constantinople were present. One

object was to consider the "cultus of images." The decision was that "images of saints made up (fictas, i. e. mosaics) or painted for the ornament and beauty of churches might be endured, so that they were not had for worship, veneration, and adoration, which idolaters practise" (*Constit. Imper. Goldast. tom. i. p. 16*). The decree of Nicaea was transmitted by the bishop of Rome to Charlemagne and others, but the French church was not even then prepared to accept the worship, though long accustomed to the sight, of images. In 790 a strong protest appeared in the famous *Libri Carolini* or *Capitulare Prolatum*, a treatise in four books, expressly directed against those abuses which the council and the pope had sanctioned. It is not probable that Charlemagne composed it himself, but it is written in his name. The author speaks of king Pipin as his father (lib. i. c. 6), and of legates sent into Greece by his father and himself (lib. iii. c. 3); and Hadrian, in his controversial reply, addresses Charles as the writer (*Labbe. Conc. tom. vii. coll. 915, 916, 960*). A brief quotation will show the practice of the church in France at that time:—"We do not banish from the basilics effigies set up for the commemoration of events, or for ornament, but we restrain a most strange, or rather most superstitious adoration of them, which we do not anywhere find to have been instituted by the apostles, or by apostolical men" (lib. ii. c. 10). "In the year 792," says Roger Hoveden, our English annalist, "did Charles the king of the Franks send a synodal book to Britain, which had been forwarded to him from Constantinople, in which book were found, alas! many unmeet things and contrary to the true faith; chiefly that it had been defined by the unanimous assertion of nearly all the eastern doctors, and not less than 300 or more bishops, that we ought to adore images, which the church of God altogether execrates. Against which Albinus (Alcuin) wrote an epistle admirably confirmed by the authority of the Divine Scriptures, and presented it, with the said book, in the name of our bishops and princes, to the king" (*Chronica ad ann. 792*; Sim., Simeon Dunelm. *Hist. Regum*, and Matth. Paris, *Chron. Maj. ad eund. ann.*); in 794 a council was held at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, "which rejected with contempt and unanimously condemned the adoration and service" which the synod of the Greeks had declared under anathema to be due to "the images of the saints as to the Divine Trinity" (can. ii.). Thus the matter rested during the life of Charlemagne. In 824 Louis the Godly received from Michael Balbus the epistle to which we have already referred, and was induced by it to convoke a synod at Paris in the following year. Having read the letter of Hadrian to Irene, the bishops assembled declare, in an address to Louis and Lothair, that as the pope "justly reproves them who in those parts rashly presumed to break the images of the saints, so is he known to have acted indiscreetly in that he commanded to give them superstitious worship" (*Constit. Imper. tom. i. p. 154*). They support their judgments by an ample catena from the fathers. At this time Eugenius II. was pope, and a letter is ascribed to him (the contents of which make the authorship doubtful) in which, after quoting a letter from Louis and Lothair to himself, he expresses disapprobation of pictures of saints altogether, and

even blames the Greek emperors Michael and Theophilus, to whom he writes, for "allowing any one who chose to have images painted or chased" (*ib. p. 186*). Claudius, who became bishop of Turin in 821, by the choice of the emperor Louis, finding the basilics of his diocese full of images superstitiously worshipped, ordered them to be removed (*Decreta de Cultu Imaginum, Goldast. p. 763*). He even effaced the painted figure of the cross. His argument was, "If you worship a cross because Christ died on one, why not a manger, because he lay in one, and a ship because he taught from one; . . . a lamb, because he is the lamb of God; but those perverse dogmatics will devour lambs that have life, and adore them painted on walls" (*ib. p. 767*). The *Apology* of Claudius was published after the council of Paris was held. As he went beyond that, he was opposed by many who approved of the acts of the council. Among these was Jonas the bishop of Orleans, whose work in three books (*Adversus Claudii Taurinensis Apologeticum*) is extant, and has preserved to us whatever remains of that of Claudius. In it he distinctly disallows the worship of images, while protesting vehemently against the extreme opinions and high-handed measures of his opponent:—"Permit the images of saints and pictures of holy works to be painted in churches, not that they may be adored, but rather that they may lend to them a certain beauty, and impart to the senses of the unlearned the history of past events" (lib. i. sig. c. Colon. 1554). A few years later, 823, Dungalus, a monk of St. Denys at Paris, published a violent attack on Claudius. His work (*Liber Responsionum adv. Claud., &c.*) is printed in the Maxima Biblioth. PP. tom. xiv. A more able production than either of the above is the *Liber de Picturis et Imaginibus*, written by Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, probably about 840. This author maintains that "the images of the apostles and of the Lord Himself were painted and kept by the ancients rather for love and remembrance than religious honour or any veneration after the custom of the Gentiles" (c. 20); and that "none of the ancient catholics ever thought that they are to be worshipped and adored" (c. 32). He laments the later practice as "near to or like the heresy of idolatry or of the anthropomorphites," and thinks that it was "rightly decreed by the orthodox fathers (in the council of Elvira), in order to put down this kind of superstition, that pictures ought not to be in churches" (c. 33). This was probably the last clear note of warning. Walafrid Strabo, abbot of Reichenau, A.D. 842, gives an uncertain sound. "We know," he says, "that icons are not to be adored or worshipped" (*colendas*), but he demands for them "seemly and moderate honours" (*De Reb. Eccl. c. 8*). Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, A.D. 845, at the request of his comprovincials wrote a treatise, now lost, to explain "in what manner the images of our Lord and His saints are to be revered" (*ven-erandae*; Flodoard. *Hist. Eccl. Remens. lib. iii. c. 29*). His teaching is not further indicated by our authority; but it may be safely inferred from his contemptuous language with respect to the Greek and Roman practice, which he stigmatizes as "doll-worship" (*puparum cultus*), and from his open rejection of the second council of Nicaea (*Opusc. lv. adv. Hincmar. Laud. c. xx.*).

XI. The "images" of which we have spoken were all either pictures, like the modern Greek icons, or mosaics. Some writers, however, to prove that statuary was not unemployed by the early church, allege the image of our Lord which was said to have been set up at Paneas (Cesarea Philippi or Dan) by the woman whom He healed of an issue of blood. (See the *Hist. Eccl.* of Eusebius, lib. vii. c. 18; Philostorgius, ex lib. vii. § 3; Sozomen, lib. v. c. 21; Asterius Amas. in Photii *Biblioth.* cod. 271.) If this were indeed a statue of our Lord, the solitary act of a semi-heathen would be no indication of the mind of the apostolic church. But opposite the principal figure was the brazen statue of a woman in a beseeching attitude, kneeling, and with hands raised, not behind and furtively touching the hem of his garment, as in the gospel story. This suggests that the erection of the group was an expression of gratitude to some earthly ruler who had granted a petition. The costliness of the work creates another difficulty (see St. Luke viii. 43). Nor can we build anything on the fact related by Lampridius that Alexander Severus had the images of Christ, Abraham, Orpheus, &c., in his *lararium* (*Vita Al. Sev.* c. 29). It is possible that in the 9th century there was some use of statues among Christians; but we cannot with Mabillon (*Præf. I. in Succ. IV. S. O. B.* c. 29) think it a certain inference from these words of Agobard (*De Imag.* c. 31):—"Whoever adores any picture, or molten or moulded statue, is not giving worship to God, is not honouring the angels or holy men, but showing reverence to (their) images" (*simulachra*).

[W. E. S.]

**IMAGINES CLIPEATAE.** The Romans gave this name to the heads painted on the shields usually hung up in their temples (Buonarroti, *Osservaz. sopra alc. medaglioni*, p. 9-11). We find in ancient Christian art a similar mode of treatment applied to portraits of our Lord. In some instances the bust of the Saviour is painted on a circular space in the form of a shield. This is notably the case in the vaulting of the chapel in the cemetery of Callixtus [*Jesus Christus*], probably the most ancient example of a type that became traditional. *Clipeatae* of the Good Shepherd as a standing figure are frequently met with in the vaultings of crypts in the catacombs. In the mosaic of the great arch of St. Paul without the walls we find the bust of our Lord in *clipeo* (Ciampini, *Vet. Mon. tab. lxxiii.*). Also in ancient ivory diptycha, such as that of Rambona (Buonarroti, *Vet.* p. 262), in which the clipeus is supported by two winged angels. Another diptych exhibits the shield or crown carried in a similar manner by two angels, and bearing in the midst a Greek cross instead of the figure of the Saviour (Calogera's *Raccolta*, vol. xl. p. 295). That this mode of treatment lasted till the 7th century is proved by a painting in the roof of the oratory of St. Felicitas; there the bust of our Lord appears in *clipeo* (Raoul-Rochette, *Disc. sur les types imit.*, p. 25). Examples may also be quoted in later times (Du Cange, *Gloss. s. vv. Scutum, Thoracida*).

Many of the sarcophagi found in Roman cemeteries exhibit the effigies of a husband and wife carved within a shield or shell, as in the in-

stantiated figured times a single xxvi. xl. lxxx (Martigny, .



**IMIZILUM**  
CILUM, MYZILUM occurs several Anastasius Fab some material of dress of a co of the word is it is akin to t (s. e.) rather Pontificum, Leo Sergius II. p. 4

IMMERSI

IMMUNIT

(1), p. 365.]

**IMMUNIT**  
**THE CLERG**  
time the clergy no immunities sion of the em ministers of wh to be exempted members of the honours conce its height in t caused a reacti the present day

By immuniti article exempt privileges, extra whether sancti Both immuniti viewed under II. PECUNIARY,

I. JUDICIAL

distinguish, 1.

2. Immunities s

1. Rights ma

cisions in mat

causes.—Christi

to the imperial

own affairs und

any internal int

authority. It j

when the world

of hostility for

in matters eccl

continued supre

privilege grant

favour bestowed by a friendly chief magistrate, but a prescriptive right maintained. The right was afterwards impaired by servility on one side, and by the exertion of might on the other; for the co-operation of the emperor was found so useful for enforcing the acceptance of conciliary decrees that it was appealed to by contending factions, and, when appealed to, the civil power naturally enough took upon itself to decide which faction it should support and why it should support it. This led imperceptibly to the civil power being regarded as having a right to judge in things spiritual as well as in things civil. But it was rather in its political than in its judicial character that such claim was made or admitted. Ecclesiastical causes, strictly so called, such as trials for heresy, were never brought before courts taking their authority from the state. This is evidenced by laws of successive emperors, of Constantius, A.D. 355 (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 12, tom. vi. p. 37, ed. Gothofred. Lugd. 1665), of Valentinian and Gratian, A.D. 376 (*Ibid.* leg. 23, p. 52), of Arcadius and Honorius, A.D. 399 (*Ibid.* tit. 11, leg. i. p. 298). These laws are of the same tenor, giving the sanction of law to the already existing custom that in ecclesiastical causes judgment was given by church officers and not by the state courts. "On questions of religion," says the law of Arcadius and Honorius, "bishops are to be judges; other cases must be carried before the law courts" (*l. c.*).

(2) *Trials of ecclesiastical persons for moral offences.*—In addition to offences against the faith, those offences against morality on the part of the clergy which were not civil crimes were by prescription under the cognisance of ecclesiastical authority alone. This could not be otherwise, as acts that were not offences against the law could not be carried into the law courts. The bishop was judged by his peers, members of the other clerical orders by their bishop; judgment being in accordance with the canons of discipline promulgated by the recognized authority of church synods. In the continuance of this jurisdiction the state simply permitted the exercise of a right which it found the church already possessed of.

2. *Immunities allowed.* (1) *Exemption of the clergy from the jurisdiction of the secular courts in respect to minor offences.*—Hitherto we have not arrived at any novel immunity or privilege granted by the state as a matter of grace. But soon episcopal jurisdiction over the clergy was extended from cases of morality to petty crimes, and at the same time the clergy were withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the state courts in respect to those crimes. There was a recognized distinction, according to the laws of the Roman empire, between great and petty crimes; the first were called *atrocia delicta*, the last *levia delicta*. By the imperial favour the clergy became exempted from the jurisdiction of the secular courts in respect to the *levia delicta*, while subject to them, as much as any other citizens, in cases of grave crime, such as murder, rebellion, and the like. In the reign of Justinian, A.D. 539, this exemption was allowed to apply to monks and nuns as well as to the clergy (*Justin. Novell.* 79, 83; *Corpus Juris Civilis*, tom. ii. pp. 166, 174, ed. Beck, Lipsiae, 1829); and in the reign of Heraclius, A.D. 610, it

appears to have been extended from petty offences to all criminal cases (*Constitutiones Imperatorias*, ad calc. *Cod. Justin.*; Const. 3, p. 808, Paris, 1628). When one of the parties was a clergyman and the other a layman, the clergyman's immunity from the jurisdiction of the secular court did not hold good, except by the consent of the layman (*Valentin. Novell.* 12).

(2) *Exemption of bishops from being summoned into court as witnesses.*—By Justinian, possibly by Theodosius, it was enacted that no bishop should be required to appear at the tribunal of a secular judge for the purpose of giving his testimony in any case before the court. The judge was required to send his officer to take the bishop's testimony at his own house. The words of Justinian's law are "No judge is to compel bishops to come to a trial to exhibit their testimony, but he is to send to them some of his subordinate officers" (*Justin. Novell.* 123, c. 7; *Corpus Juris Civilis*, tom. ii. p. 250).

(3) *Exemption of bishops from having to take an oath in giving their testimony.*—By the law of Justinian above quoted it was enacted that the word of bishops, given on the holy gospels, should be accepted in place of an oath, an oath being regarded as derogatory to their holy character. "That the bishops having the holy gospels before them may say what they know, as becomes priests" (*Ibid.*).

(4) *Exemption of bishops and presbyters from being examined by torture while bearing testimony.*—According to the laws of the Roman empire, witnesses might be scourged and otherwise tortured in order to extract from them the truth (*Cod. Justin.* lib. ix. tit. 41; *Corpus Jur. Civ.* p. 323; *Cod. Theod.* lib. xiii. tit. 9, leg. 2, tom. v. p. 105; St. Aug. *Serm.* ccclv. tom. v. p. 1572, ed. Migne, al. *De Diversis*, 49; Synesius, *Ep.* 58, Op. p. 201; Paris, 1631). Theodosius, with some hesitation and ambiguity, exempted bishops and presbyters from this liability. His words are: "Presbyters are to give testimony without being liable to torture, provided, however, that they do not pretend what is false. But the rest of the clergy below them in order or rank, if they have to give their testimony, are to be treated as the laws direct" (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xi. tit. 39, leg. 10, tom. iv. p. 331).

3. *Judicial privileges.* (1) *Episcopal coercive jurisdiction in civil causes.*—It had been the custom of Christians, in accordance with the injunctions of St. Paul (1 Cor. vi. 4), to settle their differences before one of themselves, instead of going to the heathen law courts. Very soon, and very naturally, the office of arbitrator became attached to that of bishop, the bishop being the best qualified person to exercise the judicial function. We find instances of the exercise of judicial power in Sidonius Apollinaris (lib. iii. *Ep.* 12; lib. vi. *Ep.* 4, Op. p. 160), Synesius (*Ep.* 105, Op. p. 247), St. Ambrose (*Ep.* lxxxii. *Ad Marcellum*, Op. tom. ii. p. 1100; Paris, 1690), St. Augustine (*Confess.* vi. 3, tom. i. p. 720, ed. Migne). Down to the time of Constantine episcopal decisions thus given had not any force in law. Litigants were bound only by their free choice or by contract to abide by the verdicts given. But now coercive jurisdiction was given to the bishop's court. It was still necessary for both parties to the suit to consent to carry it before the bishop, but when it was



once carried to him his sentence was final, and was executed by the secular authorities. From Sozomen's *Ecclesiastical History* (l. 9, p. 21, Cantab. 1720) it would appear that this privilege was granted by Constantine. It is clearly recognized by a law of Arcadius and Honorius (*Cod. Justin.* lib. i. tit. 4, leg. 8, tom. ii. p. 38). Valentinian III. carefully distinguishes between religious causes, in which bishops and presbyters had a prescriptive right to judge, and civil causes, in which they had no inherent right to act judicially; but he recognizes their jurisdiction in the civil causes when the free choice of the litigants has selected them in preference to the state judges (*Valentin. Novell.* 12, ad calc. *Cod. Theod.*). Thus bishops were made, by virtue of their office, not only arbitrators between members of their flocks, but also magistrates before whom any that pleased might carry their suits to be by them finally and legally settled. The burden of judicial business became so heavy (see St. Augustine, *Epistola* xxxiii. Migne, al. 147), that it was devolved upon presbyters (*St. Aug. Epist.* cxxiii. Migne, al. 110), deacons (*Concil. Tarracon.* can. iv.; *Hard. Concil.* tom. ii. p. 1042, Paris, 1714), and laymen (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 37, p. 321; Oxon. 1844); whence probably there arose the existing custom of the bishops appointing lay chancellors to preside in their courts. Episcopal jurisdiction did not, however, extend to criminal causes, but was confined to civil questions and pecuniary suits. Bishops were forbidden by canon law to interfere with criminal cases (see *Concil. Tarracon.* can. iv.).

(2) *Episcopal intercession.*—In pecuniary cases bishops were magistrates, in criminal cases they were intercessors. Wherever the arbitrary will of a despotic sovereign has power over life and liberty, a right of intercession is sure to become vested in the ministers of religion, the reason being that the religious character alone invests its possessor with so much awe as to enable him to dare to resist the passionate and capricious fury of otherwise uncontrolled power. Such a right begins in the courageous act of some brave ecclesiastic, and first being recognized by custom, is afterwards confirmed by law. When, at a more advanced stage of civilisation, punishments are calmly meted out by the scales of justice, the right of intercession necessarily ceases. The propriety of the privilege is argued in two letters that passed between Macedonius and St. Augustine (*Ep.* clii. cliii. Migne, al. 53, 54); the latter, in interceding with the tribune Marcellinus for the fanatics called *Circumcelliones*, advances very strong claims: "If you do not listen to a friend who asks, listen to a bishop who advises; though, as I am speaking to a Christian, I shall not be too bold if I say that in such a case as this you ought to listen to your bishop that lays his injunction on you, my noble lord and dear son" (*Ep.* cxxiii. Migne, al. 158). He addresses the proconsul Apringius on the same occasion in the same strain (*Ep.* cxxxiv. Migne, al. 160). Flavian, when the people of Antioch had raised a futile rebellion against Theodosius, proceeded to Constantinople. "I am come," he said to the emperor, "as the deputy of our common Master, to address this word to your heart, 'If ye forgive men their trespasses, then will your heavenly Father also forgive you your

trespasses.'" H. purdon. Eparch lème in the 6th influence over the populace was about to yie a robber that ha Turon. *Hist.* p. 1849). In the 7 the fourth coun sixth council of bishops the duty ing over-severe j ing to the kio Conc. Arelat. vi. p. 587; tom. iv.

Closely connec cession, were the of the weak, of public morals; a intercession, are l ing to the mini decision of an arl

(3) *Intercession practice*, begun a sanctioned by th and orphans wer the bishop, and t his guardianship that they will c the attacks of t and orphans can the protection o not to let the f with them, and himself resisted and indeed of a (*De Officiis Min Justinian legaliz tion in the case from their paren minors, of oppre tit. 4, legg. 22, pp. 35-39). The 549), decreed t church officer al that the prison that the bishop Conc. Arelat. v. p. 1447). Greg bishop as gettin the poor, consolli minor, as parti Turon. iv. 35).*

(4) *Sanctuary cession and prot the one side the the right of c accused could le naturally fled to if the bishop m accused and of tl one step to censu That churches a asylum is found positive law: an necessary that tl sudden fury. I and the various the Christian re churches but a imperial standar*

lege. We find the custom of sanctuary acknowledged and acted on in the time of St. Basil (Greg. Nazianz. *Orat.* xx. *De Laud. Basil.* Op. tom. ii. p. 353; Paris, 1630), St. Chrysostom (Op. tom. viii. p. 67, ed. Savil), Synesius (*Ep.* lviii. Op. p. 201; Paris, 1630). Arcadius abrogated it at Eutropius' instance, A.D. 398 (*Cod. Theod.* lib. ix. tit. 45, leg. 3, tom. iii. p. 361); but when Eutropius had himself to claim sanctuary this abrogation was itself abolished (Socrates *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 5). Shortly afterwards Theodosius II. enacted a law extending the privilege of sanctuary from the interior of the church to its environs (*Cod. Theod.* lib. ix. tit. 45). The persons who were allowed to take sanctuary were by no means all classes of criminals, as afterwards was the case through abuse of the original right. It was intended for the defeated party in any civil affray, for slaves that were in danger of cruel treatment, for debtors, unless they were debtors to the state; in general, for the innocent, the injured, the oppressed, and any whose criminality was doubtful, and for whom intercession might seem likely to be of avail. Such persons, provided they came unarmed, had protection for thirty days. Slaves were protected, at first for one day (*Cod. Theod.* lib. ix. tit. 45, leg. 5), afterwards till their masters gave a promise to spare them corporal punishment (*Concil. Epaoense*, A.D. 517, can. xxxix.; *Hard. Concil.* tom. ii. p. 1051); for breaking which promise the masters were liable to suspension from communion (*Concil. Aurelianense* v. A.D. 549, can. xxii.; *Hard. Concil.* tom. ii. p. 1447). Ordinary criminals, as robbers and murderers, were not admitted till later times, when the privilege of asylum became incompatible with the due execution of the laws, and was abrogated with the applause of all lovers of justice and morality. Charles the Great, A.D. 779, forbid any subsistence being supplied to murderers, though by that time they had made good their right not to be directly delivered up to justice.

(5) *Censorship*.—The censorship vested in the clergy was partly a right founded on the fact that the church, as a religious body, took cognisance of immorality within its own body, and exacted of its members the discipline of penance; partly it was a privilege recognized by law, arising out of the privilege of intercession, and indeed forming a branch of it. The council of Arles, A.D. 314, instructed bishops to have a special oversight of such civil magistrates as were Christians, and to cut them off from the church if they acted contrary to her laws (can. vii. *Hard. Concil.* tom. i. p. 264). St. Basil very boldly censured so purely a political act as that of separating Cappadocia into two provinces, A.D. 371, because it threw an increased burden of taxes on the poor (*Ep.* ccclxxxix. *ad Martinianum*, Op. tom. iii. p. 369; Paris, 1638). St. Gregory Nazianzen declared to rulers and governors (*δυνάσται καὶ ἄρχοντες*) that the law of Christ subjected them to his tribunal (*Orat.* xvii. Op. tom. i. p. 271; Colon. 1690); Synesius excommunicated Andronicus, president of Lybia (*Ep.* lviii. Op. p. 201); Orestes' hatred of Cyril of Alexandria was not only personal, but also "because the authority of the bishop took away so much from the power of the king's officers" (Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 13, p. 293).

The penance performed by Theodosius I. at the command of St. Ambrose was a conspicuous exhibition of a censorship exerted by a bishop and submitted to by an emperor (Sozom. *Hist. Eccl.* vii. 25, Op. p. 315; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 17, Op. p. 215; Cantab. 1720). These episcopal acts were performed on the principle that every body spiritual or political has an innerent right of exercising discipline on its own members, even to the point of excluding the refractory from its bosom. But the imperial laws were not slow in giving further rights of censorship to the clergy. We have already seen that it was the duty of the bishop to visit prisoners. The same law (A.D. 409) that imposed upon him this duty gave him also the right of admonishing the judges. Justinian required him, further, to report what he found amiss in the prison, that it might be corrected (*Cod. Justin.* lib. i. tit. 4, legg. 22, 23; *Corp. Jur. Civ.* tom. ii. p. 35). The same emperor likewise empowered bishops to uphold good morals by putting down gaming (*Ibid.* leg. 25); to see that justice was impartially administered (*Ibid.* legg. 21, 31); to resist tyranny on the part of the chief lay authorities, and to look after the administration of public property (*Ibid.* leg. 26).

These rights passed over from the Byzantine empire to the Western nations, and no questions were asked as to whether they were founded in positive law or in prescription. The third council of Toledo, A.D. 589, declared bishops to have, by royal command, the charge of seeing how the judges treated the people (*Conc. Tolet.* iii. can. xviii.; *Hard. Conc.* tom. iii. 482). The fourth council we have already seen requires bishops to admonish judges, and to report to the king such judges as disregarded their admonition (can. xxxii.). The same charge was repeated by the sixth council of Arles, A.D. 813 (can. xvii.). It was in France that the mystical signification of the "two swords" was discovered (by Geoffrey, abbot of Vendôme, A.D. 1095), and in accordance with the principle involved in that interpretation, ecclesiastical authority was freely exerted over sovereigns. Louis le Debonnaire, Lothaire, and Charles the Bald, three Carolingian princes, were deposed by councils of the Gallican church, while king Robert, Philip I., and Philip Augustus, like Henry IV., Henry V., and Frederick II. of Germany, suffered Papal excommunication. But it was in France too that the secular authority once more revindicated its right in the memorable struggle between Philippe le Bel and Boniface VIII. at the end of the 13th century. A quarter of a century later we find a conference held before Philippe de Valois (A.D. 1329), in which the whole question of lay and spiritual jurisdiction was argued by Pierre de Cugnières on behalf of the crown, and by the archbishop of Sens and the bishop of Autun in behalf of the church, in which the king's advocate alleged sixty-six excesses of jurisdiction on the part of the ecclesiastical courts. Soon after, the *Appel comme d'abus* or *Appellatio tanquam abusu* was instituted, which admitted appeal from an ecclesiastical court to the highest civil authority whenever it could be pleaded that the ecclesiastical judge had exceeded his powers or encroached upon temporal jurisdiction. At the council of Trent this right was assailed, but through the influence of the ambassadors of

Charles IX. it was maintained, and it continues still in vigour.

II. PECUNIARY. 1. *Immunities allowed.* (1) *Census Caputum or Poll Tax.*—The clergy, their wives, children, and servants were exempted by Constantius from paying the poll-tax, which was levied on all citizens between the ages of 14 and 65, except such as were granted immunity (*Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 2, legg. 10, 14*). This was a favour shared by the clergy with the members of other liberal professions. Valentinian exempts the higher class of painters (*Picturas professores, si modo ingenui sunt*) from the incidence of the tax (*Cod. Theod. lib. xiii. tit. 4, leg. 4*). This immunity is alluded to and pleaded by Gregory Nazianzen (*Ep. clix. ad Amphilochem*, Op. tom. i. p. 873) and by St. Basil (*Ep. cclxxix. ad Modestum*, Op. tom. iii. p. 272).

(2) *Equorum canonicorum adacratio or Soldiers' horses tax; Aurum tirnicum or Recruit tax.*—The clergy had to pay their property tax (*census agrorum*) and all burdens on land like other owners and occupiers, but they appear to have been exempted from any local taxation that might be imposed for the supply of horses for the army, or as a substitute for recruits. High-priests of the old pagan religions seem to have shared this immunity (*Cod. Theod. lib. vii. tit. 13, leg. 22; cum Gothofredi comment.*).

(3) *Trading-tax called Chrysargyrum* from being paid in gold and silver, and *Lustralis collatio* because collected at the end of each *lustrum*. The inferior clergy were permitted to trade without paying this tax, provided their operations were confined within moderate bounds (*Cod. Theod. lib. xiii. tit. 1, legg. 1, 11; lib. xvi. tit. 2, legg. 8, 10, 16, 36*). This immunity was abused, and clerics were forbidden to trade by Valentinian (*Cod. Theod. lib. xiii. tit. 1, leg. 16; Valentin. Novell. 12 ad calc. Cod. Theod.*). The tax was abolished by Anastasius (Eragrius, *Hist. Eccl. iii. 39; Op. p. 371; Cantab. 1720*).

(4) *Metatum or Entertainment-money.*—The clergy were not compelled to receive the emperor, the judges, or soldiers on their circuits or travels. This immunity their houses shared with those of senators, Jewish synagogues, and places of worship (*Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 8*).

(5) *Superindicta or Extraordinary taxes.*—The clergy were exempted from these by Constantius (*Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 8*), by Honorius and Theodosius Junior (*ibid. leg. 40*), and by Justinian (*Justin. Novell. cxxxi. c. 5*).

(6) *Ad instructiones reparationesque itinerum et pontium or Highway rate.*—By a law of Honorius and Theodosius Junior, A.D. 412, church lands were exempted from paying the road-tax; but this exemption was withdrawn A.D. 423 by Theodosius Junior and by Valentinian III., and it was not regranted.

(7) *Cursus publicus, angarias, parangarias, translatio, evectio, or Conveyance-burden.*—Constantius exempted the clergy from the burden of having to convey corn and other things for the soldiers and imperial officers (*Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 10*), but in the last year of his reign, A.D. 360, he revoked the concession. The immunity was restored A.D. 382, and confirmed by Honorius A.D. 412 (*Cod. Theod. lib. ii. tit. 16, leg. 15; lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 40*), but again revoked by Theodosius Junior and Valentinian, A.D. 440.

(8) *Descripti or Municipal tax* of a town-county one that was not owner had to pay to the sum previously if the property enacted by Justin demanded (*Cod. Novell. cxxxi. c. 2*).

2. *Pecuniary law of Constantine.* (4) it was equated to the between real and confirmed by Justin (leg. 13). Monasteries were administered for the welfare.

(2) *Inheritance* property of confessors and without necessaries. (*Vit. Const. 1659*). Theodosius tended the provision not only of monasteries, but also of the clergy (tit. 3, leg. 1; tit. 4, leg. 1).

(3) *Forfeiture* property of clerical or monastic the church or been connected.

(4) *Confiscation* Gratian some of to the heathen (10, leg. 20) and (*ibid.* tit. 5, leg. of the church).

(5) *Imperial* were bestowed of the clergy. African Receive (*επισκοπικός* of Carthage, for Africa Mauritania to draw for p. 722, ed. B. oecumenical council bore the title).

(6) *State allocation* requiring the payment of an annual grant revenues of the clergy (i. 11; Sozomen, was discontinued but it was restored Julian's death. Justinian (*Cod.*).

*Tithes* are not did not originate voluntary liberality partly on a belief right (see St. H. iii. p. 1829, ed. in *Psalm. cxlvi. Migne*), partly provision for the of religion in general in the 4th but as a voluntary in *Ephraim. a. f.*

were made compulsory by Charles the Great, A.D. 778 (see Selden, *History of Tithes*. Works, vol. iii. pt. 2, p. 1146).

III. OFFICIAL AND SOCIAL. 1. *Immunities*.—Public offices not bringing with them their own salary and emoluments were looked upon, though honourable in themselves, as burdens, like the office of high-sheriff of a county among ourselves. Constantine, on embracing Christianity, exempted the clergy from the burden of bearing any offices whatsoever (Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* x. 7, vol. ii. p. 724; *Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. 2, legg. 1, 2, 7). This concession applied to all offices, whether personal (*personalia munera*) or praedial, i.e. attached to property, whether honourable (*honores* or *curialia munera*) or mean (*sordida munera*). No change was made by subsequent laws in respect to personal burdens or mean offices, but the experience of Constantine taught him to restrain his first liberality as to the burdens belonging to property. For it was found that immunity from bearing office was counted so great a boon that men of wealth, who had no purpose of undertaking the ministry of the Church, solicited and obtained minor ecclesiastical posts solely with the fraudulent purpose of exempting their estates from the services to which they were liable. Constantine therefore enacted that no one qualified by his estate to bear public offices should be allowed "to fly to the clerical name and ministry, and that any who had done so with a view to declining the public burdens should nevertheless be compelled to bear them" (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xvi. tit. 2, leg. 3). Succeeding emperors modified these laws of Constantine in a manner sometimes more sometimes less favourable to the clergy, the general tendency of the legislation being to exempt the estates of the church from civil burdens, but to preserve the liability of the private property of the clergy—a liability which they had to fulfil either by finding substitutes to perform the necessary duties, or by parting with a portion at least of their lands (*Cod. Theod.* lib. xii. tit. 1, legg. 49, 59, 99, 121, 123, 163; lib. xvi. tit. 2, legg. 19, 21).

*Official and Social Privileges.* (1) *Free election*.—In the midst of the despotism of the empire the clergy and laity maintained their old right of electing, and the clergy their right of being elected, to the office and dignity of bishop. "Those absolute monarchs respected the freedom of ecclesiastical elections; and while they distributed and resumed the honours of the state and army they allowed eighteen hundred perpetual magistrates to receive their important offices from the free suffrages of the people" (Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, c. xx.). By degrees this right has been taken away in almost all parts of the church, partly on the plea that the civil magistrate represents the laity, partly on the allegation that endowments and civil privileges had been granted by the state, sometimes because it was considered that the security of the state required such a precaution, sometimes from apprehension of the evil consequences expected to arise out of the excitement of free elections, sometimes owing to corrupt agreements, termed concordats, made between the bishop of Rome assuming to represent ecclesiastical interests and the king or emperor of a particular country, representing the civil power.

(2) *Authority of the higher over the lower clergy*.—The position of the bishops of the larger sees was made one of great dignity and importance by the subjection of the clergy and ecclesiastics of all classes to their uncontrolled authority; and this was not restrained by any interference on the part of the state. The bishop of Constantinople presided as lord over 60 presbyters, 100 deacons, 40 deaconesses, 90 sub-deacons, 110 readers, 25 chanters, 100 doorkeepers (*Justin. Novell.* ciii.), and a guild of 1100 *copiatæ* or gravediggers. The clergy, under the immediate control of the bishop of Carthage, were upwards of 500. The *parabolani* alone, at Alexandria, amounted to 600. All these were allowed by the law as well as by custom to form in each central city a society which recognized the bishop as its head with a devotion which was not equalled by the retainers of any civil officer. Beyond this immediate circle of adherents a less defined authority was vested in the metropolitan, extending over all his suffragan bishops.

(3) *Rights of meeting and speech*.—Twice every year each metropolitan was commanded by the canons, and permitted by the laws, to call together the synod of his province: occasionally the emperor assembled the synod of the empire. At these meetings, as well as in the pulpit, free speech was allowed by the laws, the doctrine and discipline of the church were regulated, ecclesiastical sympathies were strengthened, and the power of the clergy, by being concentrated, was increased.

(4) *Tokens of respect*.—It was the custom for the laity, not excluding the emperor, to bow the head to the bishop and to kiss his hand (see instances given in Valesius' note on Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 6, p. 153, Cantab. 1720; and Savaro's note on Sidonius Apollinaris, viii. 11, p. 532, Paris, 1609). It was usual to address the bishop by the title of God-beloved or Most-holy (*θεοφιλέστατος, ἀγιώτατος*), and by still stronger terms of honour, as "Holy Lord and Most Blessed Pope"—words commonly used by St. Jerome in writing to St. Augustine. "*Per coronam*" was a common form of beseeching a bishop (see St. Aug. *Ep.* xxxiii. al. 157, tom. ii. p. 131, ed. Migne; Sidon. Apollinar. cum comment. Savan. vii. 8, p. 440). Its meaning is doubtful, but it is probably equivalent to the phrase "your honour" (see Bingham, *Antiquities*, ii. 9, 4). Occasionally Hosannahs were sung before bishops and others eminent for sanctity, but this practice is condemned by St. Jerome as savouring of profanity and presumption (St. Hieron. in *Matt.* xxi. 15; *Op.* tom. iv. p. 98). The bishop's seat in his cathedral was called his throne.

There is no doubt that the position of the chief bishops was one of great dignity, authority, wealth, and power. Gibbon calculates that the average income of a bishop amounted to 600*l.* a-year (chap. xx.). This does not give an accurate idea of the *status* held by them, as the value of money is constantly changing, and averages are always deceptive. We may regard the bishops of the chief cities of the empire as maintaining a state superior to that of the imperial officers and lay nobles, while the bishops of lesser sees were comparatively poor and obscure men, though enjoying a spiritual equality with their more prominent brethren. The simple presbyter's position was a humble one, at a time when



Bishops were comparatively more numerous than now and parochial endowments did not exist: the deacon was regarded as little else than one of the bishop's attendants.

We may note in conclusion how little remains of all the privileges and the immunities granted to the clergy by the fervour of the first faith of a converted world. Their judicial privileges and immunities exist no longer, except so far as the coercive power of the bishop's court be regarded as a shadow of them, though once they were considered important enough to lead an archbishop Becket to enter upon a life-and-death struggle with a Henry II. for their maintenance. Their pecuniary privileges and immunities exist no longer, for the grant made in some countries to the clergy from the national exchequer is rather a substitute for estates confiscated than a free gift of love. Their official privileges and immunities exist no longer, unless the permission conceded to bishops to take part in national legislation, and the exemption of the clergy from having to serve in the army or on juries, be regarded as the equivalents of the honours and immunities bestowed by the Caesars with so ungrudging a hand. The apparent tendency of modern legislation, still affected by a reaction from mediaeval assumptions, is to approve not only of the civil power resuming the privileges that it had bestowed, but of its transferring to itself those powers of self-government in respect to doctrine and discipline, which were not granted to the church as a favour, but were confirmed to her by Constantine and his successors as hers by prescription and inherent right.

*Codex Theodosianus*, cum comment. Gothofredi, Lugd. 1665. *Codex Justinianus*, apud *Corpus Juris Civilis*; ed. Beck. Lipsiae, 1829. Thomassinus, *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina*; Lugd. 1706. Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, books ii. v. viii.; Lond. 1726. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. xx.; Neander, *History of the Church*, Second Period, Second Section; Third Period, Second Section. Gieseler, *Text-Book of Ecclesiastical History*, Second Period; First and Second Sections. [F. M.]

IMPLUVIUM seems to be sometimes used to designate the ATRIUM, or court outside the door of a church, in which there was generally a basin or some vessel for performing ablutions [FOUNTAIN; HOLY WATER] (Bingham's *Antiq.* VIII. iii. 5). [C.]

IMPOSITION OF HANDS (*Manus impositio*, χειρῶν ἐπιθεσις, χειροθεσία, χειροτονία). [*Χειροτονία* originally signified election, *per suffragia manuum extensione data*. An election by the people always in the early church preceded consecration, so that it is not surprising that *χειροτονία* soon came to signify the whole process of making a bishop, of which it properly denoted only the first stage (Suicer, *Thesaurus*, s. v.)].

The origin of this rite is to be looked for in patriarchal times, when it seems to have been a form simply of solemn benediction. Thus Jacob, when blessing Ephraim and Manasseh on his death-bed, laid his hands upon them (Gen. xlviii. 14). The high priest employed practically the same gesture as a part of the public ritual (Lev. ix. 22, 23). So the Lord Himself blessed children (Mark x. 16).

It became also a form of setting apart or designation to important offices, as well secular as religious, e. g., in the case of Joshua (Num. xxvii. 18-23; Deut. xxxiv. 9). And in connection with the consecration of priests (Lev. viii. 22). Jewish *ḥabbin* were set apart by imposition of hands until comparatively modern times. We pass over the use of this ceremony in the Levitical sacrifices, and also in oaths, as having no Christian equivalent. Though this latter somewhat resembles the custom of swearing with the hand laid upon relics, and upon the volume of the gospels even to modern times.

In the New Testament, we find the laying on of hands used by our Lord both in blessing and in healing; and again He promises to His disciples that they too should lay hands on the sick and they should recover. The apostles laid their hands as the outward sign of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, both on ordinary Christians after baptism (Acts viii. 17; xix. 6), and on those set apart for a special office (Acts xiii. 3; and probably 1 Tim. iv. 14; and 2 Tim. i. 6); at the time when the Epistle to the Hebrews was written, the doctrine of the "laying on of hands" was one of the elements of Christian teaching (Heb. vi. 1). [DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, vol. iii. p. xcv.]

The imposition of hands is used in the following ceremonies:—

1. *In Ordinations to the higher Orders.* The 4th council of Carthage had canons directing imposition of hands in the ordination of a bishop, priest, or deacon (cann. 2, 3, 4). But another form was provided for the subdeacon, "*quia manus impositionem non accipit*." Similarly for the other minor orders (cc. 5-10). See also *Constit. Apost.* lib. viii. c. 16. These were ἀχειροτόνητος ὑπερεσία, an inferior ministry, and the holders *insacрати ministri*. They were not allowed to enter the *diaconicon*, nor handle the *casa Dominica* or sacred vessels (*Conc. Aqth.* c. 66; *Basil. Ep. Canon.* c. 51; Bingham, iii. 1). "*Manus impositio docet, eos qui sacris ordinibus mancipantur, sacras omnes actiones, quasi sub Deo efficere, utpote quem habeant operationum suarum in omnibus ducem ac rectorem*" (Pseudo-Dionysius, *De Eccles. Hierarch.* c. 5, par. 3). "*Hæc manuum impositione significatur illapsus Spiritus Sancti, quem ordinans precatur dari ordinando: ejusque regimen, directio et protectio, ut scilicet Spiritus Sanctus ordinandum quasi manu sua regat et dirigat*" (Amalarius *de Eccles. Offic.* lib. i. c. 12).

Deaconesses also received the *impositio manuum*; and their ordination is expressly called both *χειροτονία* and *χειροθεσία* in the 15th canon of Chalcedon. [ORDINATION.] [S. J. E.]

2. *In the restitution of holy orders*, as in the original conferring, the imposition of the hands of the archbishop formed an essential portion of the rite (Martene, *Rit. Ant.* III. ii.).

3. *In baptism* the laying-on of hands, with unction, followed in the most ancient times immediately upon the washing of water [BAPTISM, § 13, p. 157]; nor was the custom obsolete in the West in the 13th century (Martene, *R. A. I.* ii. 1 § 3), while in the East it is practised still. This is however to be understood, in the West at least, to refer to baptisms at which the bishop himself was present, as was generally the case when baptism took place—except in cases of extremity—only a

certain solemn seasons. When baptism was frequently celebrated in the absence of a bishop, while the laying-on of hands and chrismation on the forehead was a privilege of the episcopal order (*R. A. I. II. 3, § 2*), the custom arose of the baptized being presented to the bishop at some convenient season separate from that of baptism. [CONFIRMATION.] The Arabic canons, called Nicene (c. 55), desire the chorepiscopus in his circuits to cause the boys and girls to be brought to him, that he may sign them with the cross, pray over them, lay his hands upon them, and bless them. Bede tells us that Cuthbert used to journey through his diocese, laying his hands upon those who had been baptized, that they might receive the Holy Ghost (*Vita Cuthberti*, c. 29, in Migne's *Patrol. acir.* 759 D). Ancient authorities, however, give at least as great prominence to the chrismation on the forehead which was reserved for the bishop, as to the laying-on of hands. See on the whole subject Martene, *De R. A. I. lib. i. c. ii.*; Binterlin, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 208 ff.

4. *In the reception of a heretic into the church*, whose baptism was recognised as valid, imposition of hands was the form of conferring those gifts of the Holy Spirit which he could not have received in a heretical community [CONFIRMATION, p. 425; HENRY, p. 768].

5. *In benedictions* the laying-on of hands is constantly used; as, in the benediction of an abbot (*R. A. II. i. 3*); of a virgin dedicated to a religious life (*ib. II. iv. 16*); of a king (*ib. II. x.*), as when St. Columba, who was an abbot and not a bishop, laid his hands on the head of Aidan and consecrated him as king (Cuminus Albus, *Vita S. Columbae* c. 5, in *Acta SS. Bened.* sec. 1).

6. *In the visitation of the sick* the priest and the faithful who are with him are directed to lay hands on the sick (Martene, *R. A. I. vii. 4*, Ordd. 4, 5, 14, etc.) with the prayer that the Lord would vouchsafe to visit and relieve His servant.

7. *In absolution* the laying-on of hands accompanied the prayer for the remission of the sins of the penitent (Martene, *R. A. I. vi. 3*, Ordd. 3, 9, etc.) [C.]

**IMPOTENT MAN, CURE OF.** Guénehaut mentions (s. v. "Boiteux," p. 164) a fine bas-relief of the cure of the lame man at the gate of the Temple, with apparent reference to Acts iii. 2, as published in *Monumenta crypturæ latine*, Angelus de Gabriels, fol. pl. lxxix. no. 3. Notice of the universally-treated subject of the healing of the paralytic man will be found under the heading PARALYTIC. [R. St. J. T.]

**IMPRISONMENT OF THE CLERGY.** Seclusion of criminal clerics, generally in a monastery, appears to have been resorted to as a disciplinary measure as early as the 6th century. Justinian (*Nordhus*, cxliii. c. 20) orders "that if any presbyter or deacon were convicted of giving false evidence in a civil case, he should be suspended from his function and confined to a monastery for three years." Laymen were scourged for this crime. So the 2nd council at Seville (can. 3), in the case of vagrant clergy: "Desertorem tamen clericum, singulo honoris atque ordinationis sue exitum, aliquo tempore monasterio relegari convenit:

aliquo postea in ministerio ecclesiastico ordinis revocari." A similar canon directing deposition and relegation to a monastery to be inflicted upon clerics guilty of certain crimes, passed at the council of Agde (c. 1). A distinction was drawn by the first council of Mâcon between the inferior clergy (junior) and the higher orders (honorary). The former were to receive forty stripes, save one, whilst the latter were imprisoned thirty days for the same offence (*Conc. Mâcon. I. can. 6*). Pope Gregory the Great seems to have laid down (*Epp. vii. 50*) an intelligible principle: that such crimes as were by the Mosiac law punished with death, when committed by clerics, incurred the penalty of deposition without hope of restoration (*desperationem sacrarum dignitatum*). To these he added some others, fornication, adultery, perjury, and such like: all these incurred irregularity. Other offences were expiated by penitential in a monastery for a longer or shorter time (Thomasius, *Vet. et Novæ Eccl. Disc.* tom. ii. lib. i. c. 59). Individuals sometimes segregated themselves of their own accord to expiate some fault. The same Gregory praises (*Epp. vii. 12*) Saturninus, bishop of Jadera (= Zara), in Dalmatia, for so doing in order to atone for communicating with the excommunicated archbishop of Salona (*ib. c. 59*). Joannes Defensor, whom Gregory had sent into Spain to execute a sentence of six months' relegation to a monastery upon a certain bishop who had driven an unoffending neighbour from his see, pronounced the sentence far too lenient. The same punishment was inflicted upon certain bishops who had condemned an innocent person. When Gregory imprisoned clerics he was in the habit of making an annual payment for their maintenance to the monastery that received them (Thomasius, s. a. III. lib. ii. c. 29), but whether derived from the offender's benefice, or the property of the pope himself, does not appear. The tendency was perhaps to bear more lightly on crimes of the kind mentioned above; but incontinence was always heavily punished. Hincmar, and after him Flodoard, tell the story of Gesebald, bishop of Laudunum (Laon), who for a crime of this kind was condemned to seven years' penitence, and even put into fetters by his metropolitan, Remigius, bishop of Rheims (Hincmar, *Vita S. Remigii*). And for capital crimes the incarceration was for life, and included a sentence of perpetual lay-communication (*Conc. Episc. can. 22*).

But during the reign of Charlemagne a somewhat milder rule prevailed. Hincmar, and also Rabanus, archbishop of Mentz, were inclined to distinguish between secret crimes, and those which caused open scandal, and to treat the former more leniently upon confession and repentance. Probably the general declension of morals at that period forced them to make some abatement from the rigid rules of a purer age. Accordingly, canonical punishments were generally lightened from this time (Thomasius, s. a. tom. ii. lib. i. c. 60; Bingham, bk. xvii. c. 4).

The larger churches had sometimes prisons in their precincts as well as monasteries [DECANIA]. [S. J. K.]

**IMPROPRIATION** is the assignment of ecclesiastical tithes to a layman, and is to be distinguished from *appropriation*, which is the

assignment of them to a college or other corporation, some of whose members are in orders. The practice seems to have sprung up only about the beginning of the 8th century.

Very soon after the payment of TITHES (see the article) became general, the alienation of them by the laity began. Thus a council at Ingelheim (A.D. 948) in its 8th canon protests against this new form of robbery: "Ut oblationes fidelium, quatenus altari deferantur, nihil omnino ad laicalem potestatem, dicente Scriptura, 'Qui altari serviunt, de altario participantur.'" (So Thomassin, *Vet. et Nova Eccl. Discip.* III. lib. i. c. 7, n. 2), who interprets this canon as referring to tithes. Louis IV. of France, and the emperor Otho, were present at this council. To the same effect a council of Metz in its 2nd canon, quoting Mal. iii. 8-10. It was not uncommon for the lay lords to seize the opportunity of the vacancy of a bishopric or a parish, to make these depredations (Vid. Thomassin, tom. iii. lib. ii. c. 53, for instances of this). And we find even that the monks of St. Denis had got possession of some tithes (it does not appear how) and wanted to sell them. This seems to be a distinct case of appropriation, and we learn the facts from a letter to them of Hincmar of Rheims, who protests against their selling what they ought to restore to the parish priest.

But any instances we find in these times are exceptional, and apparently the result of violent and illegal seizure by laymen of ecclesiastical dues. As Thomassin observes: "Necdum tunc in mentem quidquam venisse de decimis in feodatie. Involaverant decimas Laici, necdum pacifice possidebant, necdum obducere potuerant huic rapinae vel colorem legitimae possessionis. Quia identidem commonebantur profani deprædatores, ut ecclesiae restituerent, quae jure retinere non possent" (tom. iii. lib. i. c. 7).

It is in the next and succeeding ages that we must look for impropriation as a legally recognised condition of ecclesiastical property.

[S. J. E.]

#### IN PACE. [INSCRIPTIONS, p. 854 ff.]

**INCENSE.** There is no trace of the use of incense in Christian worship during the first four centuries. On the contrary, we meet with many statements in the writings of the early fathers which cannot be reconciled with the existence of such a custom. Thus Athenagoras, A.D. 177:—"The Creator and Father of the universe does not require blood nor *smoke*, nor the sweet smell of flowers and incense" (*Legatio*, § 13). Tertullian, A.D. 198, comparing certain Christian customs with heathen, says, "It is true, we buy no frankincense; if the Arabians complain of this, the Sabæans will testify that more of their merchandise, and that more costly, is lavished on the burials of Christians, than in burning incense to the gods" (*Apol.* c. xlii.). "I offer Him a rich sacrifice . . . not one pennyworth of the grains of frankincense," &c. (*ib.* c. xxx.). Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 192, contrasting the reasonable service of Christians with that of the heathen says, that "the truly holy altar is the just soul, and the perfume from it holy prayer" (*Strom.* lib. vii. c. vi. § 32). "If then they should say that the great High Priest, the Lord, offers to God the incense ( *θυμίαμα* ) of sweet

smell, let them this sacrifice as them understand acceptable gift (*Pasdag.* lib. ii.

says of the use then, "It is all of years impose ledge of it flow in the olden tin after the matte that it is vainly (*Ado. Gentis*, li

"It follows the fice of God . . either victims, desired by God, not that which that which is b *Fastid. Epist.* c. bation a sayic "frankincense be offered at the lib. vi. § 25). not into Arabia we ransack the requires of us t. *Pa.* xlix. § 21) from passages, bearing on the makes the least incense, or any infer that such precludes the st

It is probable early employed a supposed divin sant smells; an ritual use of it, bly the 5th cent seen, denies by it

"If the smell something of A the same rite, r appliance, with (*De Cor. Mil.* c. diction of incen magne and late that which Ter cognized:—"M the extinction o it to the odour *Eccl. Ant. Rit.* There is no me liturgy of St. C present the offi deed in the *Apoc.* it is incorporat about 520, but first who testi monial:—"The made an end of begins the censu circuit of the ss iii. sect. 2; com is said by Evagri of Persia to a (*Hist. Eccl.* lib *Ordo Romanus*, been compiled a to the 7th cen masses a sub

shall go before the bishop (of Rome) as he leaves the *secretarium* for the choir, and two with censers before the deacon gospeller as he proceeds with the gospel to the ambo (§§ 7, 11, in *Musae. Ital.* tom. ii.). These rules are also given in the next revision of the Ordo, which may be a century later (ib. §§ 4, 8). This latter document says also, "After the gospel has been read . . . the thuribles are carried about the altar, and afterwards taken to the nostrils of persons (*hominum*), and the smoke is drawn up towards the face by the hand" (§ 9). This probably originated in its earlier natural use as a means of sweetening and (as they thought) purifying the air; but we see in it the probable origin of the strictly ritual censuring of persons in the West. In the same Ordo, which was certainly in use before Amalarius wrote (about 827), is a direction that after the oblates and the chalice have been set on the altar, with a view to their consecration, "the incense be put on the altar" (§ 9). Here we have the probable germ of the later "censing of the gifts." It is probable, however, that such ritual practices were for some time confined to Rome. We do not observe any reference to the use of incense in the Gallican Liturgies which were in use down to the time of Charlemagne, nor is it mentioned by Germanus of Paris, A.D. 555, in his explanation of liturgical rites (Martene, *u. s. ord.* 1), nor by Isidore of Seville, A.D. 610, in his book on the offices of the church. We may also infer its rarity within our period, and the little importance attached to it throughout the 9th century, from the fact that it is not mentioned by Florus of Lyons, Rabanus of Mentz, or Walafrid of Reichenau, in works largely devoted to questions of ritual.

The so-called *Missa Illyrici* (Martene, *u. s. ord.* 4) preserves the Scriptural symbolism by directing the priest to say, when the incense is burnt, "Let my prayer be set forth in Thy sight as the incense" (Ps. cxli. 2). But in the same and later ordines [ORDO] it represents divine influence on the soul, according to the following explanation of Amalarius:—"The thurible denotes the body of Christ in which is fire, to wit, the Holy Spirit, from whom proceeds a good odour, which every one of the elect wishes to snatch towards himself. The same odour is a token that virtue (*bonam operationem*) goes forth out of Christ, which he who wishes to live passes into his own heart" (*De Eccles. offic.* lib. iii. c. 18). The reader will observe the allusion to the mode of inhaling the smoke above described.

This notice would be imperfect without a reference to certain passages from early writers, which have led some to suppose that notwithstanding the authorities above cited, the ritual use of incense was known in the Christian church from the beginning. As the earliest testimony we often see alleged the third apostolical canon, which forbids that "beside honey and milk, and new ears of corn and bunches of grapes in their season [see FRUITS, OFFERING OF], anything else shall be offered on the altar, at the time of the holy oblation, than oil for the lamp and incense" (Bever. *Pandect.* tom. i. p. 2). The Arabic paraphrase has more generally, "in the time of the sacraments and prayers" (ib. tom. ii.; *Annot.* p. 16). It will be seen that this canon does not

mention the ritual use of incense, nor can it be shown that the incense mentioned was designed for such use. It was without doubt often used as a perfume, and in the caves and catacombs in which the first Christians often worshipped, and in which their dead were frequently buried, would sometimes be thought almost as necessary as the lamp-oil, on behalf of which a similar exception was made. We must add too that the whole of the clause above cited looks like a late addition to the very simple code which is assigned, with probability, to the middle of the 3rd century, though the first mention of it occurs in 394 (Tillemont, *Mem. Eccl.* tom. ii. p. 76). Pseudo-Hippolytus, alleged as the bishop of Portus, 220, but in reality some centuries later:—"The churches lament, with a great lamentation, because neither the oblation nor the (rite of) incense is celebrated" (*De Consumm. Mundi*, c. 34). Here we have nothing more than imagery borrowed from well known rites of the Mosaic law. The language was probably suggested by that of the following passage in St. Basil, 370, which has been brought forward with the same object:—"The houses of prayer were cast down by unholy hands, the altars were overthrown, and there was no oblation nor incense, no place of sacrifice, but fearful sorrow, as a cloud, was over all" (*In Gordium Mart.* Hom. xix.). St. Basil here is merely in part citing and partly paraphrasing, with reference to the church under persecution, what Azarias in the Song of the Three Children says of the state of Jerusalem during the captivity (*Sept. Vers.* v. 14). St. Ambrose says, with reference to the appearance of the angel to Zacharias "on the right side of the altar of incense" (St. Luke i. 11), "Would that an angel might stand by us also as we burn (or rather *heap*, *adolentibus*) the altars" (*Expos. Evang. S. Luc.* lib. i. § 28). Incense is not mentioned here, and "adolere" does not necessarily imply the use of fire, so that no allusion to incense may have been intended. It is probable, however, that the thought of incense was suggested to St. Ambrose by the mention of "the altar of incense." We therefore further point out that if he was thinking of material incense, as used in the Christian church, it must in his time have been burnt on altars, which no one asserts; and, moreover, that St. Ambrose explains himself by a paraphrase of his own words, "as we heap the altars, as we bring the sacrifice." The incense in his mind was "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." The testament of St. Ephrem the Syrian, a spurious document of uncertain date, is also quoted with the same object:—"I exhort you not to bury me with sweet spices . . . but to give the fumigation of sweet-smelling smoke in the house of God . . . Burn your incense in the house of the Lord to His praise and honour" (*Test. S. Ephr.* in *Surii Vitae Sanctorum*, Feb. 1). The actual use of incense during the funeral ceremony appears to be intended here; but the evidence of a late forgery is worth nothing. We may add that there was an obvious natural reason, such as the first Christians would have recognized with Tertullian, for burning incense at a funeral; and it is probable that the custom of using it then contributed not a little to the introduction of the practice as a purely religious rite. [W. E. S.]



**INCEST** (*Incestus*) is defined by the Decree of Gratian (causa 36, qu. 1, c. 2, § 4) thus: "Incestus est consanguineorum vel affinium abusus," where we are of course to understand affinity or consanguinity such as would be an impediment to matrimony (Van Espen, *Jus Eccles.* P. iii. tit. iv. cc. 48, 49).

Christian morality extended the range of "prohibited degrees" within which it was unlawful to contract matrimony, and consequently the conception of incest, much beyond that of the heathen world. The apologists, as Minucius Felix (*Octav.* c. 31) and Origen (c. *Celsus*, V. p. 248, Spencer) speak with horror of the licence given to Persians and Egyptians of marrying persons near in blood; and Augustine (*De Civitate*, xv. 16) insists upon the natural loathing which men feel at connexions of this kind. Gothofred (on the *Theodosian Code*, lib. iii. tit. 12) gives many instances of marriages among the Romans—as of uncle with niece—which the feeling of Christendom universally condemns. [AFFINITY; PROHIBITED DEGREES.]

Basil the Great (*ad Amphilochem*, c. 67) holds incest with a sister to be a crime of the same degree as murder. He who commits incest with a half-sister, whether by the father's or the mother's side, during the time that he continues in his sin, is to be absolutely excluded from the church; after he is brought to a sense of his sin, he is for three years to stand among the "Flentes" at the door of the church, begging those who enter to pray for him; then he is to pass another seven years among the "Audientes," as still unworthy to pray with the rest; then, if he show true contrition, and on his earnest entreaty, he may be admitted for three years among the "Substrati;" then, if he bring forth fruits meet for repentance, in the tenth year he may be admitted to the prayers of the faithful, but not to offer with them; then, after continuing two years in this state, he may at last be admitted to holy communion (c. 75). The same punishment is prescribed for one who commits incest with a daughter-in-law (c. 76). He who marries two sisters, though not at the same time, is subject to the penalties of adultery, i.e. two years among the Flentes, two among the Audientes, two among the Substrati, and one among the Consistentes, before he can be admitted to communion. And generally, he who marries within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity (*τῆς ἀπειρημένης συγγενείας*) is liable to the penalties of adultery (c. 68). The council of Elvira (*Conc. Elib.* c. 61), A.D. 305, allotted to a marriage with a deceased wife's sister the penalty of fifteen years' excommunication; that of Neo-Caesarea (c. 2), A.D. 314, decreed the excommunication of a woman who married two brothers for the whole of her life, except that in peril of death she might be admitted to communion, on promising to renounce the connexion if she recovered (Bingham, *Antiq.* XVI. xi. 3).

The Penitentials, as might be expected, provide penalties for incest; those, for instance, of Theodore, of Bede, and of Egbert assign to different forms of this sin periods of penance varying from five to fifteen years (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Documents*, iii. 179, 328, 420). [C.]

**INCLINATION.** [GENUFLEXION, p. 725.]

**INCLUSI.** Monks living in detached cells

within the precincts of the monastery ("intra septa") were termed "inclusi." These were monks either of long experience or of delicate health (*Conc. Agath.* A.D. 506, c. 38). They were subject to the control of the abbot, but not to the ordinary rules of the monastery (Martene, *Reg. Comm.* c. 1; Menard, *Concord. Regul.* c. 3, § 6). See HERMITS and HESYCHASTAE.

[L. G. S.]

**INDALECIUS.** [HESYCHIUS (1).]

**INDICTION.** From the middle of the 4th century a new note of time begins to appear in dates; *Indiction*, followed by an ordinal number, from I. to XV., as a character of the year, is appended to its customary designation; e.g., *Coss. M. et N.* (or *Anno ab Incarnatione—*) *Indictione*—. In respect of its origin, "indictio" is a term of the Roman *fiscus*, meaning "quidquid in praestationem indicitur," notice of a tax (on real property, *Cod. Justin.* x. 6, 3), "assessment," *ἐπιτέμνησις*: thence it came to denote the year on which the tax was assessed, beginning 1st September, the epoch of the imperial fiscal year. It seems that in the provinces, after Constantine, if not earlier, the valuation of property was revised upon a census taken at the end of every fifteen years, or three *lustra* (Ideler, *Hdb.* 2. 347 sqq., from Savigny, *über die Steuerverfassung unter den Kaisern*, in the Transactions of the Berlin Royal Academy, 1822, 23). From the strict observance of this fiscal regulation there resulted a marked term of fifteen years, constantly recurrent, the *Circle of Indictions*, ἡ ἐκαταέτηρις τῶν Ἰνδικτιῶν (or Ἰνδικτῶν), which became available for chronological purposes as a "period of revolution" of fifteen years, each beginning 1st September: which (except in the Spanish peninsula) continued to be used as a character of the year irrespectively of all reference to taxation. The Indictions (like the "solar cycle" of Sunday letters, twenty-eight years, and the lunar cycle, nineteen years, of "Golden Numbers," beside which this circle has obtained place in chronology) do not form an *era*: the annexed ordinal number is reckoned from the epoch of the circle then current: it is not expressed how many circles have elapsed since any given point of time. It is certain that September 1st is the original epoch of each indiction (St. Ambrose, *Epist. ad Episc. per Aemil.* 2, 256, *Indictio cum Septembri mense incipit*; and *de Noe et Arca*, c. 17. *A Septembri mense annus videtur incipere, sicut Indictionum praesentium usus ostendit*). From any given date of a known year to which its indiction is added, as e.g., "3 id. August. Symmacho et Boetio Coss. [= 11 Aug., A.D. 522] in fine Indictionis XV." (Reines. *Inscript. Lat.* 978), it results that a circle of indictions began 210 (= 14 × 15) years earlier, i.e., A.D. 312. Now as it is only since Constantine that "Indiction" makes its appearance as a note of time, and as with the defeat and death of Maxentius in the autumn of that year Constantine attained to undisputed empire, the date, A.D. 312, 1 Sept., is accepted as the epoch of the first circle of indictions. Hence the technical rule for finding the indiction of each year. To the ordinal number of the given year A.D. (beginning with 1 January) add 3: divide the amount by 15: the remainder denotes the indiction: if there be no remainder,

the year is Indict. 15. Thus, in respect of the above-cited date, A.D. 522 (August 11th), the division of 525 by 15 gives no remainder; therefore Jan. 1st to Aug. 31st of that year lie in Indiction 15, beginning at 1 Sept. of A.D. 521. The author of the Paschal Chronicle (probably a man of Antioch) makes the circle of Indictions begin much earlier, viz. at the epoch of the Antiochene era, 1 Gorpiaeus = 1 Sept. U.C. 705 = B.C. 49; at which year he notes: "Here begins the first year of the 15-year circle of indictions, with the first year of C. Julius Caesar:" and thenceforward he adds to each year its indiction. Twenty-four complete circles ( $24 \times 15 = 360$ ) end therefore at 1 Sept. A.D. 312: and at Ol. 273, 1, *Coss. Constantino III., Licinio III.,* U.C. 1066, beginning 1 January, A.D. 313, he notes: *Ἰνδικτιώνων Κωνσταντινιανῶν ἐνταῦθα ἀρχή*—to be understood as meaning that the first eight months of that consulship belonged to that first year. (So, throughout, the Indiction in Chron. Pasch. is attached, not to the year in which it began, but to the following year, beginning 1 January, which contains eight months of it. Comp. Clinton, *F. R. Append.* 1 and 2.) Although there is no trace elsewhere of this earlier system of indictions, it does not follow, in Ideler's judgment (2, 351), that the statement of the Paschal Chronicle is entirely without foundation. A fiscal regulation, proceeding by periods of fifteen years may, he thinks, have obtained in Syria and other Eastern provinces: and the assumption would serve to explain the circumstance, else unaccounted for, that in the reckoning of Antioch, the year (of the era of the Seleucidae) begins 1 September, not at the old 1 October. Some later writers, misled by the merely technical rule above given, have assumed that the Indictions actually had their beginning three years before the Nativity, i.e. before our A.D. 1, with the "decree of Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed" (St. Luke iii. 1). So says Duranti—a writer of the 13th century (*Speculum Juris.* t. i. pt. 1, p. 281): "Caesar Aug. decreum proposuit, ut describeretur universus orbis; i.e., ut quilibet aestimaret bona sua, describens orbem sub tributo sibi singulis quindecim annis reddendo, quod quidem tempus divisit per tria lustra," &c. And the rule concerning three years to be added to the year-date (A.D.) rests, he adds, on the fact, "quia tot praecesserant de indictione quando Christus natus fuit, vel quia praemisum edictum Caesaris tribus annis praecipit Nativitatem Christi."

It is only in the latter half of the 4th century that the indictions first appear in dates. St. Athanasius, in a fragment of his work *de Synodis*, opp. t. i. pt. 2, p. 737, gives "Indiction XIV." with the date (= A.D. 341) of the council of Antioch; but that work was written towards the close of his life (ob. 371), at which time this method of dating was in common use. The earliest clear instance is the date of a decree of Constantius (*Cod. Theod.* xii. 12, 2), of the year 356, or rather (for the text needs correction) 357. From the earliest years of that century the yearly appointment of consuls became irregular, and from time to time the designation of the year, instead of *Coss. M. et N.*, became *post consulatum M. et N.* There was even an uncertainty in the numbering of a set of post-consulate years: for instance, some would de-

signate the first vacant year *anno post consulatum M. N. i.*; others, after the old fashion of numbering, *anno ii.* (Pagi, *Dissert. Hypat.* p. 319; Ideler, 2, 345 note). A further source of uncertainty was the difference of epochs of the year. But the fifteen-years' circle of indictions once established throughout the empire provided a correction for all such uncertainty, so long as it continued to be understood, that the year of indiction began on the 1st of September (preceding the 1st of January of the year found by the rule above given). And, in fact, this was the established practice during the greater part of the period with which we are concerned in this work. In the *Codex Theodosianus*, indeed, its learned annotator, Gothofred, finds indications of four distinct reckonings of the indictions, viz. the *Italica*, A.D. 312; *Orientalis*, 313; and two of Africa, 314 and 315. As regards the supposed *Orientalis*, Cardinal Norris (*De Anno et Epochis Syro-Maced.* Dissertat. IV. c. iv.: *Opp.* t. ii. col. 422 sqq.) has shown that its epoch is the 1st September, A.D. 312. Concerning the two supposed different African reckonings, see Ideler (*Hdb.* 2, 354 sqq.; *Lehrb.* p. 409). Apart from these inferences from the Theodosian Codex, we find no trace, except here and there in corrupt texts and negligent dates, of a different reckoning: Dionysius Exiguus knows no other than that which is expressed by the usual rule (*Argumenta paschalia*, li.). To trace the history of the use of the indictions through the different provinces of the Roman empire would, as Ideler remarks, require extensive disquisition. In respect of France, Mabillon has shown (*de re diplomat.* ii. 24, 26) that this note of time does not appear in public acts before Charlemagne, but in acts of councils, and in writers, it is found earlier. But far down into the middle ages its use became so general that it is rarely absent from dates attached to civil or ecclesiastical documents in Italy, France, Germany (in the Pyrenean peninsula it seems never to have been established). Duranti, writing in the 13th century, testifies (u. s.): "Tantae fuit auctoritatis indictio, ut nullus sine ea fieret contractus, nec privilegium, nec testamentum, nec alia scriptura sollemnis: et etiam hodie eandem obtinet auctoritatem."

With the desuetude of the Imperial fiscal regulation, with which the indictions originated, the original epoch, 1st September, ceased to be significant—except in the Eastern empire, where that day was established as the first day of the year: wherever in the *Corpus Historiae Byzantinae* the indictions occur, they are those of 1st September, 312. Even in the West, beyond the limits of our period, they are still occasionally met with: thus, a writing of Gregory VII., A.D. 1073, bears the subscription, "Datum Capuae, Kalend. Sept., incipiente Indictione XII." But in process of time the indiction, detached from its original epoch, came to be dated from the new-year's day, as received at the time, December 25th, or January 1st, or March 25th. Distinct from these indictions used by various popes in their bulls, and by other writers, is one which has been called "Caesarean," of which the first notice occurs in Bede, *de temp. ratione*, c. 46: "Incipiunt Indictiones ab viii. Kalend. Octobris, ibidemque terminantur." This, of which there is extant no earlier indication (but which, as

great was the authority of the writer, may have influenced the practice of the Imperial chancelleries), is probably due to an assumption of Bede, that the old epoch of the Byzantine year, September 24th, was accepted by Constantine as the epoch of the indictions established by him. [H. B.]

**INDULGENCE.** (I.) The use of the word *Indulgentia* by ecclesiastical writers is derived from that of the juriconsults, who employ it to designate a remission of punishment or of taxes, especially such a general amnesty as was sometimes proclaimed by an emperor on an extraordinary occasion of rejoicing. Thus the Theodosian Code has a title *De Indulgentiis Criminum* (Van Espen, *Jus Eccles.*, P. II. sec. i. tit. 7). Hence the word passed into ecclesiastical usage in a double sense. First, it designates remission of sins, as in what Reticus, bishop of Autun, according to St. Augustine (c. *Julian*. i. 3), observed of baptism as early as the Roman synod under pope Melchiades, A.D. 313: "It can escape nobody that this is the principal indulgence known to the church, where we lay aside the whole weight of our hereditary guilt, and cancel all our former misdeeds committed in ignorance, and put off the old man with all his innate wickednesses." In this passage, indulgence stands immediately for remission of sins, and that alone. But we are more immediately concerned with it in a second sense, that in which it designates such a lightening of ecclesiastical penalties, in consideration of the state of the offender, as St. Paul practised in the case of the incestuous Corinthian (2 Cor. ii. 6-11). This question of the advisability of such a relaxation first comes prominently before us in the case of those who had "lapsed" or denied Christ to avoid persecution, and for whom martyrs had in many cases interceded. St. Cyprian tells us, in his letter to Antoninus, how it had been discussed and decided by his colleagues in Africa. They held that the church should not be closed irrevocably to such of the lapsed as were desirous of returning to it: nor yet opened indiscriminately till they had undergone their full penance, and had their particular case taken into consideration. "Et ideo placuit . . . examinatis causis singulorum: libellaticos interim admitti, sacrificatis in exitu subveniri: quia exomologesis apud inferos non est, nec ad penitentiam quis a nobis compelli potest, si fructus penitentiae subtrahatur" (*Ep.* lii.). The bishops, he adds, already made distinctions between other crimes, according to their discretion, and therefore might be left to deal with this similarly. No canons for regulating penances of any kind had as yet been passed. It rested accordingly with the bishops to use greater or less indulgence in dispensing them all as they thought fit. It was disputed by Novatian whether they could remit as well as bind: and he maintained that only God could remit. But this was not the doctrine of the church. The fifth of the canons of Ancyra, A.D. 314 (Mansi, ii. 516) gives the bishops power to mitigate (φιλανθρωπεύειν) or to increase the length of an offender's penitence; so the twelfth Nicene canon gives the bishop power to deal more gently with penitents who have shown true repentance (Mansi, ii. 673). The merciless rulings of the Elviran canons 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 12,

13, 17, 19, 63-66, 70-73, and 75, which forbid certain offenders to be readmitted to communion even on their death-beds,\* were neither imitated elsewhere nor maintained in Spain itself (Mansi, *ib.* 5-19). St. Ambrose, speaking for the West, says: "Our Lord must have meant the powers of loosing and binding to be coextensive, or He would not have bestowed both on the same terms" (*De Poen.* i. 2). St. Gregory Nyssa deposes, on behalf of the East, to what had been customary: Τοῖς ἀσθενεστέροις ἐγένετο κατὰ τῶν πατέρων συμπεριφορά, which is the Greek equivalent for "indulgentia" (*Ep. ad Letoi.* c. 4).

Usually there were four stages or degrees through which offenders had to pass before regaining communion: (1) weepers, (2) hearers, (3) kneelers, (4) bystanders; and usually several years had to be spent in each. Now the bishop, according to St. Gregory, might, in proportion to their conversion, "rescind the period of their penance; making it eight, seven, or even five years instead of nine, in each stage, should their repentance exceed in depth what it had to fulfil in length, and compensate, by its increased zeal, for the much longer time required in others to effect their cure" (*ib.* c. 5).

So matters went on till about the end of the 7th century. The office of PENITENTIARY presbyter, abolished by Nectarius, patriarch of Constantinople, three centuries earlier, is not supposed to have produced any change, so far as they were concerned (*Sac.* v. 19 and *Soz.* vii. 16). But they were changed materially when the system of commutations laid down in the Penitential of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, had begun to work: according to which a rigorous fast of days, weeks, or years, might be redeemed by saying a proportionable number of psalms, or by paying a proportionable fine (c. 3-10, in Migne's *Patrol.* xcix. 937 sqq.). Several of the offences stigmatised in the canons of the synod of Berghamstede, A.D. 697, are dismissed with a fine (Mansi, xii. 111 sqq.). The synod of Cloveshoe, A.D. 747, protests in its 26th and 27th canons against the neglect of discipline to which this "new device" and "perilous custom" had led (*ib.* 493-96). But the Penitential of Egbert, archbishop of York, not only re-enacts all the commutations authorised by Theodore (*ib.* 433), but adds to them in a subsequent chapter (*ib.* 456), voluntary exile from home and country being one of the new kind allowed. Similar permission is given in the Penitential of Bede, as it is called (*ib.* 519). After this the extension of indulgences to pilgrimages and holy wars was a pure matter of time; and these, from the ardour inspired by both, threw everything else into the shade. The climax was reached when, to make them more attractive, it was formally declared of the one, "iter illud pro omni penitentia repetitur" (*Concil. Claromont.* c. 2, ap. Mansi, ii. 816), and popularly believed of the other, "pro stipendio erat indulgentia peccatorum proposita" (*ib.* pp. 827 and 890). On this point see Morinus, *De Poenit.* x. 22, 1-6, and Bingham, *Ant.* xviii. 4, for earlier times. Goar (*Euchol.* pp. 68-88)

\* It is to be observed that the reading "nec in fine," or "nec in finem," is changed in some later recensions—as in that of Burchard—into "non nisi in fine," so as to bring it into harmony with the Nicene canon (13) which forbids such total excommunication.—[Ed.]

attempts in vain to detect affinity between papal indulgences and the *συγχωροχάρτια* of the Greek church (comp. Ducange, *Gloss. Gr. s. v.*).

[E. S. Ff.]

(II.) Indulgences, or relaxations of the strict letter of the law, are however by no means confined to penitential cases; such relaxations are found in relation to almost all points of conduct. The laws of God, whether known by revelation or by natural light (Augustine, *Quaest. 67 in Exod.*), are of course always binding; but under positive human enactments cases may and do occur, in which the rigid enforcement of a law may be a greater evil to the society concerned than the suspension of its operation. Hence, in all states and societies, either the law-giving power or some other has exercised the right of suspending the operation of a law upon occasion. A familiar instance of such a dispensing power is the commutation by the sovereign of this country of sentences passed by the judges in the ordinary course of law. As a law is necessarily rigid, while the real character of human acts cannot be rigidly defined, such a dispensing power seems necessary for the equitable administration of justice.

And this principle is just as true of the church as of other societies; here too we find the strict letter of the law mitigated by authority in special cases from an early period. Such indulgences, or concessions to human weakness, commonly called dispensations, have received various names—*remissio*, *venia*, *clementia*, *misericordia*, *dispensatio*; *συγγνώμη*, *συμπάθεια*, *φιλανθρωπία*, *οικονομία* (Suicer, *Thes. s. v.*)—all implying something of the nature of occasional indulgence or *ἐπίσκεψις* in the administration of a law, the law itself remaining unchanged. A constant exemption of a person or body corporate from the operation of a particular law is called a *privilegium*. The canonists generally limit the use of the word *dispensatio* to the case in which a future transgression of a law is permitted.

Thomassin (*Eccl. Discip. II. iii. 24, § 14*) holds that in the early ages of the church, when few or no councils were held, such dispensations were granted by the bishops; that afterwards, from the end of the 3rd century, councils decided on the cases in which some relaxation of the law of the church was to be allowed; then, as provincial councils frequently referred such matters to the judgment of the see of Rome, that see gradually claimed and exercised a dispensing power independent of councils. The twenty-seventh canon of the (so-called) fourth council of Carthage supplies a good instance of a dispensing power applied to a canon. The council recognises the general prohibition of the translation of bishops from an inferior to a better see “*per ambitionem*,” yet goes on to provide that “if the good of the church requires it,” such a translation may be made on the certificate of election being produced in the synod itself. Here a dispensing power seems to be given to the synod; for it must be presumed that it was to decide whether in a particular case “*utilitas ecclesiae fieri poposcerit*.” Penitents, digamists, and husbands of widows were by the general law of the church incapable of holy orders; yet pope Siricius (*Epist. 1 ad Himerium*, c. 15) permits such persons, once ordained, to exercise the functions of their order, though without hope of pro-

motion to a higher. Pope Innocent I., A.D. 414, allows (*Epist. 22, c. 5*) that the bishops of Macedonia might, under circumstances of peculiar difficulty, admit to the exercise of their functions those who had been irregularly ordained by Bonosus, a heretic, while he insists strongly on the general maintenance of the rule which for once is violated; it is only “*pro necessitate temporis*” that such relaxations of canonical strictness can be allowed, and “*quod necessitas pro remedio invenit, cessante necessitate debet utique cessare*”; such liberties cannot be permitted when the church is restored to its normal state of peace. We have another kind of dispensation in Gregory the Great’s letter to Augustine of Canterbury (*Epist. xi. 64*; in Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 21), in which he permits persons who had married in ignorance within the prohibited degrees to be admitted to communion, though the general law of the church excommunicated such persons.

Of such a nature were the relaxations of strict law permitted in the early church; the numerous dispensations in matrimonial cases, in plurality of benefices, and in some other matters, which were so great a scandal in the mediaeval church, do not fall within our period; nor within the same period had the baneful practice arisen of granting dispensations for wrongs to be committed. It was (as Thomassin observes, u. s. § 20) “in more recent times, when the discipline of the church had grown feeble and languid, that permission was sought for future violation of the canons, that license was asked and granted for sinning against sacred rules; men would fain sin without risk of penalty, and draw even from the laws themselves cover and authority for their contempt of the law.”

(Thomassin, *Vet. et nova Eccl. Discip. P. II. lib. iii. cc. 24–26*; Van Espen, *Jus Ecclesiasticum*, tom. ii. p. 754 ff. ed. Colon. 1777, *De Dispensationibus*; Walter, *Kirchenrecht*, § 180; Jacobson, in Herzog *Real-Encycl.* iii. 423.) [C.]

INDULGENTIAE HEBDOMAS. [HOLY WEEK.]

INDUS. [DORONA.]

INFANT BAPTISM. [BAPTISM, § 95, p. 169.]

INFANT COMMUNION. The practice of communicating infants was universal throughout the period of which we treat. For the east, where it still flourishes, we have the testimony of the so-called liturgy of St. Clement, in which little children (*παιδιά*) are ordered to receive immediately after all who have any special dedication, “and then all the people in order” (*Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 13*). Pseudo-Dionysius, possibly of the 5th century, but more probably of the 6th, says that “children who cannot understand divine things are yet made partakers of divine generation, and of the divine communion of the most sacred mysteries” (*De Eccl. Hierarch. c. vii. § 11*). Evagrius, who completed his Church History in 594, proves the continued observance of the rite, where he mentions “an ancient custom” at Constantinople, “when there remained a good quantity of the holy portions of the undefiled body of Christ our God, for uncorrupted boys from among those who attended the school of the undermaster to be sent for to



consume them" (lib. iv. c. 36). There is a story told by John Moschus, A.D. 630, of some children who imitated among themselves the celebration of the Eucharist, as they had witnessed, and taken part in it themselves (*Pratum Spirit.* c. 196).

The earliest witness in the Latin church is St. Cyprian, who writing in 251, relates how the agitation of an infant to whom the cup was offered, led to the discovery of its having been taken to a heathen sacrifice (*De Lapsis*). He also represents the children of apostates as able to plead at the day of judgment, "We have done nothing; nor have we hastened of our own accord to those profane defilements, forsaking the meat and cup of the Lord" (*ibid.*). St. Augustine:—"They are infants; but they are made partakers of His table, that they may have life in themselves" (*Serm.* 174, § 7). "Why is the blood, which of the likeness of sinful flesh was shed for the remission of sins, ministered that the little one (*parvulus*) may drink, that he may have life, unless he hath come to death by a beginning of sin on the part of some one" (*Contra Ju'ianum*, Op. imperf. l. ii. c. 30)? It is evident from these passages (and see especially to the same effect, *De Peccat. Mer.* lib. i. c. xx. § 26; c. xxiv. § 34) that St. Augustine considered this sacrament to be generally necessary to the salvation of infants; but it is desirable to mention that some passages often cited from his works, which appear to imply or maintain that view are not really to the purpose. He argued against the Pelagians, that if infants were not born in sin, our Lord's words, "Except ye eat the flesh," &c. (St. John vi. 53), would not be true in reference to them: they would have life without eating of that flesh (see *Contra Duas Epp. Pelag.* lib. i. c. xxii. § 40); but then he taught also that "every one of the faithful is made a partaker of the body and blood of Christ, when he is made a member of Christ in baptism." This is carefully shown from his writings by Fulgentius, who had been questioned by Ferrandus, on the hope that might be entertained for a young man who had died immediately after baptism (see the note of the Benedictine editors on Aug. *De Pecc. Mer.* lib. i. c. 20, § 26). The same remark must be made on a saying of Innocent I., A.D. 417 (*Ad Patres Syn. Milcv.* § 5, *Ep.* 182, inter *Epp.* Aug.), which Augustine himself interprets of the necessity of Baptism (*Ad Paulin. Ep.* 185, c. viii. § 28). See also Gelasius of Rome, *Epist.* 7, *ad Episc. per Picenum*. Gennadius of Marseilles, A.D. 495, gives the following direction with regard to the reception of some of those who had been baptized by heretics in schism. "But if they are infants (*parvuli*), or so dull as not to take in teaching, let those who offer them answer for them, after the manner of one about to be baptized; and so, fortified by the laying on of hands and chrism, let them be admitted to the mysteries of the Eucharist" (*De Eccl. Dogm.* c. 22). We call attention to the word "*parvulus*" when it is used in this connection, because "*infans*" was sometimes applied even to the newly-baptized adult, as being newly born to a higher life. In 585 the council of Mâcon, in France, in imitation, as we may suppose, of the Greek custom lately mentioned, ordered that on Wednesdays and Fridays innocent (children) should be brought

to the church, and there "being commanded to fast, should receive the remains of the sacrifices" (can. 6). The council of Toledo, 675, found it necessary to reassure anxious minds by a declaration that the sick who found themselves unable to swallow the eucharist, and others who had failed to swallow it "in time of infancy," did not fall under the censure of the first council of Toledo (can. 14), against those who having received did not consume it (can. 11). The Gelasian Sacramentary (lib. i. n. 75) provides for the immediate communion of an infant (*infans*) baptized in sickness. The earliest extant copy of the Gregorian has the following rubric referring to all baptized at Easter. "If the bishop be present, it is fit that he (*infans*) be forthwith confirmed with chrism, and after that communicated. And if the bishop be not present, let him be communicated by the presbyter" (*Liturgia Rom. Vet.* Murat. tom. ii. col. 158). It will be observed that previous confirmation was not an indispensable condition of the first communion. A MS. Sacramentary of the 8th century preserved at Gellone and a Rheims pontifical of the same age expressly contemplate the probability of some of the "*infantes*" baptized being nurslings, but make the same provision for the communion of all (Ordd. 6, 7, 8, in Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* lib. i. c. 1, art. 18. Comp. ord. 15). The little children were also to communicate daily throughout the octave with the rest of the newly-baptized. See Ordd. 6, 8, 9.

There is an English canon ascribed to Egbert, A.D. 740, but probably somewhat later, which says, "They who can, and know how to baptize, faithful monks especially, ought always to have the eucharist with them, though they travel to places far distant" (Johnson's *Engl. Canons*, vol. i. p. 235). Jesse, bishop of Amiens, A.D. 799, in an epistle on the order of baptism, says, that "after trine immersion the bishop should confirm the child (*puerum*) with chrism on the forehead, and that finally he should be confirmed and communicated with the body and blood of Christ, that he may be a member of Christ" (see note to Regino *De Eccl. Discipl.* lib. i. c. 69; ed. Baluz.). The epistle of Jesse was written in reply to some questions of Charlemagne respecting baptism. In the *Capitulare* of the latter we find the following law notably framed in express accordance with the answers of Jesse and other bishops:—"That the presbyter have the eucharist ready, that when any one shall be taken sick, or an infant (*parvulus*) be ailing, he may communicate him at once, lest he die without communion" (Lib. i. c. 155: Sim. lib. v. c. 57). This is in the collection of Walter of Orleans (c. 7); Regino (u. s.); Burchard (lib. v. c. 10); and Ivo (*Decr.* P. ii. c. 20).

Infants were during a period of uncertain length required to be kept without food between their baptism and communion, when the latter followed as a part of the day's rites. Thus in the earliest *Ordo Romanus*, supposed by Usher to be written about the year 730, care is enjoined that the little ones (*parvuli*) baptized on Easter Eve "take no food, nor be suckled, after their baptism before they communicate of the sacrament of the body of Christ" (§ 46; *Musæ. Ital.* tom. i. p. 28). There are rubrics to this effect in several ancient orders of baptism, three a

which were compiled or copied in the 8th century (Ordd. 6, 7, 8, in Martene, u. s. For later examples, see Ordd. 9, 15). In one copy of the Gregorian Sacramentary, the rule is thus relaxed. "They are not forbidden to be suckled before the sacred communion, if it be necessary" (*Inter Opp. S. Greg.* tom. v. col. 111; Antv. 1615). The prohibition seems to have been generally omitted from the rubric after the 8th century; but the pontifical of the Latin church of Apamia in Syria, which was written in the 12th, retains it, though speaking of confirmation and communion immediately after baptism only as "the custom of some churches" (Ord. 15; Martene, u. s.).

There can be no doubt that infants were at first communicated in both kinds; but there is little clear evidence to that effect. Passages which speak of their eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ are not conclusive. The council of Toledo before cited, after mentioning the occasional rejection of one element by the sick, "because except the draught of the Lord's cup, they could not swallow the eucharist delivered to them," proceeds to the case of others "who do such things in the time of infancy." The inference appears good that the eucharist was offered to both in bread as well as wine. We are however in a good measure left to infer the practice of the first ages from that of the later church. Because the cup only is mentioned in St. Cyprian's story of the infant who had partaken of a heathen sacrifice, some have argued that they were communicated in the blood only. Had it been so, they would hardly have been permitted to receive in both kinds at a later period; as they certainly did, when for a time the custom of intinction prevailed in the West. Even in the 12th century, when Paschal II. suppressed that practice at Clugny, he made an exception in favour of "infants and persons very sick who are not able to swallow the bread." All others were to receive the bread by itself (*Epist.* 32; Labb. *Concilia*, tom. x. col. 656). In a manuscript Antiphonary that belonged to an Italian monastery, written about the middle of the same century, after directions for a baptism, is the following rubric: "Then follows the communion, which is ministered under these words; 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ steeped in His blood, preserve thy soul unto everlasting life'" (Muratori, *Antiq. Ital. Medisev.* tom. iv. p. 843). About the same time, however, we find Radulphus Ardens saying, in a sermon on Easter Day, "It has been decreed that it be delivered to children as soon as baptized, at least in the species of wine; that they may not depart without a necessary sacrament" (Zaccaria, *Biblioth. Rit.* tom. ii. p. ii. p. clx.). How infants were communicated in the one species then, we may learn from the pontifical of Apamia already cited. "But children who as yet know not how to eat or drink are communicated either with a leaf or with the finger dipped in the blood of the Lord and put into their mouth, the priest thus saying, 'The body with the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, keep thee unto everlasting life'" (Martene, u. s.). Robertus Palulius, A.D. 1175, in a work *De Sacramentis*, long ascribed to Hugo de S. Victore, says, "The said sacrament is to be ministered with the finger of the priest to children newly born in the species of the blood;

because such can suck naturally" (Lib. i. c. 20).

As the Greeks and Orientals generally used intinction before the age of Charlemagne, it is to be presumed that they communicated infants in the same manner as adults; i. e., in both kinds with a spoon. Now "in practice, though the rule is otherwise, the eucharist is given to infants under the species of wine alone" (Goar in *Annot. Nihusii ad Allatii Dissert. de Missâ Praesant.* ad fin.; Allat. *De Occ. et Or. Consent.* col. 1659). The Nestorians, Jacobites, Armenians and Maronites, are said to have fallen into the same practice (Gabriel Sinaita, *ibid.* col. 1667). The Greeks use a spoon, but from conflicting statements before us (see Martene, u. s. art. 15, n. 15), we infer that the rest use the finger or a spoon indifferently. [W. E. S.]

INFIRMARY (MONASTIC). In his enumeration of Christian duties Benedict specifies that of visiting the sick (*Bened. Reg.* c. 4); and elsewhere he speaks of it as a duty of primary and paramount obligation for monks ("ante omnia et super omnia," c. 36), quoting the words of Christ, "I was sick, and ye ministered unto Me." Beyond, however, saying, that the sick are to have a separate part of the monastery assigned to them (cf. *Aurel. Reg.* cc. 37, 52; *Caesar. Reg.* c. 30), and a separate officer in charge of them (cf. *Reg. Tarnat.* c. 21), that they are to be allowed meat and the luxury of baths, if necessary, that they are not to be exacting ("ne superfluitate sua fratres contristent"), and that the brethren who wait on them are not to be impatient, he gives no precise directions (*ib.*). Subsequently it was the special duty of the "infirmarius," the "cellerarius" (house-steward), and of the abbot himself, to look after the sick (Martene, *Reg. Comm.* c. 4; *Caesarii Reg. ad Virg.* c. 20, *Reg. Cujusd. ad Virgines*, c. 15); no other monk might visit them without leave from the abbot or prior (Mart. *l. c.*). Everything was to be done for their comfort, both in body and soul, that they should not miss the kindly offices of kinsfolk and friends (cf. *Fructuos. Reg.* c. 7; Hieronym. *Ep.* 22, *ad Eustoch.*); and, while the rigour of the monastic discipline was to be relaxed, whenever necessary, in their favour, due supervision was to be exercised, lest there should be any abuse of the privileges of the sick-room (Mart. *l. c.*; cf. *Reg. Pachom.* c. 20). The "infirmarius" was to enforce silence at meals, to check conversation in the sick-room ("mansio infirmorum, intra claustra," *Conc. Aquisgran.* A.D. 816, c. 142) at other times, and to discriminate carefully between real and fictitious ailments (Mart. *l. c.*). The sick were, if possible, to recite the hours daily and to attend mass at stated times, and if unable to walk to the chapel, they were to be carried thither in the arms of their brethren (*ib.*). The meal in the sick-room was to be three hours earlier than in the common refectory (*Reg. Mag.* c. 28). The abbot might allow a separate kitchen and "buttery" for the use of the sick monks (*Aurelian. Reg. ad Monach.* c. 53, *Reg. ad Virg.* c. 37). The rule of Caesarius of Arles ordered, that the abbot was to provide good wine for the sick, the ordinary wine of the monastery being often of inferior quality (cf. Mabill. *Disquis. de Curs. Gallic.* vi. 70, 71; Mabill. *Ann.* iii. 8, Du Cange, *Glossar. Lat. a. v.*). [L. G. S.]

**INFORMERS.** (*Calumniatores, Delatores.* Tertullian [*adv. Marcion. v. 18*] fancifully connects "diabolus" with "delatura.") This class of men originated before the Christian era, and indeed before the establishment of the Roman empire. [DICT. OF GREEK AND ROMAN ANTIQ. s. v. *Delator.*] When persecution arose against the church, the *delatores* naturally sought gain, and probably some credit with the civil authorities, by giving information against those who practised Christian rites, since the secret assemblies of Christians for worship came under the prohibition of the Lex Julia de Majestate (Tac. *Ann. i. 72, p. 3*; Merivale, *Hist. Rome, c. xlv.*). Tertullian states that Tiberius threatened the accusers of the Christians—"Caesar . . . comminatus periculum accusatoribus Christianorum" (*Apol. c. 5*), but the story rests only upon his statement. He also (*l. c.*) claims M. Aurelius as a protector of Christians. Titus issued an edict against delators, forbidding slaves to inform against their masters or freedmen against their patrons. Nerva on his accession republished this edict. "Jewish manners," i. e. probably Christianity, is specially mentioned as one of the subjects on which informations were forbidden (Dion lxxviii. 1, quoted by Merivale). In Pliny's well-known letter to Trajan (x. 96 [al. 97]) we find the delatores in full work. The Christians who were brought before him were delated (*deferebantur*), and an anonymous paper was sent in containing a list of many Christians or supposed Christians. Trajan in his answer (*ib. 97 [98]*), though he forbade Christians to be sought out (i. e. by government officials), did not attempt to put a stop to the practice of delation; those who were informed against, if they continued in their infatuation, must be punished. See Tertullian's comment on this (*Apol. c. 2*). And in the subsequent persecutions a large part of the suffering arose from unfaithful brethren who betrayed their friends to the persecutors. It is not wonderful that during and immediately after the days of persecution the delator was regarded with horror. Thus the council of Elvira (*Conc. Elib. c. 73*), A.D. 305, excommunicated, even on his death-bed,\* any *delator* who had caused the proscription or death of the person informed against; for informing in less important cases, the delator might be re-admitted to communion after five years; or, if a catechumen, he might be admitted to baptism after five years. The first of Arles, A.D. 314, reckons among "traditores" not only those who gave up to the persecutors the Holy Scriptures and sacred vessels, but also those who handed in lists of the brethren (*nomenina fratrum*); and respecting these the council decrees, that whoever shall be discovered from the public records (*acta*) to have committed such offences shall be solemnly<sup>b</sup> degraded from the clerical order; but such degradation, if the offender was a bishop, was not to vitiate the orders of those who might have been ordained

\* According to the reading "Nec in fine;" some MSS. read "non nisi in fine." It seems probable that "nec in fine" or "finem" was the original reading, and that it was altered to bring it into accordance with the decree of Nicaea (c. 13), which provides that the Holy Communion is in no case to be refused to a dying man.

<sup>b</sup> "Non verbis nudis;" another reading is "verberibus multis."

by him. Charges against *traditores* were not to be admitted unless they could be proved from the "acta publica." This decree is highly interesting, as following immediately upon a period of persecution, and showing that the edict of Milan (A.D. 313) had brought about a great change in Gaul, and that Christians were admitted to consult the public records of the recent proceedings against them. The capitularies of the Frank kings (lib. vi. c. 317, in Baluze, i. 977) cite the 73rd canon of Elvira with the reading "nec in fine." So lib. vii. c. 205, and *Additio Quarta*, c. 34, in Baluze, i. 1068, 1202. The same capitularies (*Add. Quarta*, c. 35) enjoin bishops to excommunicate "accusatores fratrum;" and, even after amendment, not to admit them to holy orders, though they may be admitted to communion. Any cleric or layman who brings frivolous charges against his bishop (*calumniator extiterit*) is to be reputed a homicide.

The canon of Elvira is cited in the decree of Gratian (p. ii. cau. v. quae. 6, c. 6) with the reading "non nisi in fine." The same decree (u. s. c. 5) attributes to pope Hadrian I. a decree, "let the tongue of a delator be cut out (*capuletur*), or, on conviction, let his head be cut off;" a decree probably taken from the civil legislation, for nearly the same provision is found in the Theodosian code (lib. x. tit. x. l. 2), and precisely the same in the Frank capitularies (lib. vii. c. 360; Bal. i. 1102). [S. J. E.]

**INFULA.** 1. The infula was in classical times the band or fillet which bound the brow of the sacrificing priest and the victim.

"Nec te tua plurima, Panthe  
Labentem pietas nec Apollinis infula textit."

Virg. *Aen. ii. 439.*

Servius (on *Aeneid. x. 538*) tells us that it was a broad fillet or ribbon, commonly made of red and white strips. Isidore (*Etymol. xix. 30*) describes the infula of the heathen priest in similar terms. The infula of the victim is mentioned in

"stans hostia ad aram  
Lancea dum nivea circumdatur infula vitula"

Virg. *Georg. iii. 487.*

And the term seems to have been early transferred to the head-covering of Christian priests. Hence Prudentius (*Peristeph. iv. 79*) speaks of the "sacerdotum domus infulata" of the Valerius of Saragossa, when he is evidently speaking of the "clerus." So Pope Gelasius (*Hardouin's Concilia, ii. 901*), wishing to say that a certain person ought to be rejected from the Christian priesthood, says that he is "clericalibus infula reprobabilis" (Hefele's *Beiträge*, ii. 223 f.). See MITRE.

2. For infula in the sense of a ministerial vestment, see CASULA, PLANETA. [C.]

**INGELHEIM, COUNCIL OF** (*Ingelheimense Concilium*), A.D. 788, at Ingelheim, when Tassilo, duke of Bavaria, was condemned, not allowed to enter a monastery. [E. S. Fl.]

**INGENUUS**, martyr at Alexandria with Ammon, Theophilus, Ptolomeus, Zeno; commemorated Dec. 20 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Ursardi). [W. F. G.]

**INITIAL HYMN.**—A name for the hymn which in the Eastern liturgies corresponds to the

*Introit* of the Roman mass. In the eastern liturgies the term *Introit* (εἰσοδος) is applied to the two ENTRANCES of the liturgy, the little entrance (ἡ μικρὰ εἰσοδος) i. e. that of the Book of the Gospels, and the great entrance (ἡ μεγάλη εἰσοδος) i. e. that of the elements.

In the liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom this hymn takes the form of three *antiphons*, called the first, second, and third antiphons, each of which consists of a few verses called "stichi" (στίχοι) from the Psalms; each verse of the first antiphon being followed by the clause "At the intercession of the Theotocos, save us, O Saviour;" each verse of the second and third by an antiphonal clause of the same nature, varying with and having reference to the festival. That of the third antiphon is sometimes one of the *troparia* of the day. Each antiphon is followed by an unvarying prayer, called generally the prayer of the first, second, and third antiphon,\* and which are the same in the liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom.<sup>b</sup>

The first and second antiphons are followed by "Glory &c. (δόξα καὶ νῦν), after which the antiphonal response is repeated.

The third antiphon by short hymns or *troparia* in rhythmical prose under different names, and which vary with the day. These antiphons are considered to symbolise the predictions of the prophets, foretelling the coming and incarnation of our Lord.<sup>c</sup> As a specimen the three antiphons for Easter Day are:—

#### Antiph. I.

- Stich.* O be joyful in God all ye lands. (Ps. lxxvi. 1.)  
At the intercession, &c.
- Stich.* Sing praises unto the honour of His name. (Do.)  
At the intercession, &c.
- Stich.* Say unto God, O how wonderful art Thou in Thy works. (verse 2.)  
At the intercession, &c.
- Stich.* For all the world shall worship Thee. (verse 3.)  
At the intercession, &c.  
Glory, &c.  
At the intercession, &c.

#### Antiph. II.

- Stich.* God be merciful unto us. (Ps. lxxvii. 1.)  
Save us, O Son of God, Thou that art risen from the dead.
- Stich.* And show us the light of His countenance. (Do.)  
Save us, O Son of God, &c.
- Stich.* That Thy way may be known upon earth. (v. 2.)  
Save us, O Son of God, &c.
- Stich.* Let the people praise Thee. (v. 3.)  
Save us, O Son of God, &c.  
Glory, &c.  
Save us, O Son of God, &c.

#### Antiph. III.

- Stich.* Let God arise, and let His enemies be scattered  
let them also that hate Him flee before Him.  
(Ps. lxxviii. 1.)  
Christ is risen from the dead, having trodden  
down death by death, and given life to those  
that are in the grave.

\* There are variations between the two liturgies, as to whether the prayer of the antiphon should be said before or after its antiphon, which it is unnecessary to particularise.

<sup>b</sup> The prayer of the third antiphon is "A Prayer of St. Chrysostom" of the English Prayer-book.

<sup>c</sup> Vid. Casali de Fet. Sac. Christ. Rit. cap. xci.

*Stich.* Like as the smoke vanisbeth so shalt thou drive them away: and like as wax melteth at the fire. (v. 2.)

Christ is risen, &c.

*Stich.* So let the ungodly perish at the presence of God, but let the righteous be glad. (vv. 2, 3.)

Christ is risen, &c.

*Stich.* This is the day which the Lord hath made: we will rejoice and be glad in it. (Ps. cxviii. 24.)

Christ is risen, &c.

On Sundays as a rule, in the liturgy of St. Basil the *Typica*<sup>d</sup> for the day are said instead of the first two antiphons; and in those of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom instead of the third antiphon, the *Beatitudes* (οἱ μακαρισμοί).

These are the Beatitudes from the Sermon on the Mount, and are thus said. They are introduced by the clause "Remember us, O Lord, when Thou comest into Thy Kingdom." The first five Beatitudes are then said consecutively; after the fifth and each following one is interposed a short *troparion*, differing in each case, and all varying with the day. After the sixth of these follows "Glory, &c." and then two more *troparia*, the latter of which is a *Theotocion*.<sup>e</sup>

In the liturgies of St. James and St. Mark the initial hymn is the same, and unvarying. It is of the ordinary form of Greek hymns, beginning "Only begotten Son and Word of God," &c., and containing prayers for salvation through the mysteries of the incarnation, which it recites. [See ANTIPHON]. [H. J. H.]

#### INITIATION. [BAPTISM, § 5, p. 156.]

#### INNOCENT, or INNOCENTIUS. (1) [GREGORY (2).]

(2) Martyr at Sirmium with Sebastia (or Sabbatia) and thirty others; commemorated July 4 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(3) Martyr with Exsuperius (1). [W. F. G.]

INNOCENTS, FESTIVAL OF THE. (ἡμέρα τῶν ἁγίων ἰδ' χιλιάδων νηπίων: *festum Innocentium* [ium], *Natales Sanctorum Innocentum*, *Natale Infantum*, *Necatio* [Allisio] *Infantum*. The old English *Childermas* and the German *Kindermesse* may also be noted.)

1. *History of festival*.—The Holy Innocents of Bethlehem, the victims of Herod's jealousy of our Lord, are at an early period commemorated as martyrs for Christ, of whom indeed they were in one sense the first (see Irenaeus *adv. Haer.* iii. 16. 4; Cyprian, *Epist.* 56, *plebi Thibari consistenti*, § 6). Subsequent fathers continually speak in the same strain, e.g. Gregory of Nazianzum (*Serm.* 38 in *Nativitate*, § 18; vol. i. 674, ed. Bened.); Chrysostom (*Hom.* 9 in *S. Matt.* vol. vii. 130, ed. Montfaucon); Augustine (*Enarratio in Psal.* 47; vol. iv. 593, ed. Gaume; *Serm.* 199 in *Epiphania*, § 2, vol. v. 1319; *Serm.* 373 in *Epiph.* § 3, vol. v. 2178; *Serm.* 375 in *Epiph.* § 2, vol. v. 2183); Prudentius (*Cath. xii. de Epiph.* 125). Augustine also distinctly refers (*de libero Arbitrio*, iii. 68, vol. i. 1035) to a commemoration of their martyrdom by the church. Some writers, as Augusti (*Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archäologie*, i. 304), Binterim (*Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Katholischen Kirche*, v. 1. 549) and others, refer to a homily of Origen

<sup>d</sup> These terms will be explained in their place.

<sup>e</sup> These *troparia* are given in the Octoechos.



as affording evidence on this last point. The writing in question, however (*Hom. 3 de diversis*, vol. ii. p. 282; ed. Paris, 1604), is universally rejected as spurious, and Huet sums up concerning it (Origenis *Opp.* vol. iv. 325, ed. De la Rue) that it is a work originally written in Latia, and later than the time of Jerome.

The commemoration of the Massacre of the Innocents was at first combined with the festival of the Epiphany. Thus the passage of Prudentius above referred to speaks of them in the hymn on the Epiphany; Leo, in not a few of his homilies on the Epiphany, speaks of the Innocents (see e.g. *Serm.* 31-33, 35, 38; *Patrol.* liv. 234 sqq.), as also Fulgentius of Ruspe in a homily *de Epiphania, deque Innocentium nece et muneribus magorum* (*Patrol.* lxxv. 732). Subsequently a special day was set apart for the festival of the Innocents, a day in close proximity to that on which the Lord's Nativity is celebrated being chosen; not that we have any definite knowledge as to the time when Herod put the children to death, but from the special association between the two events. Hence we find December 28 in the Western and December 29 in the Eastern church set apart for the commemoration of the Innocents. The date of the origin of the separate festival cannot be very closely defined. It is however mentioned in the *Calendarium Carthaginense*, to whose date we can approximate from the fact that the latest martyrs commemorated are those who perished in the Vandal persecution under Hunneric, 484 A.D. Here the notice is, "V. Kal. Jan. Sanctorum Innocentium, quos Herodes occidit" (*Patrol.* xiii. 1228). It may be added that Peter Chrysologus, bishop of Ravenna (ob. 450 A.D.), has left among his sermons, two *de Infantium nece*, quite apart from several others on the Epiphany (*Serm.* 152, 153; *Patrol.* lii. 604). It is needless to give here a list of later calendars and martyrologies, in which the festival of the Innocents uniformly occurs, but it may be noted that it subsequently acquired a considerable degree of importance, for in the *Rule* of Chrodegang, bishop of Metz (ob. 766 A.D.), the "festivitas Infantium" is included among the "solemnitates praeicipuae" (*Reg. Chrodeg.* c. 74; *Patrol.* lxxxvii. 1009).

2. *Liturgical notices.*—The earliest of the Roman Sacramentaries, the Leonine, contains two masses for the festival of the Innocents, which follow immediately after that for St. John the Evangelist, and are headed *In Natali Innocentium* (Leonis *Opp.* vol. ii. 155, ed. Ballerini). We may call attention to the curious reference in the Preface of the second mass to the prophecy of Jeremiah (xxxi. 15), "Rachel plorans filios suos, noluit consolari, quia non sunt," where the mother's grief is explained as arising not from the death of her children, but because infants held worthy of receiving so great a renown were born not from her line, but from that of Leah. Elements from the Leonine Sacramentary are found embodied in the service for the day in the Gelasian (*Patrol.* lxxiv. 1060) and Gregorian Sacramentaries (col. 12, ed. Menard), in the latter case including a slightly modified form of the Preface,\* which also appears in the service for

the day in the Ambrosian liturgy (Pamelius, *Liturgg. Lat.* i. 308). In the ancient Roman church a special degree of mournfulness was associated with this day, for we find in the Gregorian *Liber Antiphonarius* (col. 659, ed. Menard) the notice that the *Gloria in Excelsis* and *Alluia* are not sung, "sed quasi prae tristitia dies illa deducitur." Of this we may derive an illustration, though of much later date, from the *Ordo Romanus* (x. 26), which remarks that on this day, except it fell on a Sunday, the Roman abstain from flesh and fat. See also Amalarius (*de Eccl. Off.* i. 41; *Patrol.* cv. 1074), and the *Micrologus* (*de Eccl. obs.* c. 36; *Patrol.* cli. 1005), which mentions the further omission on this day of the *Te Deum* and *Ite, missa est*. He subjoins as a reason for the sadness attaching to this day, that the Innocents, though martyrs for Christ, "non tamen ad gloriam, sed ad infernalem poenam discesserunt."

In the ancient lectionary of the Gallican church, the prophetic lection, epistle, and gospel were respectively Jer. xxxi. 15-20, Rev. vi. 9-11, Matt. ii. 1-23 (Mabillon, *de Liturgia Galicana*, lib. ii. p. 112; see also the service in the Gothic gallic missal, lib. iii. p. 198). In the Mozarabic liturgy, however, they are respectively Jer. xxxi. 15-20, 2 Cor. i. 2-7, Matt. xviii. 13-15, 1-5, 10, 11 (*Missale Mixtum S. Isidori*, p. 48, ed. Leslie).

The *Micrologus* (*supra*) refers to the octave of the festival of the Innocents as generally observed ("eodem modo ut aliorum Sanctorum celebratur"). It would seem, however, that this is of comparatively late date as a matter of general observance, for according to Binterim (*Denk.* v. 1. 552), it is wanting in many calendars of the 9th century. A curious mistake must be mentioned here into which several have fallen in connection with the octave of the festival of the Innocents. In the *Indiculus operum S. Augustini* by Possidius, is an entry "de die octavarum Infantium; duo" (*Patrol.* xlvi. 16). This has been taken by Baronius (*Martyrologium Romanum*, Dec. 28 and Jan. 4, *not.*) and others as showing the existence of an octave of the festival of the Innocents in Augustine's time. The two sermons, however, of Augustine refer to the first Sunday after Easter, the octave of the day on which the sacrament of baptism had been received, "hodie octavae dicuntur infantium, revelanda sunt capita eorum" (*Serm.* 260, 376; *Patrol.* xxxviii. 1201, 1669).

Attention has already been called to the proximity of the festival of the Innocents to that of the Nativity, in consequence of the association of the two events commemorated. These two indeed, with the commemorations on the two intervening days of Stephen the protomartyr and John the disciple whom Jesus loved, may be supposed to form one combined festival, all centering in the idea of the Incarnation. Thus we have a homily of Bernard of Clairvaux *de Quatuor continuis solemnitatibus, scilicet Nativitatis Domini ac Sanctorum Stephani, Johannis et Innocentium* (*Patrol.* clxxxiii. 129).

The day for the commemoration of the Innocents in the Eastern church is December 29, but we find in the Armeno-Gregorian calendar (Neale, *Eastern Church*, introd. p. 799) June 10 associated with them: this same calendar being one of those which gives from what original

\* The collect in the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries furnished that of our own church till 1662, when it was modified into its present form.

comes does not appear, the amazing number of 14,000 for the infants slain. This is also the case with the pictorial Moscow calendar prefixed by Papebroch to the *Acta Sanctorum* for May (vol. I. p. lxvii.).<sup>2</sup> Numerous Eastern calendars, however, do not contain this absurd addition (see e.g. Ludolf, *Fasti Sacri Ecclesiae Alexandrinae*, p. 16; Selden, *de Synedrüs veterum Ebraeorum*, pp. 214, 231, ed. Amsterdam, 1679).

For further details on the subject of the festival of the Innocents, reference may be made to Binterlin, *Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Katholischen Kirche*, v. 1. 549; Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archäologie*, i. 304 sqq.; Amsemani, *Kalendarium Ecclesiae Universalis*, v. 519. [R. S.]

**INNOCENTS, THE HOLY, MASSACRE OF.** Represented in the mosaics of Sta. M. Maggiore (Ciampini, *V. M.* I. tab. ii.), and in two ivories, one of which (from a diptych in the cathedral of Milan) is given by Martigny (a. u. *Innocents*); also on a sarcophagus at St. Maximin, south of France (*Museum. de Ste. Madeleine*, t. i. col. 735, 736). Here it is contrasted with another relief of the Adoration of the Magi,



Mosaics of the Innocents. From Martigny.

the two pictures occupying two sides of a frieze, and being divided by the titulus of the decussed. Martigny also mentions an ivory diptych of this subject, attributed to the period of Theodosius the Younger, and published by M. Rigollot (*Arts de Sculpture au moyen âge*). [R. St. J. T.]

#### INSACRATI. [IMPOSITION OF HANDS, § 1.]

**INSCRIPTIONS.** In strictness of speech every inscribed monument falls under this category, unless the writing be upon skin or upon paper; and accordingly the great collections of Greek and Latin inscriptions recently published at Berlin include every kind of monument which is inscribed, coins only excepted. These are somewhat arbitrarily but at the same time profitably excluded, as belonging to a special department of study. But in common parlance, by *Inscriptions*, the larger monuments in stone are intended, and in the following article comparatively little notice will be taken of any others.

In treating of this vast subject it is proposed

to take into account—(1) The literature of the subject, which is indeed the only division which can be treated at all comprehensively in an article like the present. (2) Technical execution. (3) Symbols. (4) A selection of inscriptions, with notes on some matters arising out of them. (5) Their language and style. (6) The modes of dating them. (7) An enumeration of the abbreviations which occur on them.

(1.) *Literature of the Subject.*—This matter is ably treated of by M. De Rossi in the first thirty-six pages of his preface to the *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae Septimo Saeculo Antiquiores* (Rome, 1857–1861 fol.). The principal facts are as follows. The earliest collections of Christian inscriptions of which we have any knowledge belong to the age of Charles the Great, and were made, as De Rossi thinks, by scholars of Alcuin. The most ancient of these is contained in an Einsiedeln MS. written in the age of Alcuin: about a third of the whole collection is Christian, sepulchral examples however being wholly wanting. Various compilations of inscriptions were also now made, in which many of the epitaphs written by pope Damasus, among other Christian authors, were included; and the small

remaining stone fragments of some of these can be completed with certainty by their aid. The collectors of these inscriptions cared little for their historical value, and commonly omitted all mention of their age or authors; they rather designed them to be models, after which similar verses might be composed. The others now remaining in whole or in great part are—(1) The Palatine MS. of the 11th century (now in the Vatican), edited by Gruter, *Thes. Inscr.*, pp. MCLXIII.–MCLXXVII., who has omitted a few profane epigrams, which are interspersed. None of the Christian inscriptions seem to be later than the 9th century, and they were probably collected by some one who visited Rome and various other places in Italy about the close of that century. (2) A MS. of Kloster Neuburg, about the 11th century, consisting of Christian inscriptions exclusively, which were copied from Italian originals about the 8th cen-

<sup>2</sup> Le Blanc's catalogue of books relating to Christian epigraphy, published at the end of his *Manuel*, is a useful supplement to this, and brings the bibliography down to 1860. De Rossi is less careful to notice printed books than MS. collections, as being better known. After the publication of Marini's papers by Mai in 1831 he ceases altogether.

<sup>3</sup> A still wilder estimate, however, is found in an *Auctorium* to the martyrology of Usuardus, which fixes the number at 144,000 (*Patrol. crit.* 11. 348), probably with reference to Rev. vii. 4.

tury; they are almost all historical, many being by Damasus. (3) A Verdun MS. of the 10th century, containing thirty-one Roman inscriptions; a collection independent of either of the preceding, made in the 8th or 9th century.

"Hae tres antiquissimae syllogae omnes trans Alpes servatae nobis sunt; neque quidquam his simile in Italiae nostrae bibliothecis uspiam inveni . . . . Primi ergo veterum inscriptionum amatores transalpini omnes fuere . . . . Ab Alcuiniana aetate ad saeculum usque decimum quartum . . . . antiquis inscriptionibus colligendis nemo videtur operam navasse" (De Rossi, *u. s.* pp. x.\* xi.\*).

The 15th century saw the revival of epigraphic studies, but among the inscriptions collected by Poggio, Signorili, Cyriaco, Feliciani, Marcanova, Pehem, Schedel, and others, those which are Christian "apparent raræ," and are not separately classed. The earliest collector of purely Christian inscriptions, who lived in the age of the Renaissance, is Pietro Sabini, who in 1495 presented his work, in MS., comprising those which he had copied in Rome and out of it, both from the originals and from MSS., to Charles VIII., king of France. The MS. has been found in the library of St. Mark at Venice by De Rossi, who affirms that some of the inscriptions are very valuable, and have been copied by no other scholar; many however belong to a late period. A volume of inscriptions from the ancient churches of Rome, made by Giovanni Capoti in 1498, seems to have been of much the same character. The other collectors of inscriptions who lived from this time to the middle of the 16th, added scarcely anything (*vix mediocre incrementum*) to Christian epigraphy. Aldus Manutius the Younger however applied himself diligently to the collection of Christian inscriptions among others, and twenty volumes of these formed by various members of this illustrious family are preserved in the Vatican, from which De Rossi has derived no small profit. The most important of these was compiled in 1566 and 1567, and is entirely filled with inscriptions contained in Christian churches. The whole number of Christian inscriptions hitherto collected from all parts, from the 8th to the middle of the 16th century, excluding those of very recent date, is considerably less than a thousand; a great many of these being contained in MS. only.<sup>b</sup> At present more than 11,000 Christian inscriptions earlier than the 7th century are known to have been found in Rome alone. With the exception of a few epitaphs by Damasus copied in tombs of the martyrs by the scholars of Alcuin, no subterranean inscription had hitherto been decyphered. But the discovery of the catacombs of Rome in 1578 marks a new era in the study. Ciaccone, L'Heureux or Macarius, Winghius, Ugone, and somewhat later in time, but first and foremost in diligence and success, Antonio Bosio, were among the earliest explorers, and all were more or less addicted to the study of Christian

<sup>b</sup> The *Edinburgh Review* for 1864, p. 221, goes so far as to say that "the results of the whole epoch (of the revival of letters) may be summed up in the single statement, that more than a century had elapsed after the discovery of printing before a single inscription of the early Christian centuries had been given to the world."

Various MS. volumes are mentioned by De Rossi (*u. s.* pp. xiv.\*-xvii.\*) of which no notice is taken here.

inscriptions. Soon after this time the Christian inscriptions occupy a distinct place in Gruter's *Corpus Inscriptionum*, published in 1616; but besides the Palatine Collection mentioned above, all the others together reach only about 150, although many more had been now copied in Rome by several of his friends. There can be no doubt that Gruter cared comparatively little about this class of inscriptions. The extensive and accurate transcripts of Bosio were transferred, after his death in 1629, to Severani, who published the *Roma Sotteranea* in 1632; which was republished in an enlarged Latin form by Aringhi, in two folio volumes, in 1650.<sup>c</sup> During the half century that followed the publication of Gruter's great work, many scholars collected additional Christian inscriptions, some of the most important of which are still in MS. Especially to be named are those of J. B. Doni (died 1647), preserved in the Marucelli Library at Florence, "*codex inter primaria operis mei subsidia numerandus*" (De Rossi); of Sirmond (died 1651), in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (very valuable, containing many still unpublished), and of Peiresc (died 1637), whose *Inscriptiones Christianas et novae* were consulted at Paris by De Rossi, who speaks of their value, more especially for the inscriptions of Gaul. To these should be added the collections of F. Ptolomeo (made about 1666), preserved in the public library of Sienna, of which Muratori made much use, and those of Brutio, in seventeen volumes, finished in 1679, preserved in the Vatican, whose value is scarcely proportional to their bulk. Between Aringhi (1650) and Fabretti, whose folio volume on inscriptions appeared in 1702, Montfaucon alone (so thinks De Rossi) can be regarded as having materially added to the knowledge of Christian epigraphy; his MSS. were examined at Paris by De Rossi who thence derived some valuable additions to his Roman inscriptions. It deserves however to be recorded that William Fleetwood, fellow of King's College, Cambridge, afterwards bishop of Ely, published in 1691 an *Inscriptionum Antiquarum Sylloge* (Lond. 8vo), in two parts; the second part, "*Christiana monumenta antiqua quae hactenus innotuerunt omnia complectitur*:" these occupy nearly two hundred pages, and are occasionally accompanied by brief notes.<sup>d</sup> Zaccaria several times notices this work controversially or otherwise (*Diss. de Vet. Inscr.* *uss.* pp. 326, 327, 370, 382, 384, 388, 399), and it is frequently quoted by other epigraphists as by Marini, Le Blant, and De Rossi himself, though he has not named it in his introduction. Fabretti's labours are both skilful and accurate; but the types which the printer made use of were inadequate to express the true reading of his inscriptions. Boldetti and Marangoni, who laboured in concert in the same field as Bosio had done, "are

<sup>c</sup> Dr. McCaul (*Christian Epitaphs*, pref. p. iv. note) observes that these volumes "have a reputation far beyond their merits." There is no doubt, he adds, that some forger of inscriptions imposed both on Severani and Aringhi. De Rossi promises a detailed account of this matter, p. xxvi.\*.

<sup>d</sup> We can the less afford to pass it over, though it appears to be little else but a compilation from other authors, as it is almost the only work on Christian epigraphy expressly devoted to the subject, that has appeared in this country till quite lately.

made especially memorable by one of those catastrophes, which occasionally diversify the monotonous history of student life. They had spent more than thirty years in the exploration of the catacombs and other sacred antiquities of Rome. Boldetti's volume, published in 1720 at Rome [entitled *Osservazioni sopra i cimiteri de' Santi Martiri*], comprised a portion of the results; but by far the greater part still remained in MS., when in 1737 an unlucky fire destroyed in a few hours the fruit of all these years of toilsome research. The loss, it is melancholy to add, was complete and irreparable. Boldetti's great age precluded all hopes of his being able to repair his portion of the work. Marangoni although grievously depressed resumed his labours with great energy; but M. De Rossi has everywhere sought in vain for the results of his attempted restoration" (*Edinburgh Rev.* u. s. p. 222). The destruction of these papers has left a void which can hardly be supplied; the chambers which they explored are now "demolita et horrendum in modum vastata" (De Rossi). Boldetti indeed and those whom he employed to copy the inscriptions have been proved to be very inaccurate both as regards the sites of their discovery and the reading of the texts;\* "ei me iratissimum esse profiteor," says De Rossi (p. xxvii.\*). Marangoni was much more exact, and his *Appendix ad Acta S. Victorini*, Rom. 1740, 4°, is a work of considerable value. P. Lupi, a friend of these scholars, has left, besides various printed works relating to epigraphy, a valuable collection of inscriptions preserved in MS. in the Vatican at Rome; and a similar collection by the celebrated Buonarrotti is preserved at Florence.

It became evident that the time had now arrived when a fresh collection of Christian inscriptions should incorporate the previous discoveries of so many scholars. The industrious Gori projected such a work, in which they should be so arranged as to illustrate the doctrines, the ceremonies, the hierarchy and the discipline of the church. But his other engagements prevented. The MSS. however of his friends Stosch, Ficoroni and others, containing materials for the work, are stored up in the Marucelli Library at Florence, where they were consulted with profit by De Rossi. The task was in some measure executed by the indefatigable Muratori, whose *Notus Thesaurus Veterum Inscriptionum* published at Milan in 1739 in four folio volumes, contains, in addition to the profane inscriptions, a larger number of Christian ones than had ever yet appeared, being taken both from printed and from MS. sources: but the work was very uncritically executed, and his conjectural additions are not distinguished from the actual readings of the broken inscriptions. Maffei, who has been called the founder of lapidary criticism, had undertaken in conjunction with Séguier a great body of inscriptions, in which there should be a purely Christian division; but both these and various other scholars, who had cherished like good intentions, bore no fruit to perfection.

It now also again entered into the minds of more than one divine to turn the extant mass

of Christian inscriptions to theological account; and with somewhat better success. The learned Jesuit A. F. Zaccaria contemplated a very extensive work, in which the more interesting Christian inscriptions should be arranged under the following heads: (i.) Religio in Deum; (ii.) Religio in Sanctos; (iii.) Templā; (iv.) Templorum ornamenta, vasa sacra, idque genus caetera; (v.) Dies Festi; (vi.) Sacramenta; (vii.) Hierarchia ecclesiastica ac primo Romani Pontificis; (viii.) Episcopi; (ix.) Presbyteri; (x.) Ordines majores; (xi.) Ordines minores; (xii.) Monachi; (xiii.) Laici; (xiv.) Laici dignitate praestantes; (xv.) Artes atque officia minora; (xvi.) Leges ecclesiasticae (De Rossi, u. s. p. xxx.\*). This magniloquent announcement however was never carried out; but a kind of first fruits were put forth in 1762 in a treatise entitled *De veterum Christianorum in rebus theologicis usu*.<sup>f</sup> In this work he brings together with a considerable amount of industry and learning such inscriptions as bear or seem to bear upon the doctrines of his church; "quae non ultra septimum nostrae aerae saeculum progrediuntur, ne haereticis cavillandi detur occasio" (*Thes. Theol. Diss.* p. 325). Martigny however calls it "un livre mediocre;" and speaks of his friend and imitator, Danzetta, as having written "avec moins de succès encore"<sup>g</sup> (*Dict.* p. 305). The bearing of inscriptions upon doctrinal or disciplinary controversy is "a perfectly legitimate use of the subject,"<sup>h</sup> and indeed its true ultimate end, but one for which from the insufficiency of the data the time had not [in the 18th century] fully arrived." (*Edinburgh Review*, u. s. p. 224.) Nor can it be said to have fully arrived now. In a few years' time it will probably be otherwise.

Zaccaria in his later years encouraged a rising young scholar, Gaetano Marini, to undertake the task which he had found to be too much for himself. Marini set about the work with great spirit, and from 1765 to 1801 worked at it, not exclusively indeed, but yet so as never to allow his labours to be wholly intermitted. An ample account of his preparations and of the merits and defects of his performances is given by De Rossi (u. s. pp. xxxi.\*-xxxii.\*). By help of his friends in Italy and his own labour he had amassed about 8600 Christian inscriptions in Latin, and about 750 in Greek from all parts of the world, of the first ten centuries. But these were in a confused, imperfect and uncritical state. "Marini's labours were interrupted by the French Revolution; and at his death he bequeathed to the Vatican Library the materials which he had compiled, and which, having

<sup>f</sup> Published in the *Thesaurus Theolog. Dissertationum* vol. i. pp. 325-396. Venet. 1762, 4to; apparently for the first time (see *Præfatio generalis*). Le Blant (in his *Bibliographie*) gives 1761 as the date. It has been republished by Migne in his *Cursus Theolog. completus*.

<sup>g</sup> It would seem from De Rossi's remarks (p. xxxi.\*) that his *Theologia Lapidaria* exists only in MS. (in the Vatican). He gained from it a few unpublished inscriptions which Danzetta had taken from the papers of Marangoni.

<sup>h</sup> For the ecclesiastical historian inscriptions of all periods will of course have their own value; and many of them yield up a great deal of information and furnish "illustrations of almost every branch of Christian literature, history, and antiquities" (*Edinburgh Review*, u. s. p. 231).

\* De Rossi (under his *Inscr. Urb. Rom.* n. 17, p. 24) calls him a man "cujus in id genus apographis excipiens imperitiam et incuriam non centena, sed millena exempla testantur."



recently been put in order by M. De Rossi are found to fill no fewer than 31 volumes. Among these, four volumes had been partially prepared for publication, of which the first was in a comparatively forward state. This is the *Inscriptionum Christianarum pars prima*, which is printed in the fifth volume of Mai's *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, in 1831. And perhaps it may be said that it is to the incomplete and unsatisfactory condition of the remaining portion of Marini's papers that we are indebted for much of the far more critical and scholarly work of M. De Rossi, entitled *Inscriptiones Urbis Romae Septimo Saeculo antiquiores* (Rom. 1857-61, fol. pp. 619+123 *prol.* +40 *præf.*) This publication was undertaken at the express solicitation of Cardinal Mai, who finding the task of preparing for the press the rest of Marini's materials entirely incompatible with his other engagements, transferred to his young and learned friend the undertaking for which his tastes, his studies, and his genuine love of the subject pointed him out to Mai as eminently fitted." (*Edinburgh Rev.* u. s. pp. 224, 225, slightly altered.) The first volume of this great work, the only one known to the writer, and perhaps the only one yet published, contains those Roman inscriptions only whose precise or approximate date is positively known.<sup>1</sup> The number of these is 1126; among which we have one belonging to the first century, two to the beginning of the second (all very brief and unimportant), and twenty-three to the third; the fourth and fifth centuries have between four and five hundred each, and the sixth century a little more than two hundred. Fragments and additional inscriptions contained in the appendices bring the number up to 1374.

The second part of his work is intended to include select inscriptions interesting for their theological and historical worth; and in the last place he will include all the remaining inscriptions arranged according to the localities where they were found; and also the Jewish inscription found in Rome.<sup>2</sup>

We can afford no more space to notice this masterly performance, which every one who desires to become acquainted with Christian inscriptions must necessarily study; an interesting account of it, and also of the work following will be found in the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1864.

The impulse given to Christian epigraphy by De Rossi's great work, and by his other works of smaller dimensions<sup>3</sup> has been manifested by the

<sup>1</sup> He calls them *Epitaphia certam temporis notam exhibentia*. Notwithstanding this, the mark of time on the stone, by reason of its fragmentary condition, often leaves the exact date uncertain. See, for example, n. 986, the date of which may be 523 or 485, and n. 999, which may be of the year 525, 524, 454, or 453.

<sup>2</sup> Under each inscription mention is made of the place where it was found, where it has been edited, if at all, or from what MSS. It has been copied by the editor, if he have not himself transcribed it. Plates are in most cases added. If the inscriptions were more frequently written out in common minuscules, besides being figured, they would be more easily read by the non-antiquarian scholar or student.

<sup>3</sup> His *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, of which the first volume (in twelve monthly parts) appeared in 1863 (Roma, tipografia Salviucci, 4to) is a magazine of most

publication of other books relating to the subject, among which those which comprise the Christian inscriptions *en masse* of particular countries hold the first rank. And among these we must place at the head the *Inscriptiones Christianæ de la Gaule antérieures au VIII<sup>me</sup>. Siècle*, edited and annotated by M. Edmond Le Blant, in 2 vols. 4to., Paris, 1856, and 1865, comprising 706 inscriptions, nearly all Latin, but a few Greek, and a few also written in Runes.<sup>4</sup> The earliest dated inscription belongs to the year 334, and the latest to 695; but only four of these are as early as the 4th century. Of the rest that are dated about 50 belong to the 5th century, nearly 100 to the 6th, and 13 to the 7th century. A few which are undated are certainly before the age of Constantine (*Manuel*, p. 124).

The same learned author has likewise more recently, in 1869, written a *Manuel d'Épigraphie Chrétienne d'après les marbres de la Gaule, accompagnée d'une bibliographie spéciale*, i.e., a catalogue of books relating to Christian epigraphy generally, Paris, sm. 8vo. pp. 267. Although this valuable<sup>5</sup> work refers more especially to Gaulish inscriptions, there is a great deal about others also; in particular his enumeration of formulae (Greek and Latin) which occur in different parts of the Christian world, in Europe, Asia and Africa, where different provinces have their own styles of epigraphy, is peculiarly instructive (pp. 76-81), and a translation will be found below. The Christian inscriptions of Spain have very recently been edited by one of the most eminent living epigraphists, Prof. E. Hübsner, of Berlin. His *Inscriptiones Hispaniæ Christianæ* was published at Berlin in 1871, and includes 209 inscriptions, besides 89 others of the medieval period comprised in the appendix. Of the earlier ones two or three only can be referred to the 4th century; the others are of the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th centuries; about half of them are dated, the earliest being of the year 465, and the latest being 782. Nearly all are in Latin; a very few only in Greek. A splendid publication commenced in 1870, entitled *Christian Inscriptions in the Irish Language*, chiefly collected and drawn by G. Petrie, LL.D., edited by M. Stokes, Dublin, printed at the University, 4to. Four parts have now (1874) been published. Those of Clonmacnois (above 100 in number) range from

valuable information for inscriptions among other antiquities. Other works of his (some unknown to the writer) on this subject are enumerated by Le Blant in his *Bibliographie* at the end of his *Manuel d'Épigraphie*.

<sup>4</sup> Both this and Hübsner's work (see below) give details for each inscription in the same exact and comprehensive manner as De Rossi, and are accompanied by numerous plates. M. Le Blant has subsequently obtained additional inscriptions from various parts of France and Switzerland, which will one day, he hopes, form a rich supplement to his former work (*Manuel*, p. 1).

<sup>5</sup> It is notwithstanding to be regretted that so useful a book was not put together with a little more fulness and precision: it is divided into nineteen chapters, but nothing is said either at the beginning of the work or at the head of each respecting the contents of the chapters; the list of books placed at the end of the volume scarcely satisfies the requirements of the bibliographer, as it almost invariably omits the Christian name or initials of the authors mentioned, and the number of volumes in each work. At the same time it will be found very helpful without being by any means complete, particularly as regards English books.

the 7th to the 12th century in a regular series; and by their help it is hoped that a key to the approximate date of such works in other parts of the country as well as in other parts of the British Islands may be obtained. They occupy the first part of the work. All the above works are beautifully illustrated with figures. There are also other recent books which deal with the Christian inscriptions of particular regions. Among them are to be named C. Gazzera, *Delle iscrizioni cristiane antiche del Piemonte discusso*, Torino, 1850, 4to. (also in *Mem. Accad. di Torino*, 1851); J. B. De Rossi, *De Christianis titulis Carthaginiensibus* (in Pitra's *Spicil. Solesm.* vol. 4); and (along with the Pagan inscriptions) L. Renier, *Inscriptions Romaines de l'Algerie*, Paris, 1858, fol.

The *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, whose publication is still going forward at Berlin, includes, with specified exceptions, all Latin inscriptions, both Pagan and Christian, which can be placed with certainty or reasonable probability before 600 A.D. (see pref. to vols. ii. and iii.). The Christian inscriptions are distinguished in the indices by a dagger prefixed.\*

A great number of Welsh inscriptions, the earliest being probably about the 7th century, will be found in the numerous volumes of the *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 1846, sqq. 8vo., mostly described by the well-known palaeographer Prof. Westwood. But a conspectus of the whole of the early Christian inscriptions of Great Britain and Ireland† will, it is to be hoped, in process of time be included in Messrs. A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs' *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain*, of which the first volume appeared at Oxford in 1869, 8vo., part of the second in 1871, and the third in 1873. The very scanty inscribed Christian remains of the Roman period will be found at vol. i. pp. 39, 40;‡ vol. ii. p. xxii. (Addenda)

\* It is astonishing how small a number of Latin Christian inscriptions (or, at any rate inscriptions known to be Christian) occur in some countries. In vol. iii. edited by Mommsen, which includes Egypt, Asia, Illyricum, and the provinces of European Greece, there are only about thirty inscriptions which can be counted upon as Christian out of 6574. Of these several were found together at a place in Dalmatia.

† The books where the inscriptions are described and figured are fully detailed under each inscription in the same complete manner as in De Rossi's, Le Blant's, and Hübner's works already mentioned. It is hardly necessary therefore to say much of any of them here; many of them are periodicals, others are monographs on particular classes of monuments, particularly Stuart's *Sculptured Stones of Scotland* (printed for the Spalding Club, Edinb. 1856-1867, 2 vols. fol.); G. Stephen's *Old Northern Runic Monuments* (London and Copenhagen, 2 vols. fol. 1856-1863); Munch's edition of the *Chron. Manniae* (Christian. 1860). A great number also of topographical and archaeological works by Lysons, Hodgson, Nichols, C. Roach Smith, Horsley, Borlase, &c. are brought under contribution.

‡ The Lincoln inscription is considered by Hübner (*Inscr. Brit. Lat.* n. 191) to be of the 16th century. If so, perhaps the only Roman Christian inscription which deserves the name must be struck off. The chrism, however, has been found on six or seven monuments of different kinds (without counting coins), once with the α and ω (Haddan and Stubbs, u. s.). The chrism occurs also on a lamp in the Newcastle museum, published by Hübner (u. s. p. 240, n. 27), who likewise gives two rings with the Christian acclamation, "Vivas in Deo," found

and p. 51. To these will perhaps be added a Roman inscription found at Sea-milla, near Bristol, in 1873, seen by the writer, but whether it be Christian or no "adhuc sub judice lis est."‡ The sepulchral Christian inscriptions in Celtic Britain, A.D. 450-700, mostly in Latin, but one or two in Welsh, vol. i. pp. 162-169; some few of the Latin inscriptions being accompanied by Ogham characters. The same class of inscriptions in Wales, A.D. 700-1100, vol. i. pp. 625-633 (Latin); the inscriptions of Scottish and English Cumbria (A.D. 450-900, vol. ii. pp. 51-56), some Latin, some (at Ruthwell near Dumfries, and at Bewcastle in Cumberland) Runic. The inscribed monuments (very few) in the Pictish and Scottish kingdoms (A.D. 400-900), partly Latin, partly in Runes and Oghams, are in vol. ii. pp. 125-132; those of the Isle of Man, nearly all Runes, of Norwegian origin (one may be Gaelic), and inscribed on crosses, whose date is not given, will be found in vol. ii. pp. 185-187. There still remain to follow the Saxon inscriptions of the period of the Heptarchy and the Monarchy.§

A work has yet to be mentioned, which is perhaps of greater importance to the student of Christian epigraphy than any which has been already named, De Rossi's only excepted; viz., the Christian inscriptions, which are contained in Böckh's *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* (vol. iv. fasc. 2, Berlin, 1859, fol., plates). They are collected and edited by Prof. A. Kirchhoff, the same great epigraphist who has just been occupied upon the *Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum*. The Christian inscriptions begin at No. 8606 and terminate at No. 9893, besides a few in the Addenda; thus making a total of nearly 1300 inscriptions of all ages and in almost all parts of the Roman world, down to the fall of the

in England (pp. 234, 235), as well as other rings which seem to be Christian. The Romano-Christian remains in Britain are so extremely rare that it seems to be worth while to make these slight additions to what will be found in Messrs. Haddan and Stubbs' work. Mr. Wright's statement (*Celt, Roman and Saxon*, p. 294) that "not a trace of Christianity is found among the innumerable religious and sepulchral monuments of the Roman period found in Britain," cannot be safely contradicted. The Westminster and Bristol monuments may possibly be exceptions. So much can hardly be said of one or two others which have been suspected to be Christian. See Dr. McCaul's remarks on the Chesterholm stone in the *Canadian Journal* for 1874.

§ See *Proc. of Soc. of Antiq.* Nov. 1873, pp. 68-71; *Archaeolog. Journ.* 1874, pp. 41-46 (with figure).

¶ Until these appear, it may be useful to indicate some of the principal sources of information. In addition to the books already referred to, among which Professor G. Stephen's *Runic Monuments* is the principal, Pegge's *Sylloge* and Camden's *Britannia*, with the additions of Gibson and Gough, may be consulted. Among the periodicals, the *Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal* and the *Proceedings of the West Riding of Yorkshire Geolog. and Polytechnic Society* are more especially to be mentioned, where the Runic and other early inscriptions of Yorkshire are described by the Rev. D. Haigh and the Rev. J. Fowler. Professor Hübner informs the writer that he hopes his *Inscriptiones Britannicae Christianae* will appear in the course of 1875, which will be analogous in all respects to the *Inscr. Hisp. Christ.* It includes all Latin inscriptions down to about 800 p.c. "As there are in Wales some few in Oghams only, while the rest is in part bilingual, I do not," he says, "exclude those few merely Celtic ones."

Byzantine empire. To these are to be added about sixty already included in the earlier parts of the book, which are evidently of Christian times ("quos Christianae esse aetatis apparet"). They are divided into three classes. (1) *Tituli operum publicorum et votivi*, the first division of which is arranged chronologically, the second comprising those whose age is uncertain. Of the former division there are 175, but none is earlier than the 4th century, a copy of a letter of St. Athanasius, the only authority for the Greek text, being perhaps the earliest of all; there are only six or seven others which can be referred to the 4th century. The fifty-eight which follow these comprise all which are of the fifth and following centuries, several of them being in verse, to the death of Charlemagne, of which number about twelve belong to the age of Justinian (A.D. 527-565). The most important of these perhaps is a copy of the paschal canon of St. Hippolytus, which appears to have been engraved in the reign of Theodosius; most of the others are inscriptions on various kinds of buildings, such as churches, monasteries, hospitals, towers, and there are two or three which are invocations of the Virgin and the saints, or prayers for the welfare of the persons mentioned.

(2) The second class comprises 156 inscriptions on mosaics, fictile and other vessels, glass, lamps, triptychs or other wooden tablets, "et variae supellectilis sacrae et profanae, ponderum, sigillorum, amuletorum, gemmarum" (Nos. 8953-9109). About seventy of these are on seals (nearly all lead); a few are as early as the 7th and 8th centuries. Some of those however on gems and glass are much earlier, and some notice has been taken of these in the articles on those subjects in this Dictionary.

(3) The remaining class contains no less than 783 inscriptions, all sepulchral, and these are arranged by the regions in which they are found. Those which bear dates are comparatively very few. (a) Egypt, Nubia, and the rest of Africa (Nos. 9110-9137); (b) Syria (Nos. 9138-9154); (c) Asia Minor (Nos. 9155-9287); (d) Greece and Illyricum (Nos. 9288-9449, of which 114 are from Athens); (e) Sicily and Malta (Nos. 9450-9540); (f) Italy and Sardinia (Nos. 9541-9885); (g) Gaul and Germany (Nos. 9886-9893).


Various other Greek Christian inscriptions have been since published; in particular, it may be observed that a few have been found in Spain and Algeria, countries from which Kirchoff has not given a single example (Hübner, *u. s. p. v. praef.*; Rénier, *u. s. pp.* 255, 349).

From what has now been said, it must be apparent how utterly hopeless and impossible it is to give within the limits of an article in a dictionary a satisfactory account of this immensely numerous class of Christian antiquities. The most important aid which such an article can render must be to indicate the principal sources of information; and these, if De Rossi's labours are carried out, will be very largely increased in the course of a few years.

A little work however has been published at Toronto in 1869 by the Rev. John M'Caul, LL.D., in which a judicious selection of a hundred "Christian epitaphs of the first six centuries" (Greek and Latin from various parts of the world, especially from Rome) has been brought together and ably commented upon. They occupy


sixty-eight pages, and an introduction relating to the language, names, and dates employed fill up twenty-eight more. Besides these we have a brief preface pointing out the necessity of caution in using uncritical books, like those of Aringhi and Boldetti, and giving amusing examples of forgeries of Christian inscriptions, which have deceived some learned writers even of the present century. To those who cannot give any great amount of attention to the subject, this little work may be heartily recommended, as it bears every mark of conscientious care and of strict honesty.

(ii.) *Technical Execution and Materials employed.*—The modes of writing employed have much the same variations as in all ages: the letters are most commonly engraved with a chisel below the surface of the stone, and then occasionally coloured (red) or gilded; sometimes the letters are scratched with the point of some instrument, a nail or the like (fig. 1); on some gems the




1. Letters scratched on mortar. A.D. 330. (Rome.)

letters are in relief (camei). More rarely the letters are drawn in paint (vermilion) (fig. 2) or in gold upon the flat surface of the marble, or cut in gold leaf (upon glass), or written in ink upon sepulchral tablets or vases, or in white



2. Letters (Latin words in Greek characters) painted in vermilion on the flat (not incised) surface of the marble; they are of mixed forms, uncial and minuscule. Leaves and points interlaced capriciously. A.D. 289. (Rome. The famous epitaph of St. Severa.)


colour on frescoes, &c. In the catacombs the inscriptions were occasionally, by reason of the unhappiness of the times, smeared in charcoal, in hope that when persecution had passed away, they might be recorded in a more permanent



3. Words divided uniformly by points. 7th century. (Italy.)


form. Sometimes also old tombstones of the pagans were used over again, and the Christian inscriptions were written on their backs, or on their obliterated faces (fig. 5). Points are also frequently found, sometimes to distinguish words (fig. 3) sometimes scattered capriciously (figs

2, 4); likewise a variety of other marks, particularly cordate leaves, common to pagan and




4. Words divided, but not consistently, by various small marks. Irregular uncial letters. A.D. 300. (Rome.)

Christian inscriptions (figs. 2, 5, 6). Some of the above remarks are illustrated by the inscriptions figured above and below, to be more fully described under TOMA. The reader may see more on this subject in Martigny's *Dict. a. v. Inscriptions*, §§ II., III.; but it can only be studied to advantage by examining the plates in such works as De Rossi's *Rome Sotterranea*




5. Inscription written on a scraped portion of a sarcophagus previously used. Punctum, hyphen, and various small marks introduced between some of the words. A.D. 300. (Rome.)

(coloured plates) and *Inscr. Urb. Rom.*, and the other books named above in which the letters and accessories are figured. The same remark must be made of the palaeography. The letters have the same varieties of form, such as uncial, minuscule, rustic, and ligated, which are common to MSS. and monuments of all kinds, and



6. Marks of different kinds before and after one word only, strokes drawn through two letters to indicate that they stand for words (mones and aies). Regular uncial letters. A.D. 370. (Rome.)


their execution varies from extreme neatness (figs. 6, 10) and even beauty to extreme ugliness and carelessness (*litteras rusticas*) (figs. 1, 8). Of the former sort the characters employed by pope Damasus in the 4th century are the most remarkable, their apices being ornamented with little hooks (fig. 7). They are called after him



7. Inscription (completed by conjecture) written in the Damasine uncial characters (litteras). 4th century. (Rome.)

*Damasine letters*; but Philocalus was his artist, or one of his artists. They are sometimes en-

graved, sometimes painted on the marble. There are also many Christian inscriptions as well as



8. Example of rude palaeography. Rustic letters. No points or other marks. A.D. 400. (Rome.)

others which are not Christian, where letters are connected by ligatures (*litteras ligatas*); sometimes to that degree that it is no easy matter to



9. Inscription remarkable for the complexity of its ligatures. A.D. 400. (Near Arjona, Spain.)

decypher them (fig. 9). For some observations on the form of letters in certain Christian inscriptions see Le Blant, *Manuel*, pp. 41, 42; Hubner,



10. Inscription in minuscule letters of variable form. 7th century. (Clonsmacilla, Ireland.)

n. a. p. 116; De Rossi, *Bull. Arch. Crist.* 1863, p. 18.

(iii.) *Symbols*.—Of the symbols which are found with some Christian inscriptions, the principal are the following: the fish, the anchor, the dove, the Good Shepherd, the chi-rho, the  $\omega$  and  $\alpha$ , and the cross in various forms. These will be found described under their respective heads (also noticed under *GENS* and *MOSES*), and they may be regarded as either exclusively or prin-



especially Christian symbols. The palm which is also found, and that very commonly, is, like the phoenix, Christianised; but it occurs also on pagan and Jewish inscriptions. It must be sufficient to refer to a table indicating the symbols on the early Roman and Gaulish sepulchral inscriptions (by far the most complete series), and the observed dates of their introduction and disappearance, given by M. Le Blant (*Manuel*, p. 29). For symbols generally see Raoul Rochette, *Tableau des Citocombes de Rome*, pp. 228 sqq., Paris, 1853, and the authors named at the beginning and end of the book.

(iv.) *Select Inscriptions*.—These consist of such examples, arranged chronologically, in prose and verse, as are connected with churches or their furniture or adjuncts, and they have mostly some further interest of their own. No uniform system of printing has been followed. Sometimes the mere transcript of the letters seems to be sufficient; sometimes the words have been written out (corrected and at length) below these; sometimes a translation has been added; also such notes as seemed desirable.

1. De Rossi, *Bulletino di Arch. Crist.* 1864, p. 28; Rénier, *Inscr. Rom. de l'Alg.* n. 4025. From Caesarea in Mauretania; written by a poet named Asterius (*ex ingenio Asteri*) to commemorate the gift of a burial-ground to the Christians by Evelpina.

ARCAN AT (ad) SEPVLICRA CVLTOE VERBI  
CONTVLIT  
ET CEILAM STEVXIT SVIS CVNCTIS SVMP-  
TIVS  
ECLISIAE SANCTAE HANC RELAQVIT MEMO-  
RIAM  
SALVETE FRATRES PYRO CORDE ET SIMPLICI  
EVKPLIVS VOS (mutat) SATOS SANCTO SMPLIV  
ECLISIA FRATHVVM (sic) HVNC RESTITVIT  
TITVLVM. M A L SEVERIANI C V.  
EX INV. ASTERI.

A wreath enclosing AG is on the left; a dove and palm on the right.

M. Rénier reads the end of the last line but one *titulum marmoreum anno primo Severiani, viri clarissimi*. If this be right, as seems very probable (though De Rossi feels some doubt, *Prod. Inscr. Urb. Rom.* p. xi.), the mode of dating is very unusual. Other Mauretanian inscriptions are dated by the era of the province, i.e. 40 A.D. when it was reduced by the Romans (*M'Caul, Christ. Epist.* p. 37).

The words *ecclesia fratrum* indicate the restoration of the inscription to be "assai antico" (De Rossi); the original was probably broken during the tumults against the Christians, A.D. 258-304, as De Rossi thinks; and the restored marble tablet would seem to have been put up in the first year of Severianus, probably the Roman governor of Mauretania. One of the earliest Christian inscriptions, not being an epitaph, which have come down to us in any form.

2. Bäckh, *C. J. G.* 8608. Coreyra (Corfu) in the porch of a church, written in two lines

3. Hübner, *Inscr. Christ. Hiap.* No. 135. Found in a wall of the Benedictine convent of S. Salvador de Vairão, near Braga in Portugal, on seven stones.

IN NE DMI PERP | ECTVVM | EST TEMPLVM H | VNC PER M | ARISPALLA | IN VOFA  
SVB DNE XIII K | AV KR | DXXIII . RVS | MANTE BERE | NINIMOVE | REMVNDV RE | X

In memoria d(omi)ni perfectum est templum hunc per Arispalla d(e)o voto  
Sub die XIII k(a)ndulas Ap(osto)licae a(n)te D(omi)ni VIII regnante monacho Veronensem Rom.  
Epistolam 188 363; A. 14. 408.

of two hexameters each. A cross at the beginning and end of the first line.

ελευθεριον βασιλε(ς)ου ιησου χριστου σωτηρος  
ου, μακαριον εφελκετο, το(ς) ιερους τακτικα οηδ,  
'ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ τεμεση και βαρβαροι ιελασεσθαι,  
χειρ(ς) δ(α) ορθοδωξ(ης) το βαρβαροι ορθοδωξ(ης).

Render: I constructed with unworthy hand, in

This is the earliest Greek inscription relating to the imperial destruction of pagan temples, the date of Julian's act being about A.D. 361.

3. Le Blant, *Inscr. Christ. de la Grèce* i. 478, n. 369. Preserved in the Hôtel de Ville at Sion in Switzerland.

DEVOTIOE . VIGENS .  
AVGVSTAS . PONTIVS . AEDIS  
RESTITVIT . PRAKTOR .  
LONGE . PRAESTANTIVS . ILLIS .  
QVAE . PRISCAE . STETERANT .  
TALIS . RESPVBLICA . QVIERE .  
DN VRATIANO AVG . IIII KT MRE . ON-  
PONTIVS ASCEPIODOTVS VFPDD.



The date of this consularship of Gratian with Merobaudas is A.D. 377, the earliest date of any public monument yet known, bearing the chrism. The next earliest is A.D. 390, on a column of St. Paul's basilica, extra muros, Rome. It is wonderful that the former church should be spoken of as old so early as A.D. 377; it can hardly be doubted that it was a Christian or a Christianised building. Le Blant's observation that this church-restoration is precisely contemporaneous with the greatest abundance of Mithraic monuments and those of Cybele is worthy to be noted. The abbreviations at the end are probably for *vir praepositus praetorio dedecavit*. *Talr*, i.e. *men like Asclepiodotus*. De Rossi, however (*Bull. di Arch. Crist.* 1867, p. 25), who evidently considers Asclepiodotus to be the author of the verses, refers *titles to aedes* ("che li dedicò alla repubblica"). He takes the building to be "il palazzo dei presidi imperiali," the chrism and *devotio* notwithstanding.

4. Rasponi, *De Basil. et patriarch. Lateran.* iii. 7, Rom. 1856. On the bronze-silvered gates of the Baptistery of the Lateran, Rome.

IN HONOREM S. IOANNIS BAPTISTAE  
HILARIUS EPISCOPVS DEI FAMVLVS OFFERT.

Hilarius was pope from A.D. 462 to 467; and the inscription has the appearance of being contemporary. The ancient baptisteries were commonly placed under the patronage of St. John the Baptist; and both they and the fonts which they contained were frequently inscribed. Ciampini gives both kinds of inscriptions from the Baptistery of the Lateran, which are said to have been there in the 5th century: but this edifice has been often remodelled. (See *Camp. de Sacr. Edif. c. iii.*, Mart. *Dict.*, p. 321; Hübner, *Arch. Christ.* p. 5, Guerber's French transl. 1886.)

For this class of inscriptions generally see the posthumous papers of Marini published by M., *Script. Fot. Nov.* collect. t. v., pp. 167-177.

Diction barbarous, as frequently in these Spanish inscriptions. The church seems to have been completed under the auspices of a nun, named Marispalla: probably the text really is *per Marispallam Deo votam*, the last letters having a stroke above them, which may have been obliterated or accidentally omitted. The inscription is interesting as being doubly dated, both by the Spanish era and by the reign of the Visigothic king. The Spanish era, whose origin is uncertain, but which appears to commence B.C. 38 (see Hübner, *praef.* p. vi.), is the era most commonly used to mark the time of the Spanish Christian inscriptions: about 100 of them are thus dated (Hübner, p. 109), the earliest appears to be A.D. 466, and the latest A.D. 762. Both the proper names in the inscription are Gothic (see Hübner, *praef.* p. vii., who gives several others); the remark of M<sup>c</sup>Caul (u. s., p. xxi.) that Gothic names are "very rarely" found in inscriptions does not apply to Spain.

6. Le Blant, *Inscr. Chrét. de la Gaule*, i. 87, n. 42. Found at Lyons, formerly on the exterior of the church of St. Romanus, where Spon saw it in the 17th century; now lost.

TEMPLI FACTORES FVERANT FREDALDVS  
ET VXOR MARTVRIS EGREGII QD  
CONSTAT HONORE ROMANI ILLIVS VT  
P<sup>C</sup> BEQVEATVR (sic) SEDE PE . . ENNE.

Date, as Spon believed, of the 5th or 6th century. He thus restores and rectifies the lines—

*Templi factores fuerant Fredaldus et uxor,  
Martyris egregii quod constat honore Romani  
Illius ut precibus recreentur sede perenni.*

The motive of the founders is here sufficiently clearly expressed, that they may enjoy eternal rest through the prayers of the saint. They do not, however, actually invoke him.

7. Böckh, *C. I. G.*, n. 8640. On a stone found in the Peloponnese by S. Alberghatti; originally (see l. 7) erected at Corinth; now in the museum at Verona.

+ΑΓ. ΜΑΡΙΑ ΘΕΟΤΟΚΕ ΦΥΛΑΞΟΝ  
ΤΗΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑΝ ΤΟΥ  
ΦΙΛΟΧΙΤΟΥ ΙΟΥΣΤΙΝΙΑΝΟΥ  
ΚΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΓΝΗΣΙΟΝ  
ΔΟΥΛΕΥΟΝΤΑ ΑΥΤῶ  
ΒΙΚΤΩΡΗΝΟΝ + ΕΥΝ ΤΟΙΣ  
ΟΙΚΟΤΕΙΝ ΕΝ ΚΟΡΙΝΘῶ Κ. ΘΕΩΝ +  
ΖΩΝΤΑΣ +

Ἁγία Μαρία θεοτόκε, φύλαξον τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ φιλοχ[ρ]ίστου Ἰουστινιανοῦ καὶ τὸν γνησίως δουλεύοντα αὐτῇ Βικτορήνον σὺν τοῖς οἰκίῳις ἐν Κορίνθῳ κατὰ θεὸν ζῶντας.

*Holy Mary, God-bearer (Deipara), guard the kingdom of the Christ-loving Justinian and his faithful servant Victorinus with them that live godly in Corinth.*

Sixth century, between A.D. 527 and 565. Other and even stronger invocations of saints occur about this time. In one, too long to quote at length, Demetrius is invoked by Justinian to aid him against his enemies, in the capacity of a mediator with God (ὁ μεγαλομάρτυς Δημήτριε μεσίτευσον πρὸς θεὸν Ἰνα, κ.τ.λ. n. 8642). Another inscription, mutilated, from Thera (Santorin), of uncertain date, not later than the 4th or 5th century at latest according to Ross, begins — ἄγιε καὶ φοβέρε Μιχαὴλ ἀρχάγγελε, CUBIST. ANT.

βοήθει τῷ δούλῳ σου Ὁρίμῳ (n. 8911). Votive tablets were also erected to saints; one from the cemetery of Cyriace in Rome runs thus: *Petrus et Pancara votum posuent (sic) marture Felicitati*. (Marini, u. s., p. 15.) In another, found near the baths of Diocletian, Camasius and Victorinus pay their vows (votum reddunt) *Domnis Sanctis Papro et Mauroleoni marturibus* (Id. p. 14).

The expression, *μήτηρ Θεοῦ* (*Mother of God*), the usual title of the Virgin on the early mediæval camei (see GEMS) had not yet come into common use in the Greek church, as appears from Ephraim, patriarch of Antioch, a contemporary of Justinian. See Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. III.

8. *Sec. Voy. de deux Bénédict.* p. 234 (quoted by Martigny, *Dict.* p. 321). On a silver chalice given by Remigius, archbishop of Rheims (died A.D. 533) to his cathedral church.

HAVRIAT HINC POPVLVS VITAM DE SAN-  
GVINE SACRO  
INIECTO AETERNVS QVEM FVDIT VVLNERE  
CHRISTVS  
REMIGIVS REDDIT DOMINO SVA VOTA SA-  
CERDOS.

This is considered by Martigny to be in all appearance the "ministerial" (sacramental) chalice given by St. Remigius himself to the church of Rheims; see also *Archæol. Journ.* 1846, p. 134. The magnificent chalice of gold which goes by the name of Remigius, formerly at Rheims, now in the Paris Library, is of the 12th century (*Arch. Journ.* u. s.). For other inscriptions on chalices, see Marini, u. s. p. 197.

9. Le Blant, *Inscr. Chrét. de la Gaule*, ii. 348, n. 574. Engraved on the four scalloped edges of a square marble altar slab formerly in the ancient cathedral of Rodez.

DEVSDEDIT EPS INDIGNVS FIERI IVSSIT HANC  
ARAM.

Deusdedit is supposed to have been bishop of Rodez about the end of the 6th century: the inscription is doubtless a contemporary composition, but the letters and the sign of contraction *Λ* are suspected of having been restored.

The name *Deusdedit* occurs also on a gem (see GEMS); the form *Deusdet* is likewise found more than once in inscriptions (Le Blant, u. s. p. 433); for similar instances, see *Names* below. For the altars of Christian churches *ara* (though as old as Tertullian) is less commonly used than *altare*, especially in prose. For other inscriptions on altars see Marini (u. s. pp. 74–80). This and the altar at Ham of the 7th century are among the earliest that are inscribed (Le Blant, n. 91).

10. Camden, *Britan.* § "Brigantes," ed. 1600: "Accepimus crucem hic (at Dewsbury, Yorkshire) exstitisse, in qua inscriptum fuit:

PAVLINVS HIC PRAEDICAVIT ET CELE-  
BRAVIT."

Paulinus was bishop of York, A.D. 625–664.

The inscription upon it is among the earliest that we have in England, which are not sepulchral. Fragments of the ancient cross itself, probably broken at the Reformation, which Leland, in his *Itinerary*, mentions having seen, bearing the above inscription (temp. Henr. VIII.),



*Fabioi* (p. 145) has written so prettily, as implying a 'precious thing, intrusted to faithful, but temporary keeping' and some others which seem Christian in their tone occur sometimes in Pagan inscriptions (see M'Caul, u. s. pp. xiv. 4, 29; Tertull. *De Test. Anim.* c. 4, commented on by Fleetwood, *Inscr. Ant.*, Index, p. 6, who is deceived, however, in thinking that no Christians of Tertullian's age "refrigerium mortuis suis comprecatos esse." See *De Monag.* c. 10). And conversely some words and expressions which are not Christian, find their way occasionally from Pagan into Christian inscriptions, as *diuus aeterna*, *percipere* (*baptisma* sc. said primarily of the rites of Mithras and Cybele), *contra votum*, *Dirus* (said of emperors deceased); and even occasionally *D. M.*, or in full *Dis Manibus*, so usual at the head of Pagan inscriptions (see TOMB, and McCaul, u. s. p. 54, and his Index, s. v. *Pagan usages*). In fact there is a very small residuum indeed of mere words, i. e. not necessarily involving peculiar doctrines or religious distinctions<sup>7</sup> which are exclusively Pagan, or exclusively Christian.<sup>8</sup> Dr. McCaul remarks that there is scarcely one of the designations of the place of burial used in Christian epitaphs, that is peculiar to them, so far as he remembers, although he has not observed *quadrisomus* (*locus*) in any Pagan epitaph. Likewise he does not remember seeing *sepultus* in any Christian inscription of the first six centuries, and but rarely in Pagan ones; but yet *sepulcrum* occurs in both not rarely.<sup>9</sup> Again he says *praecedo* is charac-

et cinquième siècles, bien qu'on en ait quelques exemples antérieurs." Martigny, *Dict.* p. 319. Neither is the word universal, being very rarely found in Gaul.

<sup>7</sup> Thus the words *resurrectio*, *resurgo*, *baptidatus*, *redemptor*, perhaps also *sanctimonialis*, as well as the combinations *dies judicii*, *puella Dei* (a nun), and perhaps *famulus Dei*, applied in very many epitaphs to the pious dead, but in a few other inscriptions to the living (see § iv. n. 4) have no place in Pagan inscriptions, nor *costa* as applied to a wife (see De Rossi, n. 151). It might be thought that *Deo aeterno magno*, and in *aeternum renatus* would equally be absent; yet both occur, the former in connexion with goddesses (*deabus-que*), the latter in relation to the mysteries of Mithras. (Mal, *Script. Vet. Nov.* Coll. vol. v. p. 3 (note); Le Blant, *Inscr. Chrét. de la Gaule*, vol. II. p. 72). Christian influence may be suspected in these instances.

<sup>8</sup> At the same time it is undeniable that *depositus* (= *sepultus*) and *depositio* occur in a very large number of Christian inscriptions, but only in a very small number of Pagan ones (Orelli, n. 4555, is a clear example); while *elatus*, the classical expression for being carried out to burial, is so rare in Christian inscriptions that De Rossi can find no parallel to his single example (n. 1192). There may perhaps be some few other instances of the same sort of each kind.

<sup>9</sup> Since this sentence was penned, the writer has discovered an example of *sepultus* in an ancient Christian epitaph of Mauretania (Rénier, n. 4026). It is very possibly as early as the third century, to which several Pagan inscriptions in that region certainly belong. There is a second example in the same region, A.D. 416 (n. 3675), and a third, A.D. 389 (n. 3710). We have another instance occurring in an epitaph of Rimini, A.D. 523 (De Rossi, *Bull. Arch. Crist.* 1864, p. 15). The word is found also in Christian epitaphs of Spain, dated and undated, but perhaps in no case before the seventh century (Hübner, p. x. and the references). We have in fine in a Perugian inscription of Roman times (Vermigli, *Inscr. Perug.* t. II. p. 442) in qua (basilica sc.) *sepelliri non debet*. Cardinal Wiseman therefore is not strictly accurate in saying (*Fabiola*,

terstatically Christian, while *abscedo* he thinks occurs only (and that rarely) in Pagan epitaphs (u. s. pp. xiv. xv. 53). But who does not see that any new discovery may upset the supposed distinction? There are indeed phrases which appear to have an exclusively Christian meaning, such as *Deo reddere spiritum sanctum*, *apud Deum acceptus*, *decessit* or *exivit de saeculo*, *absolutus de corpore*, *receptus ad Deum*, *arcessitus ab angelis*, and a few others of the same kind.<sup>b</sup> (Mart. *Dict.* p. 315; M'Caul, u. s. p. xv.). The expression, in *pice*, is derived from the Jewish epitaphs, and passes over, both as an acclamation and otherwise, to the Christian inscriptions; its occurrence is generally considered to be a certain proof that the monument is not pagan. (See, however, MONEY.) "Dictio illa *In Pace* Christiana tota est" (Morcelli, *De Stil. Inscr. Lat.* II. p. 77; and so Martigny *Dict.* s. v. "In Pace," q. v.).

Upon the whole, it will perhaps be thought enough to give the following extract from the *Edinburgh Review* relative to the Latinity of the Christian inscriptions, with the addition of a few notes.

"The reader at once recognises in the Latinity of these epitaphs [of Italy and Gaul]<sup>c</sup> the germ of that total change in the government of prepositions, which is one of the great sources of distinction between the ancient and the modern languages of Italy.<sup>d</sup> The old distinction of government between the ablative and the accusative has evidently begun to disappear. Many of the prepositions are used indiscriminately with both those cases. Thus we read (De Rossi, *Inscr. Urb. Rom.* p. 82) that Pelegrinus "lived in peace *cum uxorem suam Silvanam*;" and in another place (p. 108), Agrippina erects a monument to her "sweetest husband, *cum quem vixit sine lesione animi, annos tres et menses decem*."

p. 145) "The word to bury is unknown in Christian inscriptions." It occurs even at Rome, which he had more particularly in his eye, in an inscription thought to be of the third century: *εταφη εδε ευσεβης* (Böckh, n. 9612). At the same time, for whatever reason, the word appears to be decidedly rare. But as it seems to be not much more common in Pagan inscriptions there is no great force in the cardinal's remark.

<sup>b</sup> There are also various expressions relating to light, as *lumen clarum*, *praemia lucis*, *lux nova*, &c. occurring in Christian epitaphs which contrast remarkably with the *lucis caret*, *jaceo in tenebris*, &c. of the Pagans. See Mart. *Dict.* p. 380. But this is a difference of feeling rather than of language. There are other similar contrasts which we can hardly discuss here. See M'Caul p. xii.; *Edimb. Rev.* u. s. p. 242. But some of the earliest Christian inscriptions express no feeling of any sort. See De Rossi, nos. 3, 6, 12, 13, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, all of the first three centuries.

<sup>c</sup> Much the same remarks may be made of the sepulchral inscriptions of Britain and of Africa. See TOMB.

<sup>d</sup> And of France. We have this interesting inscription of Berre, *Maria virgo minister de templo* (= *templi* = *du temple*) *Gerosale* (= *Jerusalem*), Le Blant, n. 542, A. The same author points out various other links of connection between the epigraphical Latin and the French language. Thus *qui*, which is invariable for both genders in French, is twice found on the epitaph of a nun, A.D. 431. (In an inscription of Piedmont *qui* in like manner agrees with *Maria*. Gazzera, *Mem. Acc. Tor.* u. s. p. 191.) In the fifth century we have also *santa*, which prepares the way for the modern *sainte*; from *spiritus* ("que l'on entend encore aux offices de villages") comes *esprit* (*Manuel*, p. 194).



A third monument is erected *pro caritatem* (Le Blant, *Inscr. Chret. Gaul.* vol. i. p. 400). In a fourth, a mother is entreated to pray for the child she has left behind, "*pro hunc unum ora subolem*" (De Rossi, p. 133). Conversely, we find *de sua omnia* (De Rossi, p. 133) and *decessit de saeculum* (p. 103). And although an occasional solecism of this kind might be explained by the rude and illiterate character of the individual author of the inscription, the frequency of the occurrence clearly indicates the settled tendency of the popular usage of the prepositions towards the abolition of all distinction in the government of cases.\* We may add that the same confusion of case is found in the inscriptions of the Jewish catacombs published by Father Garrucci, among which we read, on the one hand, *cum* with the accusative, as *cum virginium* (p. 50), and *cum Celerinum* (p. 52); and on the other, *inter* with the ablative, as *inter diceis*.

"It is hardly worth while, perhaps, to advert to such solecisms as *pauperorum* for *pauperum* (although it is plain from the recurrence of the same form in other words, as *omnium* for *omnium*, that the change is not an accidental error); or to the occasional use of forms rare, but not entirely unexampled, in classical Latin, as *nectus* (Le Blant, p. 15) as the participle of *neco*, or *utere* (De Rossi, p. 233) as the ablative of *uter*, a rare form following the third, instead of the second declension.<sup>†</sup> But it is impossible not to discern a foreshadowing of the modern idiom of Italy in such words as *pulla*, and still more *Pizzinina*, which is the direct prototype of the Italian *Piccinina*. The same may be said of the orthography, which, in many cases, points clearly towards the modern pronunciation. The form *santa* for *sancta* already appears; and the *x*, as in *sesies* for *series*, begins to give place to the modern *s*. This tendency goes, however, beyond individual words, and seems to indicate certain general principles of usage. We do not mean those broad characteristics which distinguish Italians and foreigners generally from ourselves, in the sounds of the vowels and diphthongs of the ancient languages, although in all these the interchanges of the characters of the two languages which the inscriptions frequently exhibit, and the characters employed in each to represent equivalent sounds of the other,

\* Martigny (*Dict.* p. 320) thinks that if an inscription has *cum* or *de* followed by an accusative, it must be placed in the fourth or fifth century. This seems very doubtful. We have certainly *inter sanctis* in an inscription of 268 A.D., and perhaps *cum eum* in another of 279 A.D. (see De Rossi, pp. 16, 21). Before this *cum sodales* occurs at Pompeii (*C. I. L.* iv. n. 221).

† Dr. McCaul notes some very singular instances of inflection, as the datives *Niceni*, *Agapeni*, *Leopardeti*, *Ireneti* (also *Ireni*), *Mercuraneti* from *Nice*, *Agape*, *Leoparde*, *Eirene*, *Mercurane* (*Mercuriane*); also *ispeti* for *spei*; likewise *Victoriaes* for *Victoriae* (u. s. p. xiii. and 18, 19). The same forms, as was to be expected, occur in Pagan inscriptions. Thus we find *Glyceni*, *Staplyleni*, &c. in Spain (*C. I. L.* H. Index, p. 779). We have also *Januariaes* for *Januariae*, at Pompeii (*C. I. L.* iv. n. 2233), and several similar examples; and *Ampliatas* in Spain (*C. I. L.* ii. n. 4975, 60). Professor Hübner, in fine, observes in a few Christian inscriptions of Spain, *Joanni*, *Pastori*, &c. as the genitives of *Joannes*, *Pastor*, &c. (p. xiii.), and conversely we have *Saturnis*, *Mercuris* as the genitives of *Saturnus*, *Mercurius* (De Rossi, nos. 172, 175).

are quite decisive against the English usage. We refer rather to certain peculiarities of Italian pronunciation, which are regarded as defects even by the Italians themselves, and which nevertheless find their counterpart here. One of these is the well-known *coda* or additional vowel sound, which Italian speakers often attach to words ending with a consonant. Of this there are numberless examples in De Rossi's volume; as *posuete* for *posuit* (p. 18). In like manner we find a type for the vowel sound prefixed to words; as *ispiritus* for *spiritus*, *iscribit* for *scribit* (p. 228); and the actual Italian sound of *h* (*ch* or *k*) between two vowels, which has long been the subject of ridicule, is found directly expressed in these inscriptions, in which *michi* is one of the forms of *mihi*.

"It is amusing too, to meet in the Roman catacombs, or among the Christians of ancient Gaul, the prototype of the cockney aspirate and its contrary. Thus we find upon the one hand (Le Blant, vol. i. p. 2-3), *Hossa* (for *ossa*), *Hordine*, *Hoctobres*, *Heterna*; and upon the other *oc* for *hoc* (Le Blant, p. 93), *ic* for *hic*, *Ilarus*, *ora*, *Onorius*, &c." (*Edinb. Rev.* 1864, pp. 234-5).

The *Index Grammaticus* added at the end of Hübner's Christian Inscriptions of Spain, gives a rich harvest of similar barbarisms. Nearly all the vowels are blundered in one way or other, and no small number of consonants; without dwelling on them we have the following: *hunc edificium*; *in annibus*; *post funers*; *in hunc tumulum requiescit*; *cum operarios venolos*; *offeret* (for *offert*;) besides other less heinous sins against inflections. For the Saxon forms which occur in inscriptions in England the reader is referred to Stephens' *Runic Monuments*, and for the Celtic forms in the Irish inscriptions to Petrie and Stokes' work thereon (see above).

Examples of bilingual inscriptions (Greek and Latin) and of Latin inscriptions in Greek characters, also of double rendering of words into Runic and Roman characters, as well as Celtic words in Ogham characters, will be noticed under *TOMB*.

**B. Proper Names used in Christian Inscriptions.**—For the proper names used in Christian inscriptions see careful and interesting notices in De Rossi, *I. U. R. Prof.* cxii.-cxiv.; McCaul, u. s. pp. xix.-xxi.; Hübner, u. s. pp. vi. vii., and the references.

The Edinburgh Reviewer has treated this matter so well for the Latin inscriptions of Italy, Gaul, and Africa, taking also some slight notice of the Greek inscriptions, that his words are set down with little abridgment. The account has been supplemented by a few words about the Spanish, British, and Irish names which occur in the early Christian inscriptions of those countries.

\* The small proportion of patrician families among the early Christians will hardly suffice to explain the rapid disappearance among them of the use of the three names, which had hitherto been the peculiar privilege of the aristocratic class. Not a single inscription after Constantine presents three names; and of the ante-Constantinian inscriptions, there are but two [rather, is but one] in which the three names occur \* \* \* \* After Constantine, except Flavius, which continued in partial use, prænomena may be said entirely to disappear. The old distinctive *Gentile* name too, quickly followed. The inscriptions before Constantine abound with *Aurelii*

Cornelli, Claudii, Antonii, &c. \* \* \* \* Thus, in the Aurelian age, we find Aurelius or Aurelia repeated seven times; and under Constantius and his sons, Constantinus. Constantius and Constans, have their turn of popularity. The Gentile name, however, was quickly displaced by new forms terminating in *nus* as Lactantius, Dignantius, Crescentius, Leontius; or in *us*, as Bonosus. A favourite form in the third and succeeding centuries was some laudatory epithet, as Benignus, Castus, Grata, Castula. Often, especially in Africa, in the superlative degree; as Dignissimus, Felicissimus, Acceptissima. Sometimes similar adjectives appear in the comparative degree, as Dignior, Nobilior; and occasionally the abstract quality itself, as Prudentia, Ἀγάπη, &c., is found as the name. The names of the fourth, fifth, and later centuries would be found on examination to furnish the type, if not the exact equivalent of most of the fanciful appellatives of the pulmy days of puritanism. We meet, not merely with simple forms such as *πίστις*, ἔλπις, ἀγάπη, Decentia, Prudentia, Dignitas, Idonitas, σωζομένη;<sup>8</sup> or Renatus, Redemptus, Refrigerius, Projectus; or the more self-abasing appellatives, Stercorius or Contumeliosus, but compound names of the true Puritan stamp, such as Deus Dedit, Servus Dei, Adeodatus, Quod vult Deus \* \* \*

"In a few instances occasion is taken from the name to introduce into the sentiment of the epitaph some playful allusion to the etymological import of the name; and although this practice is more consonant with the tastes of the later times, yet the inscriptions of the classic period, present examples of a similar play upon words, of which we may instance the sentence from the very pretty epitaph of Claudia given by Orelli (vol. i. p. 547).

"HIC EST SEPULCRUM HAUD PULCRUM PULCRAI FEMINAE." [Pulcher was a cognomen of the gens Claudia.] These allusions in the Christian epitaphs are commonly very simple. Thus we meet INFELIX FELICITAS, and INFAUSTUS FELIX. A monument is erected to *Innocentius* in recognition of his *innocence*, PRO INNOCENTIA SUA. GLYCO (γλυκύς, sweet) is described as "*sweeter* than his name." The sorrowing friends of ANTHUS bemoan his years "*stript of their flowers*:" and even in a very tender poetical epitaph, addressed to the memory of Verus, by his wife Quintilla (whose grief for his loss proclaims itself so extreme that it is only the fear of God that restrains her from following him to the grave, and that she vows to remain a widow for his sake), room is found, in the midst of all the writer's passionate expressions of sorrow, for a pun upon the name of "HIC VERUS, QUI SEMPER VERA LOCUTUS,"<sup>9</sup> a pun exactly similar to that contained in the epitaph of the emperor Probus, which Vopiscus has preserved—"HIC PROBUS IMPERATOR, ET VERE PROBUS, SITUS EST" (u. s. pp. 236-237).

The proper names which occur on the Christian inscriptions of Spain (Hübner, praef. pp. vi. sqq.) are more varied. The old Roman nomina gentilicia are rare, and generally occur alone, as Aurelius, Julius, Licinia, &c., but with a provincial cognomen occasionally added, such as A. (Aurelius) Vincentius. We have also numerous examples of old Roman cognomina, as Avitus,

<sup>8</sup> A remarkably pretty specimen is given in De Rossi's *Roma Sotterranea*, vol. i. p. 262, where Faith makes an epitaph to her sister Hope which runs thus—

PISTE SPEI  
SoRoRI DVL  
CISSIMAE  
FECIT. (Dove.)

But it ought to be remembered that *Spes* is a name not unfrequent in Roman Pagan epitaphs, so that the now famous fragment of the Bristol inscription which contains it is not on that account presumably Christian: apart from the symbols, dog, cock, and asp, and the portrait (?), it now reads only SPES C. SENTI (filla).

<sup>9</sup> This Christian epitaph is published by Fabretti, III. 620.

Dexter, Felix, Crispinus, Camilla. Of the more modern names are those which are of truly Latin origin, as Aeternalis, Amator, Axella, Iominicus, Februarius, Honorius, Sanctus, which seem to be generally diffused in the provinces of the empire; also the following, which appear to be peculiar to Spain (including of course Portugal): Bracarius, Cerevella, Cuparius, Graniola, Lilliolus, Salvianella, &c. There are also many which come from the Greek, as Arcadius, Basilia, Glaucus, Leontius, Macarius, Theodosius, Zenon, &c. Others are still more modern, such as Agilo, Ermengond, Froila, Gulfinus, Huniric, Oppila, Reccisvinthus, Reswentus, Sonnica, Marispalla (fem.), Swinthiliuba (fem.), all which are probably Gothic; also "Anna Gaudiosa sive Africa" (n. 71) and Maurus, which are of course both African; and Bacauda and Camuelates, which appear to be Gaulish. The origin of others, as Istorna, Locuber, Macona (fem.), Quinigia, Quistricia, and Rexina, is unknown. To these must be added Scriptural names, as Emmanuel, Johannes, Maria, Sallomon, Susanna, Thomas, &c.; those of the puritanical type mentioned above appear to be wanting.

With regard to Great Britain we find (for the British period) some Latin names, as Viventius and Florentius (in Scotland), also Silius, Paulinus, Saturninus, and Carausius (in Wales and Cornwall), and some of these forms, as Augustinus and Paulinus, were re-imported from Rome in Saxon times. But there are also Celtic names occurring, as Isnioe (in Cornwall), Pascent (or Pasgen), Cadfan, Cyngen, Pabo, Boduoc (in Wales), and Drost, Voret, Forcas (Fergus?) and others (in Scotland); as well as Saxon or Scandinavian names, such as Sinnik (in Scotland), Herebricht, Hildithruth, Wulfhere, and the like (in England). A Saxon name is occasionally Latinised, as Wini into Ovinus. In Ireland the great mass of the names is Celtic, but occasionally a Latin form is Hibernized, as Columbanus into Cholumban: very occasionally a Latin form, as Martinus, survives.

C. *Words and Formulae employed in different ages and places.*—The words and phrases relating to burial and other matters vary a good deal in different places, and in the same place at different times. M. Le Blant has collected these "*formules d'épigraphie chrétienne*" with considerable industry; but a good many additions might easily be made. He even takes no notice at all of some provinces, *e.g.* Dalmatia and Pannonia, which however have some formulae and words of interest.<sup>1</sup>

Several of the selected inscriptions (sepulchral and others) have been chosen partly on account of the formulae therein contained, and some remarks upon them are made in their places.

But it is well observed by Hübner that until the Christian inscriptions of all parts of the world have been collected and edited, it is im-

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.* an inscription from Sabaria (Stein an Angar) speaking of a dead child, has "*requiem accipit in Deo patre nostro, et Christo ejus*" (*Corp. Inscr. Lat.* t. iii. n. 4221, edited by Mommsen). Another (n. 4220) from the same place begins: "*Bonememorle, in Deo vivas. Iodorus Civ. Graec. ex reg. Ladic. q. vix. an. L. &c.*" (*Bonememorius* occurs in Gaul, Le Blant, *Man.* p. 77). See also n. 6399 sqq. from Dalmatia, where we have *hic in pace jacet, depositus, &c.*

possible to say what formulae are peculiar to each: those which we consider to be peculiar may turn out to be universal or common to many provinces (u. s. p. vii.).<sup>a</sup>

The following is a translation with slight omissions and additions<sup>1</sup> and a few tacit corrections, mostly for the Greek, of M. Le Blant's *Manuel d'Epigraphie Chréti.* pp. 75-85 (Paris, 1860), omitting the references to his own work for Gaul and to those of others, as De Rossi (Rome), Gazzera (Piedmont), Mommsen (kingdom of Naples), Rénier (Algeria), and (for the Greek) Böckh. To this has been added (besides some Roman phrases) a collection of Spanish formulae derived from Hubner; also a notice of the few formulae which occur in Great Britain and Ireland.

"That which is true for ancient coins, as also for the works of architecture, is not less so in that which concerns the monuments of epigraphy. In each new place which he visits, the antiquary sees variations of the formulae, the symbols, the writing, the disposition, the ornaments of the marbles. Though apparently of little importance, these marked differences are worthy of being studied with care. Arising sometimes from the difference of the times, as well as from that of the places, they are able to serve as guides in the restoration of the texts, to fix the nationality of personages, the age of the inscriptions, and even to furnish materials for the history of ideas.

"I must appeal to the patience of the reader in undertaking to place before him some features of the localisation of the types and formulae of Christian epigraphy. Below are those which seem to me the most remarkable in different provinces:

#### Germania Prima:

Mayence: IN HOC TITVLO REQUIESCIT FELICITER. Worms: TITVLVM POSVIT.

#### Belgica Prima:

Treves: PRO CARITATE, and the like; TITVLVM POSVIT; HIC IACET; HIC IACET IN PACE; PATRES (titulum posuerunt).

#### Belgica Secunda:

Amlens: VBI FECIT NOVEMBER DIES XV, and the like; DEFVNCTVS EST.

#### Viennensis:

SVRRECTVRVS IN XPO, and analogous formulae. Briord: HYMANITAS; ABSTVTVS (i.e. *astutus*, in a good sense). Briord and Vienne: VOLVNTAS. Vaison and Arles: PAX TECVM. Marseilles: RECESSIT, retained even when this word has disappeared in other places from the epigraphical formulary.

<sup>a</sup> Dr. M'Caul, usually most accurate, illustrates this remark by a statement that among the many expressions for our "here lies" we have "hic iacet (not often), ἐνθάδε κεῖται (often)," p. xlii. We may safely say of *hic iacet* that it occurs almost everywhere, being found first in Rome, then in Gaul, Spain, Dalmatia, Algeria, and Britain, in which last country it is almost the only formula. Nor does there seem to be any reason to think it rare in any of those countries. M. Le Blant, however, only notices it under Gaul. The Greek rendering of this, ἐνθάδε κεῖται, or κατέκειται, is also very general, but perhaps not quite so common: it occurs in Rome, Sicily, Gaul; in Egypt, Dalmatia, and Greece; Algeria, and Cyrene; also in Asia Minor, but not everywhere. In truth M. Le Blant's is only a sketch partially worked out, but still very interesting.

<sup>1</sup> They are enclosed in brackets.

#### Aquitania Prima:

Coules: TRANSIT IN ANNOS

#### Narbonensis Prima:

Toulouze: REQUIEVIT IN PACE.

#### Lugdunensis Prima, Viennensis:

BONAEMEMORIVS (adject.); APTVS (i.e. *sympathetic*).

#### Lugdunensis Prima et Secunda, and a good many other (though not all) parts of Gaul:

BONAE MEMORIAE; very uncommon at Rome.

#### Lugdunensis Prima, Germania Prima, Maxima Sequanorum, Viennensis, Aquitania Prima:

VIXIT IN PACE.

#### Lugdunensis Prima et Quarta, Viennensis, Prima et Secunda Narbonensis:

OBIIT, in common use (though seldom at Rome).

#### Lugdunensis Prima, Viennensis, Aquitania Prima:

TRANSIT; not common at Rome.

#### [Lugdunensis Prima, Viennensis:

FAMVLVS DEI (applied in epitaphs to the dead. See Le Blant, *Manuel*, pp. 10, 24, and references.]

#### Spain:

FAMVLVS DEI, or CHRISTI. [Apparently always similarly applied. See Hübner, pp. xi. 111, 112 and references. For the Spanish formulae in general, see below.<sup>m</sup>] This formula does not occur among those of the catacombs registered by Bado and Boldetti.

#### <sup>m</sup> Spain:—

*The formula In peace.*—IN PACE (in various connections), with REQUIESCIT, REQUIEVIT, RECESSIT, REQUIESCAT, &c.; DOMINI, CHRISTI, IESV being sometimes added. See Hübner, u. s. pp. ix. x.

*Consecration formulae.*—IN NOMINE DI (DOMINI?) NOSTRI I. C. CONSACRATA EST ECCLESIA S. STEPHANI PRIMI MARTYRIS; IN NOMINE DOMINI CONSECRATA ECCLESIA S. MARIE; EPISCOPVS CONSECRAVIT HANC BASILICAM; IN NOMINE DOMINI SACRATA EST ECCLESIA; IL KAL. IANUARIi ERA D LXXX DEDICATA EST HAEC ECCLESIA SCE MARIE; DEDICATA EST HEC BASILICA A PIMENIO ANTISTITE; DEDICAVIT HANC AEDEM DOMINVS BACAVDA EPISCOPVS.

*Reliquary formulae.*—IN NOMINE DOMINI HIC SVNT RECONDITE RELIQVIE SANCTORVM SERVANDI, GERMANI, etc.; RECONDITE SVNT IC RELIQVIE DE CRVORE DOMINI, SANCTI BABILE, etc.

*Building formulae.*—CEPRIANO EPISCOPV (sic) ORDINANTE EDIFICATA [est haec ecclesia]; HAEC SANCTA TRIA TABERNACVLA IN GLORIAM TRINITATIS (in unitate?) COOPERANTIBVS SANCTIS AEDIFICATA SVNT AB INLVSTRI GVDILIVVA CVM OPERARIOS VERNOS ET SVMPV PROPRIO; CONSVMATVM OC OPVS ERA DCCXX; FVNDAVIT EAM (sc. aram) ALTISIMVS PER EVLALIAM ET FILIVM EIVS PAVLVM MONACHVM; PERFECTVM EST TEMPLUM.

*Votive formulae.*—RECCESVINTHVS REX OFFERET (offert) (sc. coronam); OFFERET MVNVSVLVM S. STEPHANO THEODOSIVS ABBA.

*Sepulchral formulae* (length of life).—VIXIT TOT ANNOS, or ANNIS; or ANNORVM TOT; CVM MARITO ANNIS TOT; PLVS MINVS TOT (without annos); ANNORVM DIERVMOVE TOT; QVI IN HOC SAECVLO CONPLEVERAT LVSTROS TOT

**Gallia Cisalpina :**

**Como:** VIXIT IN HOC SAECVLO ANNOS. *Como, Alba, Pollenzo, Nice and the environs:* DEPOSITVS SVB DIEM XIV KAL., etc. *Como, Milan, Aquileja, Florence, Bologna, etc.:* B.M., at the head of inscriptions. *Turin, Tortona, Milan, Brescia, Civita di Friuli, Aquileja:* CONTRA VOTVM POSVIT. *Piedmont:* HIC REQVIESCIT IN SOMNO PACIS.

**Latium :**

**Rome, Ostia:** LOCVS, at the beginning of the inscription. **Rome:** DEPOSITVS, very common form, of which Gaul gives scarcely four examples; REFRIGERIVM, IN REFRIGERIO, REFRIGERET DEVS (once only in Gaul); LOCVM EMIT, or COMPARAVIT, a formula which is completely unknown in Gaul; the mention of a tomb prepared by the living is very rare in Gaul. **Ostia:** HIC DORMIT, CVM DEVS PERMISERIT, QVANDO DEVS VOLVERIT.

**Campania :**

**Naples:** IN AVLA REGNI TVI, INDVC EOS IN CAELESTIA REGINA.

**Apuleia :**

**Mirabella, Eclanum, Fontanarosa, etc.:** HIC REQVI-

AETATIS SVAE XLIII; DECEDIT E VITA. Sometimes the words ANVS, PVER, VIRGO are introduced.

**Formulae of Burial.**—DEPOSITIO; HVIC RVDI TVMVLO IACENS; IN HOC LOCO QVIESCENS; IN HOC TVMVLO IACET; HIC RECONDITVM EST CORPVS; DEPOSITVS IN PACE; IN ISTO LOCO SEPVLTVS EST; HIC SITVS EST; *ἐταφρώθη μετὰ εἰρήνης.*

**Prayers for the Dead.**—DOMINE IESV CHRISTE, FAMVLE TVE OMNIA PECCATA DIMITTE (A.D. 682); PRECATVS, VT PRO TVO PROMISSO ET SVB LIBAMINE (sublevamine) MEREAMVR INGRESSE PARADISI IANVE (seemingly offered for the dead, but? see n. 96); YNER ANAHAYCEOC KAI COTHPIAC THC MAKAPIAC KYPIHC KITOYPAC.

**Acclamations.**—CHIONI VIVAS; LVPICVS VIVIT; MARCIANE VIVAS IN CHRISTO (said of the living).

**Station of the deceased in life.**—The public and private station of the deceased are very rarely mentioned; and then only extending to VIR INLVSTRIS, CLARISSIMA FEMINA, etc. The usual designations are FIDELIS, FIDELIS CHRISTI, FAMVLA or FAMVLVS DEI or CHRISTI; also BAPTIDIATVS (once).

**Ecclesiastical station in life.**—ABBA; ANTISTES; DEVOTA VIRGO; PONTIFEX; VIRGO CHRISTI; VOTA DEO.

\* The following formulae (from De Rossi's *I. U. R.* vol. i. *passim*) may be added for Rome up to A.D. 400, and from Bückh (*C. I. G.*).

**Formulae of death.**—ORBIT; DECESSIT; DISCESSIT; RECESSIT; DORMIT; DORMIT IN PACE; MORTVA EST; DEFVNCTA; TEAEYTA; ETEAEYTHCEN; ENAYCATO; IPOAPEI, ETEAIOEH (Bückh); KOIMATE (*κοιμάται*, *id.*); EN EIPHNH; DE SAECVLO RECESSIT, or DECESSIT, or EXIBIT (*exiit*); RECESSIT DE HAC LVCE; IIT AD DEVM; RECEPVS AD DEVM; PRAECESSIT AD PACEM; EXIVIT IN PACE; QVIESCET IN PACE; REQVIESCET IN SOMNO PACIS; ABSOLVTVS DE CORPORE; SPIRITVS IN LVCE DOMINI SVSCEPTVS EST.

**Sepulchral Formulae.**—HIC IACET, ENΘΑΔΕ KEITAI, or KATAKEITAI (Bückh); HIC SITVS EST; HIC DORMIT; HIC POSITA EST; DEPOSITIO; KATAΘECIC; ETAΦH (Bückh); KATETEΘH (*id.*).

**Designation of tomb.**—LOCVLVS; BISOMVS, TRISOMVS, QVADRISOMVS (with LOCVS expressed or understood); ΤΟΠΟC, CVBICVLVM, AETERNA DOMVS.

ESCIT IN SOMNO PACIS, DEPOSITIO EIVS III IDVS . . . etc.

**Brutium, Campania, Apulia :**

B. M. (*i. e. bonae memoriae*) at the head of inscriptions.

**Africa :**

**Sitiffa, Cirta, Cearea, Rusgunia, etc.:** MEMORIA, at the beginning of the inscription. **Sitiffa, Orléansville, Arbal, Portus Magnus:** PRAECESSIT. **Hamman bel Hanefia, Hadjar Roum, Portus Magnus:** DECESSIT, DISCESSIT. **Cirta, Kalama, Carthage, etc.:** VIXIT IN PACE. [**Caesarea:** IN PACE HIC QVIESCIT; ACCUBITORIVM; SEPVLTVS. **Sitiffa:** HIC IACIT. **Cirta:** ENΘΑΔΕ KEITE.]

**Greece :**

**Athens:** KOIMHTHPION, at the beginning of the inscription.

**Galatia :**

**Tachorum, etc.:** ΘECIC.

**Cilicia :**

**Mopsuestia, Tarsus, Corycus, Seleucia:** ΤΟΠΟC. **Seleucia, Bor:** ΜΝΗΜΑ. **Mopsuestia, Tarsus:** ΜΝΗΜΑ ΔΙΑΦΕΡΟΝ. **Seleucia:** ΧΑΜΟCΟΡΙΝ (*χαμαισόριον*), ΠΑΡΑΚΤΑΤΙΚΟΝ; in the sense of sepulchre. **Corycus, Epinoia, Seleucia, ΘΗΚΗ.** **Corycus:** CΟΜΑΤΟΘΗΚΗ, ΘΗΚΗ ΔΙΑΦΕΡΟΥCΑ.

**Syria :**

**Andrena, Phylea, Schmerrin, Horus, on the gates:** ΑΥΤΗ Η ΠΥΛΗ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ. K.T.A.

**Palestine :**

**Jerusalem:** ΜΝΗΜΑ ΔΙΑΦΕΡΟΝ; ΘΗΚΗ ΔΙΑΦΕΡΟΥCΑ.

**Egypt :**

**Benka el Assel:** ΕΠ ΑΓΑΘΟ. **Thebes:** Ο ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC, applied to the dead; [Ο ΘΕΟC ΑΝΑΠΑΥCΙ ΕΝ CΚΗΝΑΙC ΑΓΙΟΝ. **Alexandria:** ΜΝΗΘΗΤΙ ΤΗC ΚΟΙΜΗCΕΟC ΤΗC ΔΟΥΛΗC CΟΥ.]

**Nubia :**

**Phile:** ΕΠ ΑΓΑΘΟ. **Kalabacheh:** Ο ΜΑΚΑΡΙΟC, applied to the dead; [ΕΝΘΑ ΚΑΤΑΚΕΙΤΕ]. **Kalabacheh, cemetery of Wady-Gazal:** ΑΝΑΠΑΥCΟΝ Ο ΘΕΟC ΤΗΝ ΨΥΧΗΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΚΟΛΠΙC (*κολποις*) ΑΒΡΑΑΜ ΚΑΙ ΙCΑΑΚ ΚΑΙ ΙΑΚΩΒ. **Colasucia:** Ο ΘΕΟC ΤΟΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΝ ΚΑΙ CΑΡΚΟC . . . ΑΝΑΠΑΥCΟΝ ΤΗΝ ΨΥΧΗΝ.

**Great Britain :**

IC IACET; HIC TVMVLO IACIT; IN OC TVMVLO IACIT; A. HIC IACIT B. FILIVS; HIC IACIT IN CONGERIES (*sic*) LAPIDVM; A FILIVS B HIC IACIT; HIC IACENT SANCTI ET PRAECIPVI SACERDOTES; HIC MEMOR IACIT; HIC IN SEPVLCHRO REQVIESCIT; IN MEMORIAM SANCTORVM; LVCEM TVAM DA DEVS ET REQVIEM; and (later) ROGO OMNIBVS AMBVLANTIBVS EXORENT PRO ANIMA; also (in Celt.) OR DO (pray for); and (in Saxon) BECUN AFTER (a memorial to) . . .; GIBIDDADDAER SAVLE (pray for the soul); also name only.

**Ireland :**

HIC DORMIT (once); name only in genitive (in Latin); and in Celtic, of which the great majority are composed, OR or OROIT DO (pray for); OR or OROIT AR (pray for); BENDACHD FOR ANMAIMN (a blessing on the soul of); SAPEI SAHATTOS ([the stone] of the wise sage); also name only (very frequently).

**D. Acclamations.**—There is still one point relating to the phraseology of Christian inscriptions, on which it may be convenient to say a





longer doubtful, be transferred to the life to come.<sup>9</sup>

Other forms express to the dead good wishes for their rest or peace. Thus on a gem, found in a grave of (bone) QVERQVAT, (quiescat) (see GEM), and on tombs QVERE IN PACE (Marini, p. 386), QVERQVAT BENE IN PACE (Id. p. 385). Nor can we well take such phrases as FAX TRICUM (Le Blant, n. 490, etc.), *elphoy eoi* (Böckh, n. 9486), *elphoy (elphoy) eoi dr elphoy* (Id. n. 9844), and *elphoy vñe*, with or without *dr thg* (Id. nos. 9487-8), as other than good wishes addressed to the departed, not affirmations of a full accomplishment, but a confident prayer, or rather a sure hope, that the state of peace may continue. In other inscriptions, however, it is evidently regarded as already accomplished, e.g., *drtrawer Agla dr elphoy* (Marini, p. 456). Compare *dr elphoy spadye* (Böckh, n. 9645 and 9632); *ODORNIVIT IN PACE INEV, QVEN DILEXIT, OBIT IN PACE DEI* (Hubner, n. a. p. x.). The full expression *elphoy eoi thra, FAX VORIVITV ART*, also occurs (Böckh, n. 9710; Le Blant, n. 526). More interesting are the acclamations which relate to *refrigerium*, which God himself is often elsewhere invoked to bestow on the departed. De Rossi notes the occurrence of *spiritum tuum Deus refrigeret*,<sup>10</sup> and the like, as occurring in early Christian epitaphs (*Prod.* p. cx.). But here the deceased is addressed, in the hope that he is in receipt of that refreshment, or as being sure to receive it. Thus we have the neuter verb *refrigerare*, to enjoy a cool repose, in this connection, IN ROSO REFRIGERER (Marini, p. 420), i.e., *may you enjoy refreshment in a good place, by which is intended Paradise, or the bosom of Abraham*; REFRIGERA CVM SPIRITU SANCTO, i.e., *in thine own holy soul* (Marangoni, *Cons. Gen.* p. 460. See Tertull., *adv. Marc.* lib. iv. c. 34). More rarely ACCEPTA EIS IN CRISTO (Marini, p. 454) is the form which the acclamation assumes, with which *Xpocvdr parv eoi* (Böckh, n. 9697) may be compared, as well as AETERNA TINI LUX IN CRISTO (Marini, n. a. p. 450), the last word being expressed by the christema. Some addresses to the dead, however, are congratulatory, as BENE VIVENTI (sk.), VENE CONSVANTI (Marini p. 434), ANIMA TVA CVM IVETIS (Id. p. 381), IN REFRIGERIO ANIMA TVA (Fabretti, p. 547), where *off* rather than *oil* seems to be understood.

The Greek acclamation *θάψω* (i.e. *θάψω*) is sometimes placed at the end of an epitaph (Böckh, n. 9621); and sometimes at the begin-

ning (Id. n. 9789), addressed in each case to the departed. Another imperative *ταφύτω* (was *ap*) in singular contrast to the *quiescat* above, is occasionally found at the end of Christian inscriptions (Id. 9599, 9570); it may probably contemplate the return of the Saviour. *Εὐαγγελ* also occurs (Id. 9800).

The Latin classical form *ave*, much used by the Pagans, is found also in a Christian epitaph, and written AVE (Böckh, n. 9635). We have also HAVE VALE on the same monument (Le Blant, n. 495).

In the last place are to be noted prayers or requests to the departed to pray to God for the survivors.<sup>11</sup> De Rossi notes that in the earlier undated inscriptions of the catacombs (i.e., those before the peace of Constantine), we have *pote pro nobis, pro parentibus, pro conjuge, pro filio, pro sorore* (*Prod.* p. cx.). To these Dr. McCaul adds *roga, ora pro nobis*, but adds at the same time that there are "comparatively few among the thousands" of these undated inscriptions, which contain these prayers, and "that instances of the mention in such forms of others than the members of the family of the deceased are extremely rare." He has observed only one dated example, of the year 380 A.D. (De Rossi, n. 288) which contains any such request; it has the expression *PRO HVIC VIVM ORA SVDOLEM* (n. a. p. xviii.). With respect to such acclamations of affection as *oicis amica, amica pura of mundi, omnia innox, parv inveniens, φυχῇ καλῇ*, and the like, they are applied in Christian inscriptions of various kinds both to the living and the dead, and need hardly be dwelt upon in this place (see Garrucci, n. a. Index, s. v. *oicis amica*; Martigny, *Dict.* p. 7; Perret, *Cat. de Rome*, t. v. pl. 17; Böckh, n. 9697).

**E. Style and Structure.**—Such inscriptions as relate to public works, churches, basilicas, fontaines, or to sacred objects and furniture, altars, chalices, crosses, liturgical book-covers, &c., or to votive offerings and the like, need hardly be taken into the present account. They exist in prose and verse, both in Greek and in Latin, and are of very various styles and lengths. A large number of such are collected by Marini, and edited by Mai (*Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.* tom. v. pp. 1-256); to this work more especially the reader is referred. Many of them, however, are later than the period embraced in his work. Very few inscriptions, if any, which belong to this class, go back before the time of Constantine, so far as the writer is aware, and can hardly be taken into account till after the close of the 4th century. With regard, however, to the sepulchral inscriptions the case is somewhat different. They can, to some extent at least, be classified by their style. But the first thing to be borne in mind is that inscriptions of one country are as a rule for those of another. Those of Britain and of Ireland, for example, are both unlike each other, and unlike those of Gaul, Spain, and Italy, of nearly the same period. The Greek inscriptions, again, admit for the most part of but little comparison with the Latin ones; the Greek and

<sup>9</sup> The indicative is likewise found, as in *Deo deusdū e vñd* (Hubner, n. a. p. xl.); and both expressions amount in reality to the same thing. The reader, however, may see Martigny, *Dict.* s. v. "Purgatoire" for a different view of the optative formulae.

<sup>10</sup> The verb is there used transitively. In the Latin version of St. Irenaeus, *refrigerare* is the rendering of *δωρανοσναι*, and Doucange accordingly (*Gloss.* n. v.) explains the Latin word by *refrigerare*, which is substantially correct. *Refrigerare* as used by Tertullian and in the *Acclamations* does not mean "a release from pain, but an enjoyment of positive though imperfect happiness on the part of the just from the very moment of their dissolution in that separate shade which Tertullian compares our Lord to distinguish by the appellation of Abraham's bosom."—Faber, *Off. of Roman-ens*, book i. c. v.

<sup>11</sup> See De Rossi (n. a.). The words occur in this sense in the epitaph of St. Severa at Rome. See Tamm.

<sup>12</sup> The invocation of the Virgin and of saints (see above § iv.) are scarcely to be accounted acclamations, and are better considered separately.

Latin inscriptions to Dometius, written on the same slab, are a good illustration of this (Le Blant, *Insc. Chrét. Gaul.* n. 613A).

With few exceptions the earlier inscriptions are characterised by their brevity and simplicity, while from the 4th century onwards they assume in some countries, as in Italy, Gaul, and Spain, a more complex and ornate character. In the earlier epitaphs, moreover, sometimes occur traits more or less similar to the pagan epitaphs, e.g. mention of those who made the tomb, which by degrees disappear. They also contain a much greater number of acclamations, most of which soon vanish completely. In the 4th century Christian Latin epigraphy began to make a style of its own, and for the first time we now get at Rome such opening words as *hic requiescit in pace*, or *in somno pacis*, *hic quiescit*, *hic jacet*, *hic positus est*, &c.; and new rhetorical phrases, as *mirae innocentiae*, *sapientiae*, *sanctitatis*, &c., begin to make their appearance. It is not until about this time that any mention of the secular profession of the deceased occurs in the Latin inscriptions; and it is not very commonly mentioned at any time. The chrisma and the cross, signs of a triumphant faith, now come in abundantly. The inscriptions of Gaul followed the style of Rome a good deal, and the same or similar formulae appear upon them at a somewhat later time. It is in these Roman and Gaulish inscriptions that changes of style can best be studied, because they are so numerous, because so many of them bear dates, and, in fine, because they have been so admirably edited. M. De Rossi makes some remarks on the changes of style in the Roman inscriptions (*Insc. Urb. Rom., Prolegom.*, pp. cx.-cxvi.), and will in another volume discuss *totam stili epigraphici Christiani doctrinam*. M. Le Blant, in the first fifty-eight pages of his *Manuel*, treats of the successive variations in the Gaulish inscriptions (few of which, however, are before the age of Constantine), and also establishes the fact that blank formulae were in circulation for the use of stonecutters, where of course the number of years of the deceased or of the reigning king could only be expressed by the word *tot* or *tantus*, and that the stonecutter has sometimes neglected to replace the *tantus* by the particular number required. (See Le Blant, *u. s.* pp. 59-74.) Similarly in Spain traces of blank formulae can be recognised (Hübner, *u. s.* p. viii.).

By means of a careful study of the phrases of the dated inscriptions a close approximation may sometimes be made to the date of an undated one; great caution, however, is necessary, as certain expressions held their place for a long period. (See Le Blant, *u. s.* pp. 31-33).

#### (vi.). Dates of Christian Inscriptions.

(a) Christian inscriptions, when dated, most usually bear the names of consuls, and all the earliest are thus dated. Sometimes one, more usually both consuls, are given, the names being commonly contracted. The abbreviation COS for *consulibus* was in use up to the middle of the 3rd century, after which COSS, CONS, and CONSS, came to be successively adopted: COS is very seldom found during the 4th century, and almost never in the 5th or 6th: COSS fell into disuse

about the first quarter of the 5th century, and after that CONS was used.<sup>1</sup>

The numerals, to designate a second or third consulate, are frequently prefixed to COS and the other abbreviated forms; but where there is no ambiguity they are sometimes omitted. A very strange abbreviation was occasionally used, though in Christian inscriptions it is exceedingly rare: the names of the consuls were omitted and the numbers only retained. In an epitaph from a Christian crypt at Motycia, in Sicily, to "Euterpe, the companion of the Muses," her death is fixed to Nov. 27, *ἑννενήκοντα καὶ τὸ γ'* in the consulship of our Lords for the tenth time and for the third time, i. e. 360 A.D., when Constantius was in his tenth consulate, and Julian in his third. (Böckh, n. 9524.)

Another form of dating was by a post-consulate, i. e. the words POST CONSULATVM, or the abbreviations POST CONS, POST CONSS (or from the middle of the 5th century), P C, and even POST (or POS) only was placed before the consuls' names of the year preceding, "when it was not known who were the consuls of the year, or when the name of but one was known, or when it was necessary or expedient not to mention them" (Mc Caul, *u. s.* p. xxvi.). This formula, which is said to have arisen in the troublesome times of Maxentius, 307 A.D., rarely appears in Christian inscriptions till 542 A.D., when the post-consulate of Basil the younger was taken as a point of departure for almost the whole empire, and the years *post consulatum Basilii* extend up to xxix. The consulate of Justin in 566 A.D. gave birth to another era of post-consulates, which lasted nine years.

There are various other matters connected with consular dates which are intentionally passed over here. For the whole subject see De Rossi (*Insc. Urb. Rom.* pp. xiii.-liv.; and for an epitome of the more important parts, McCaul (*u. s.* p. xxiii.-xxvii.).<sup>2</sup>

(b) Other inscriptions are dated by an era, whether of a province or of a city. Examples of the former are seen in Spain and Mauretania; of the latter in various parts of Asia, where the eras of Antioch and Bostra (among others) obtained currency. Examples of these will be found above, and below under TOMB. In all these parts of the empire Christian inscriptions were very rarely dated by the consuls, and those are mostly of the 6th century (De Rossi, *u. s.* p. xiii.). For other eras employed in Christian inscriptions, see De Rossi (*u. s.* pp. v. vi.).

(c) Dates by Indictions<sup>3</sup> (or cycles of fifteen years) are not found in Christian inscriptions of Rome before the beginning of the 6th century. The earliest seems to be 522 A.D. (De Rossi, *I. U. R.* n. 984). In Gaul, however, we find an

<sup>1</sup> In Diocletian's time CONS. was first used for one consul, and CONSS. for two consuls; as well as CS and CC. SS. similarly.

<sup>2</sup> In Christian inscriptions dates taken from the office of magistrates other than consuls are extremely rare (De Rossi, *u. s.* p. xi. See above § iv. n. 1).

<sup>3</sup> These have been thought to be connected with the fifteen years of military service and the extraordinary tribute necessary for their payment from time to time, as adjusted by Constantine; but their origin is not altogether certain.

inscription dated *Ind. XV. Olibrio juniore cuns* (consule), i. e. 491. A.D. (Le Blant, n. 388). The indictions themselves (which commence 312 A.D.), unless accompanied by other notes of time (as they often are), do not suffice to determine even approximately the year A.D. For the first year of each cycle is counted as the first indiction, and thus the tenth indiction merely signifies the tenth year in some undetermined indiction. See De Rossi (u. s. *De Cyclo Indictionum*, pp. xcvi. — ci.)

(d) For the mode of dating by solar and lunar cycles, i. e. by the day of the month, the day of the week, and the day of the moon, as compared with each other and with the year, the reader who desires to enter into so difficult a subject must consult De Rossi (u. s. pp. lxx. — xcvi.). See also MONTH; WEEK.

There are now to be noticed a few eras or modes of dating which are peculiar to the Christians.

(e) The era of the martyrs is only used in Egypt and the adjoining regions. A barbarous Greek inscription (n. 9121 Böckh) dates March 30, ἀπὸ μαρτύρων σθ, i. e. 209 of the Dioclesian era, which commenced August 29, 284 A.D., and so corresponding to 494 A.D. This era, invented and first used by the pagans, was adopted afterwards by the Christians, who more usually changed its name (Martigny, *Dict.* p. 532, and the references, also Böckh, n. 9134).

(f) Episcopal dates. A Roman epitaph (De Rossi, *I. U. R.* n. 139) is dated DEPOSITA IN PACE SUB LIBE[RIO EP.], and another (n. 190) has RECESSIT III NON. IN PACE SVB DAMASO EPISCO. These are the only examples of the kind known, and do not prove that epitaphs were then dated purely and simply by the papal era, but rather that those who put them up wished to express their adhesion to the orthodox pontiffs and not to their opponents Felix and Ursicinus.\*

But from the end of the 4th century it became common at Rome to date sacred buildings by inscriptions in which the pope's name occurred; thus we have in such connections SALVO SIRICIO EPISCOPO (like the SALVIS DD. NN. AUGUSTIS) and TEMPORIBVS SANCTI INNOCENTII EPISCOPI, and the still remaining inscription in the basilica of St. Sabina:

CVL MEN APOSTOLICVM CVM CAELESTINVS  
HABERET  
PRIMVS ET IN TOTO FVLGERET EPISCOPVS  
ORBE.

(De Rossi, u. s. pp. viii., ix). In the 5th and following century the custom of dating sacred buildings by bishops and other ecclesiastics spread abroad, and at length became very general throughout Europe; but public monuments of the provinces of the 4th, 5th, and even 6th and later centuries are dated by the eras of Mauretania or of Bostra or Antioch, or by consuls, or by the reigns of emperors (De Rossi, u. s. p. ix. and the references). Sometimes, but very rarely, the exact year of office of the bishop or abbot is given (De Rossi, u. s. and above, § iv. n. 11).

There are two other eras much employed in inscriptions soon after the period with which we are concerned, and which indeed at length almost

superseded the others in common use—the Dionysian epoch of the Incarnation,\* and the mundane era, which reckons the Creation at 5508 B.C. [ERA.]

(g) Bede brought the former into vogue in the beginning of the 8th century, and there are also some early inscriptions dated thereby. De Rossi affirms that he knows of no inscription of the first six centuries so dated. There is one of the year 617 A.D., which records the construction and consecration of a baptistery, at Brixia, by Domina nostra Flavia Theodolinda, which is thus dated at the end: *vixente domino nostro Adelvaldo sacrae salutis saeculo* CCC CCC XVII (Marini, u. s. p. 170); besides this there is one at Interamna (Merni), dated AN. S. DCC. XXVII. (Marini, u. s. p. 157); others just below our period are a little differently expressed: one is dated AN. INCARNAT. DNI DCCCLVII IND V REGE LOVDOWICO IMP. AVG. (Marini, u. s. p. 85), and another is placed ANNO DOMINI DCCC LXIII (Marini, u. s. pp. 164, 5). All these are in connection with the dedication or building of sacred edifices.

(h) An early example\* of the mundane era is furnished by an inscription on a tower at Nicaea in Bithynia, ἔτους ςτις, in the year 6316, corresponding to 808 A.D. (Böckh, *C. I. G.* n. 8669). But as it is called "the tower of Michael, the great king in Christ, emperor," some error in the date (as edited) has slipped in. For Michael I. reigned from 811–813 A.D., and Michael II. from 820–829 A.D. Possibly the ς is a misreading for θ: if so, the date is 811 A.D. Another mutilated inscription, relative to the foundation of an arsenal (τοῦτον μεγαλότατον (sic) ἀρσηνάλην) by "Theophilus the king, son of Michael the king," is doubly dated, ἀπὸ κτίσεως (sic) κόσμου ςτμβ, ἀπὸ δὲ Χριστοῦ ἔτους ωλδ', the year 6342 of the mundane era, corresponding to the year 834 of the Christian era (*Id.* n. 8680).

(i) There are, in fine, inscriptions dated by the reigns or by the years of the reigns of the sovereigns of the kingdoms which sprung out of the ruins of the western empire. Examples occur in England, France, Spain, and Italy. (See above § iv., Nos. 5, 11, and TOMB.)

In like manner, after the consulate came to an end in 541 A.D., the year of the Byzantine emperor's reign, was occasionally placed on inscriptions as a date. An early example of the year 592 A.D., in the 11th year of Justinian II. (in an inscription relating to a church), is given in Böckh's *C. I. G.* n. 8651. Another less precise is dated by the joint reign (842–857 A.D.) of Theodora, Michael, and Thecla (Böckh, *C. I. G.* n. 8683).

More than one mode of dating often occurs on the same monument, as by consuls and an indiction conjointly; by an era and a king conjointly;

\* This was devised in 525 A.D. by Dionysius Exiguus, a Roman abbot. For his purpose, which was neither literary nor historical, but simply had reference to Easter, see the late Professor Grote in the *Cambridge Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, vol. I. pp. 68 69, in a paper entitled 'On the dating of Ancient History,' where several subjects here touched upon are discussed.

\* Probably there may exist somewhat earlier inscriptions dated by this era than those here referred to. It began to prevail in the 7th century, and appears in the *Paschal Chronicle* (Ute, u. s. p. 66).

\* Martigny (*Dict.* p. 317) says: "Après Clovis, ils (les Gaulois) inscriront quelquefois sur les marbres l'année du pontife Romain."



or by a king and an ecclesiastic conjointly. In addition to the years the months are often noted; these are in general the Roman months.

But the day of the month, whether of the death or of the burial, is sometimes in the more ancient inscriptions alone set down. Thus in a<sup>b</sup> Roman inscription we have simply *Fortunatus depositus III Kal. Oct. in pace*; and in another, *Laurentius (sic) idus Ienuras (sic) decessit*, followed by the chrisma (Marini, u. s. pp. 380, 387).

In Egypt, however, the Egyptian months are set down, either alone (Böckh, n. 9110), or together with an indiction (*id.* n. 9111), or with the era of "the martyrs" (*id.* 9121), or with an indiction together with the same era, under its proper name, "the year of Diocletian" (*id.* 9134).

The days are added to the months when these occur: usually computed according to the Roman kalendar by kalends, ides, and nones; but the cyclic inscriptions have the days of the week (*die Beneris, die Saturnis (sic), &c.*; also *die Sabbati, die dominica*), the days of the moon, or the octave of Easter. (See De Rossi, u. s.; McCaul, u. s. pp. 53-58.) In Egypt the day of the month is reckoned numerically, as the 21st of Tybi, the 10th of Phaophi, &c.

We have also examples, though they are not numerous, of epitaphs dated by saints' days. One at Briord, of about the 6th or 7th century, records of "Ricelfus et jugalis sua Guntello" that "*obierunt in die Sci Martini*, who probably himself died Nov. 8, A.D. 397 (Butler's *Lives of Saints*, under Nov. 11). M. Le Blant, who gives this inscription (n. 380), quotes other and earlier examples from the catacombs; such as *Natale Susti, Natale Dmnes Sitiretis, posteru die marturorum, ante natule Domini Asteri, d. nat. Sci Marci*.

In addition to the day the hour is sometimes added, and occasionally even the fraction (*scrupulus*) of the hour. See TOMB.

(vii.) *Abbreviations used in Christian Inscriptions.*—This catalogue might no doubt be enlarged considerably: it has been taken from Martigny (*Dict.* pp. 322-324, omitting, however, the numerals, L for quinquaginta, X for decem, and the like); and the writer has made various additions to it, mostly by help of Hübner's Index to his Spanish Inscriptions, p. 115.

- A.—Anima,—annos,—ave.
- ABBI.—Abbatis.
- A. B. M.—Animæ benemerenti.
- ACOL.—Acolytus.
- A.D.—Ante diem,—anima dulcis.
- A.D. KAL.—Ante diem calendæ.
- A.K.—Ante calendæ.
- A.N.—Annum,—annos,—annis,—ante.
- ANS.—Annos,—annia.
- AP. or APR. or APL.—Aprilia.
- APOSTOR.—Apostolorum.
- A.Q.T.C.—Anima quiescat in Christo.

<sup>b</sup> Cardinal Wiseman says of the deceased Christians in early times that "annual commemoration had to be made on the very day of their departure, and accurate knowledge of this was necessary. Therefore, it alone was recorded" (*Fabiola*, p. 147). Even if this be the true reason (which is very much to be doubted), it remains to be explained why the day of burial alone is sometimes recorded. The truth seems to be, that some little incident which would be sufficient to remind the friends of the deceased, was sometimes regarded as date enough.

A.R.T.M.D.—Anima requiescat in manu Dei.

AVG.—Augustus,—Augusti.

B.—Benemerenti,—bixit (*for* vixit).

B. AN. V. D. IX.—Vixit annos quinque, dies non.

BENER.—Veneriæ.

B. F.—Bonæ feminae.

BIBAT.—Bibatis (*for* vivatis).

B. I. C.—Bibas (*for* vivas) in Christo.

B. M., or BO. M., or BE. ME., or BO. ME.—I memoriae.

B. M. F.—Benemerenti fecit.

BMT.—Benemerenti.

BNM., or BNMR.—Benemerenti, or benemerenti.

B. Q.—Bene quiescat.

B. Q. I. P.—Bene quiescat in pace.

BVS. V.—Bonus vir.

C.—Consul,—cum.

CAL.—Calendæ.

CC.—Consules,—carissimus, or carissima conjux.

CESQ. I. P.—Quiescit, or quiescat in pace.

C. F.—Clarissima femina,—curavit fieri.

CH.—Christus.

C. H. L. S. E.—Corpus hoc loco sepultum (*or situm*).

CL.—Clarus,—clarissimus.

C. L. P.—Cum lacrymis posuerunt.

CL. V.—Clarissimus vir.

C. M. F.—Curavit monumentum fieri.

C. O.—Conjugi optimo.

C. O. B. Q.—Cum omnibus bonis quiescas.

COI.—Conjugi.

COIVG.—Conjux.

CONI.—Conjugi.

CONS.—Consul,—consulibus.

CONT. VOT.—Contra votum.

COS.—Consul,—consulibus.

COSS.—Consules,—consulibus.

C. P.—Clarissima puella,—curavit poni.

C. Q.—Cum quo, or cum qua.

C. Q. F.—Cum quo fecit (*for* vixit).

C. R.—Corpus requiescit.

CS.—Consul.

C. V. A.—Cum vixisset annos.

CVNG.—Conjux.

D.—Dies,—die,—defunctus,—depositus,—dormi dulcis.

D. B. M.—Dulcissimæ benemerenti.

D. B. Q.—Dulcis, bene quiescas.

D. D.—Dedit,—dedicavit,—dies.

D. D. S.—Decessit de sæculo.

DE. or DEP.—Depositus,—deposita,—depositio.

DE.—Deum.

DEC.—Decembria.

DF.—Defunctus,—defuncta.

DI.—Dei.

DIAC.—Diaconus.

DIEB.—Diebus.

D. III. ID.—Die tertius idus.

D. I. P.—Dormit, or decessit, or depositus in pace.

D. M. MANIBUS.—Dis Manibus.

D. M. S.—Dis Manibus sacrum.

DM.—Dormit.

DMS.—Dominus.

D. N., or D. NN.—Domino nostro, or dominis n. (the emperors).

DNI.—Domini.

DO.—Deo.

DP.—DPS.—DPT.—Depositus,—depositio.

E.—Est,—et,—ejus,—erexit.

EID.—Idus *for* idus.

EP.—EPVS.—EPS.—episcopus.

E. V.—Ex voto.

E. VIV. DISC.—E vivis discessit.

EX. TM.—Ex testamento.

F.—Fecit,—fui,—filius,—filia,—femina,—fideliter, lix,—fidelis,—februaria.

F. C.—Fieri curavit.

FE.—Fecit.  
 FEBVS.—Februarius.  
 FF.—Fili, —fratres, —fieri fecit.  
 F. F. Q.—Filiis filiabusque.  
 F. K.—Filius carissimus, —filia carissima.  
 FL.—Filius, —Flavi.  
 FLAE.—Filiae.  
 F. P. F.—Filio, or filiae, poni fecit.  
 FS.—Fossor, —fossoribus, —fratribus.  
 F. V. F.—Fieri vivus fecit.  
 F. VI. D. S. E.—Filius sex dierum situs est.  
 GL.—Gloriosi.  
 H.—Hora, —hoc, —hic, —haeres.  
 H. A.—Hoc anno.  
 H. A. K.—Ave anima carissima.  
 H. L. S.—Hoc loco situs, or sepultus est.  
 H. M.—Honesta mulier.  
 H. M. F. F.—Hoc monumentum fieri fecit.  
 H. R. I. P.—Hic requiescit in pace.  
 H. S.—Hic situs, or sepultus est.  
 H. T. F. or P.—Hunc titulum fecerunt, or posuerunt.  
 I.—In, —idus, —ibi, —illustris, —jacet, —januarius, —julus.  
 IAN.—Januarius, —Januarias.  
 ID.—Idus, —idibus.  
 I. D. N.—In Dei nomine.  
 IDNE.—Indictione.  
 I. H.—Jacet hic.  
 IH.—Jesus.  
 IHS.—Jesus.  
 IHV.—Jesu.  
 IN. B.—In bono, —in benedictione.  
 IND.—Indictione, —in Deo.  
 IN. D. N.—In Dei nomine.  
 IN. D. V.—In Deo vivas.  
 INO.—Ingenu.  
 INL.—Inlustris.  
 INN.—Innocens, —innocuus, —in nomine.  
 IN. P., or I. P.—In pace.  
 INPC.—In pace.  
 IN. X.—In Christo.  
 IN. ✠ —In Christo.  
 IN. XPI. N.—In Christi nomine.  
 I. P. D.—In pace Dei.  
 ISPA.—Ispalensis.  
 IX.—Jesus Christus.  
 K.—Kalendas, —carus, —carissima.  
 KAL.—Kalendas.  
 K. B. M.—Carissimo benemerenti.  
 K. D., —I., —M., etc.—Calendas decembres, —januarias, —maias, etc.  
 K. K.—Carissimi.  
 KL. KLEND.—Calendas.  
 KRM.—Carissimae, —carissimo.  
 L.—Locus, —lubens.  
 L. A.—Libenti animo.  
 L. F. C.—Liberis fieri curavit.  
 L. M.—Locus monumenti.  
 LNA.—Luna.  
 L. S.—Locus sepulchri.  
 M.—Memoria, —martyr, —mensis, —menses, —merenti, —maias, —mater, —merito, —monumentum, —marmoreum —minus.  
 MA.—MAR.—MART.—Martyr, —martyrium, —martias.  
 MAT.—Mater.  
 M. B.—Memoriae bonae.  
 MERTB.—Merentibus.  
 MES.—Menses, for menses.  
 M.M.—Martyres.  
 M P., or PP.—Monumentum, or memoriam, posuit, or posuerunt.  
 MR. F.S.C.—Moerens fecit suae conjugis.  
 MRT.—Merenti, —merentibus.  
 MS.—Menses, —mensibus.

N.—Nonas, —numero, —novembria, —nomine, —nostro.  
 NAT.—Natalis, —natale.  
 NBR.—Novembria.  
 NME.—Nomine.  
 NO. or NON.—Nonas.  
 NON. APR., —IVL., —SEP., —OCT., etc.—Nonas apriles, —julas, —septembres, —octobres, etc.  
 NN.—Nostris, —numeria.  
 NOV.—Novembria.  
 NOVE. NOVEBRES.—Novembres.  
 NST.—Nostris.  
 NVM.—Numerus.  
 O.—Horas, —optimus, —obitus, —obit.  
 OB.—Obit.  
 OB. IN. XPO.—Obit in Christo.  
 OCT.—Octobria, —octavas.  
 O. E. B. Q.—Ossa ejus bene quiescant.  
 O. H. S. S.—Ossa hic sepulta sunt.  
 OM., or OMIB.—Omnibus.  
 OMS.—Omnes.  
 OP.—Optimus.  
 O. P. Q.—Ossa placide quiescant.  
 OSS.—Ossa.  
 P.—Pax, —plus, —posuit, —ponendum, —posuerunt, —pater, —puer, —puella, —per, —post, —pro, —pridie, plus, —primus, —etc.  
 PA.—Pace, —pater, —etc.  
 PARTB.—Parentibus.  
 PC.—Pace, —poni curavit.  
 P. C., or P. CONS.—Post consulatum.  
 P. F.—Poni fecit.  
 P. H.—Positus hic.  
 P. I.—Poni jussit.  
 PL.—Plus.  
 P. M.—Plus minus, —post mortem, —plae memoriae.  
 PONT.—Pontifex.  
 PONTFC.—Pontifice.  
 P. P.—Praefectus praetorio.  
 PP. K.L.—Prope kalendas.  
 PR.—PRB.—PRBR.—PREB.—PSBR.—PRSB.—Presbyter, or presbyteri.  
 PR., or PRID. K. IVN.—Pridie kalendas junias.  
 PR. Q.—Posterisque.  
 PR. N.—Pridie nonas.  
 PTR.—Posterior.  
 P. V.—Prudentissimus vir.  
 P. Z.—Pie zeses (for bibas, vivas).  
 Q.—qui, —quo, —quiesce, —quiescit, —quiescas.  
 Q. B. AN.—Qui bixit (for vixit), annos.  
 Q. FEC. MEC.—Qui fecit (for vixit) mecum.  
 Q. FV. AP. N.—Qui fuit apud nos.  
 Q. I. P.—Quiescat in pace.  
 Q. M. O.—Qui mortem obit.  
 Q. V.—Qui vixit.  
 R.—Recessit, —requiescit, —requiescas, —retro, —refrigera, —refrigere.  
 REG. SEC.—Regionis secundae.  
 RE.—Requiescit, or requiescat, —repositus.  
 REQ.—Requiescit.  
 RES.—Requiescit? (Inscr. Hisp. n. 114).  
 R. I. P. A.—Requiescas in pace animae, or recessit.  
 RQ.—Requievit.  
 S.—Sua, —sua, —sibi, —salve, —somno, —sepulchrum, —solve, —situs, —sepultus, —sub? (Inscr. Hisp. n. 56).  
 SA.—Sanctissimus? (Inscr. Hisp. n. 174).  
 SAC.—Sacer, —sacerdos.  
 SAC. VG.—Sacra virgo, or sacrata.  
 SBRS.—Septembres.  
 SC.—Sanctus.  
 SCA.—Sancta.  
 SCE.—Sanctae.  
 SCI.—Sancti.  
 SCIS.—Sanctis.  
 SCLI.—Saeculi.  
 SC. M.—Sanctae memoriae.  
 SCLO.—Saeculo.

SCOR.—Sanctorum.  
 SCORVM.—Sanctorum.  
 SD.—Sedit.  
 S. D. V. ID. IAN.—Sub die quinto idus januarías.  
 SEP.—September,—septimo.  
 S. H. L. R.—Sub hoc lapide requiescit.  
 S. I. D.—Spiritus in Deo.  
 S. L. M.—Solvit lubens merito.  
 S. M.—Sanctae memoriae.  
 S. O. V.—Sine offensa ulla.  
 SP.—Sepultus, - sepulcrum,—spiritus.  
 SP. F.—Spectabilis femina.  
 SS.—Sanctorum,—supra-scripta.  
 ST.—Sunt.  
 S. T. T. C.—Sit tibi testis coelum.  
 T. and TT.—Titulus.  
 TB.—Tibi.  
 TIT. P., or PP., or FF.—Titulum posuit, or posuerunt, or fecerunt.  
 TM.—Testamentum.  
 TPA.—Tempora.  
 TTM.—Testamentum,—titulum.  
 V.—Vixit,—vixisti,—vivus,—viva,—vivas,—venemerenti (for benemerenti),—votum,—vovit,—vir,—uxor,—vidua.  
 V. B.—Vir bonus.  
 V. C.—Vir clarissimus.  
 V. F.—Vivus, or viva, fecit.  
 VG., or VGO.—Virgo.  
 V. H.—Vir honestus.  
 V. K.—Vivas carissime.  
 V. I. AET.—Vive in aeternum, or in aeterno.  
 V. I. FEB.—Quinto idus februaril.  
 V. INL.—Vir illustris (illustris).  
 VIX.—Vixit.  
 V. O.—Vir optimus.  
 VOT. VOV.—Votum vovit.  
 VR. S.—Vir sanctus.  
 V. S.—Vir spectabilis.  
 V. T.—Vita tibi.  
 VV. CC.—Viri clarissimi.  
 VV. F.—Vive felix.  
 V. K.—Uxor carissima,—vivas carissime.  
 X.—Christus.  
 XI.—XPI.—Christi.  
 XO.—XTO.—Christo.  
 XPC.—XS.—Christus.  
 Z.—Zexa, for vivas,—Zesu, for Jesu.

[C. B.]

**INSINUATIO.** The making certain customary payments to the bishop on appointment to a church. See Thomassin (*Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discip.* iii. 1, c. 56). Justinian (*Novell.* 56, col. 5, tit. 11, § 1) provides that if any of the clergy make the payments which are called insinuatives, "quae vocantur insinuativa," except in the great church of Constantinople, the bishops who exact them shall be deprived of their office.

[P. O.]

**INSPECTOR.** [BISHOP, p. 210.]

**INSTALLATION.** [BISHOP, p. 224.]

**INSTRUCTION.** 1. For the Christian instruction of children in general, see **CATECHUMEN, CHILDREN.**

2. In a more special sense, the lections from the Old Testament read to the candidates for baptism immediately after the benediction of the taper, and before the benediction of the font, on Easter Eve, were called "Instructiones baptizandorum." See the Gelasian *Sacramentary* (i. c. 43), and the Gregorian (p. 70). Amalarinus (*De Eccl. Off.* i. 19) gives mystical reasons why

the lections should be four in number, which however is by no means invariably the case. They are four in the *Ordo Romanus I.* (c. 40, p. 25), but the Gelasian *Sacramentary* gives ten and the Gregorian eight. Instruction of this kind seems to be alluded to in Palladius's description of the scene which took place when soldiers burst into John Chrysostom's church at Constantinople on Easter Eve; "some of the presbyters," he says (*Vita Chrysost.* c. 9) "were reading Holy Scriptures, others baptizing the catechumens." So Paschasius Lilybetanus, in a letter to Leo the Great (quoted by Martene), speaks of a case in which, after the accustomed lections of Easter Eve had been gone through, the candidates were not baptized, for lack of water (Martene, *De Rit. Ant.* I. i. 13, § 3). As in the responses of the candidates at Rome both Latin and Greek were used, so also the lections in baptism were in ancient times recited in Latin and Greek. Thus *Ordo Romanus I.* (c. 40, p. 25), after noticing that the reader does not announce the lection in the usual way, "Lectio libri Genesis," but begins at once "In principio," goes on to say, "First it is read in Greek, and then immediately by another in Latin." The next lection is read first in Greek and then in Latin; and so on. Amalarinus (*De Eccl. Off.* ii. 1) says of this custom, that lections were recited by the ancient Romans in Greek and in Latin, partly because Greeks were present who did not understand Latin, and Latins who did not understand Greek; partly to show the unanimity of the two peoples. Anastasius tells us (p. 251, ed. Muratori) that pope Benedict III. (855–858) caused a volume to be prepared in which the lessons for Easter Eve and Pentecost were written out in Greek and in Latin, which volume, in a silver binding of beautiful workmanship, he offered to a Roman church. [C.]

**INSTRUMENTA.** By the word *instrumenta* we understand vessels, &c. employed in the sacred ministry; thus, pope Siricius, A.D. 385 (*Epist. I. ad Himerium*, c. 14), forbidding persons who had incurred public penance to be ordained, says, "nulla debent gerendorum sacramentorum instrumenta suscipere qui dudum fuerunt vase vitiorum."

By the words "instrumentorum traditio" is technically designated the handing to a person on ordination some vessel or instrument used in his office. Thus, the African statutes at the end of the 4th century (*Conc. Cart. IV.* c. 5) order the bishop to hand to a subdeacon on ordination an empty chalice and an empty paten, and the archdeacon to hand to him a water vessel with a napkin, because he receives no imposition of hands. Similarly the acolite (c. 6) is to receive from the archdeacon a candlestick with taper; the exorcist (c. 7) is to receive from the hand of the bishop the book of exorcisms; the reader (c. 8) the codex from which he is to read; the doorkeeper (c. 9) the keys of the church.

In these cases it is to be observed that the "instrumentorum traditio" takes place only in the case of those ordained to minor orders (i. e. sacri ministri) who received no imposition of hands.

The fourth council of Toledo, A.D. 633, provides (c. 28) that a bishop who is restored to

his orders shall receive from the bishops, before the altar, stole, ring, and staff; a priest, stole and chasuble; a deacon, stole and alb; a subdeacon, paten and chalice; and that those in other orders shall receive back on restoration those instruments which they had first received on ordination. We see from this that the appropriate vestments were regarded in the 7th century as the outward sign of the bestowal of the higher orders. The delivery of the pastoral staff and ring also forms part of the ceremony of the ordination of a bishop in the Pontificals of Gregory the Great and of Egbert [BISHOP, p. 222].

In later times, the handing of the chalice with wine and the paten with a host to a priest on ordination came to be regarded as the "matter" of the sacrament, while the "form" was the words "Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo missasque celebrare tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis in nomine Domini." But this opinion not only has no support in Scripture, but it seems to have been totally unknown in the church for at least nine hundred years; Isidore, Amalarius, Rabanus, and Walafrid Strabo, know nothing of it. (Martene, *De Rit. Ant.* l. viii. 9, § 16.) [C.]

INSUFFLATION. [BAPTISM, § 31, p. 158; EXORCISM.]

INSULANI. A designation of monks in Southern France in the 5th century, on account of the great reputation of the monasteries and of their schools on the islands near the coast, especially on the island Lerina (Lerins) (Bingh. *Orig. Eccl.* VII. ii. 14). [I. G. S.]

INTERCESSION (*Intercessio*, ἱκετεύσις). It does not fall within the scope of the present work to discuss or to investigate historically the doctrine of the intercession of the saints, or of the nature and efficacy of intercessory prayer generally; the subject is considered here simply in its relation to liturgical forms. And here we have to consider (1) the persons whose intercession is asked; (2) the objects on behalf of which intercession is made.

(1.) a. Throughout the Western church a large portion of the prayers end with a pleading of the merits of Christ, the great Intercessor; generally in the form "per Christum Dominum nostrum." This is in fact an extension to all prayer of the principle laid down for the altar-prayers, "cum altari adsistitur semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio" (*Conc. Carth. III.* c. 23); when the prayer is addressed to the Father, it is through the intercession of the Son. This principle is not adopted in the East, where the prayers, being addressed to the Triune Deity, generally end with an ascription of glory; if with a pleading of merits, it is of the Virgin Mary or the saints (Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, i. 373).

b. We may take the words of Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. Myst.* V. 9, p. 328) as an authentic account of the manner in which the intercession of the saints departed was invoked in the church of Jerusalem in the middle of the 4th century. "Then we also commemorate those who have gone to rest before us (τῶν προκεκοιμημένων), first patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs; that God at their prayers and intercessions (προσεβείας) would receive our supplication." It appears then that in Cyril's time the church asked

the intercession of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs; for the rest of the faithful departed, including "holy fathers and bishops," it interceded [CANON OF THE LITURGY, p. 269; DIPTYCHA, p. 560]. But it is "beyond all question that the early church offered the eucharistic sacrifice as well for the highest saints, and even for the blessed Virgin Mary, as for the common multitude of the departed faithful" (Neale, *Eastern Ch. Int.* 510). The intercession of saints, for whom at the same time intercession is made, is asked in the so-called liturgy of St. Chrysostom, where we have the following form (Daniel, *Codex Lit.* iv. 360):—"We offer to Thee also this reasonable service on behalf of (ὕπέρ) those who are at rest in the faith, our forefathers, fathers, patriarchs . . . and every just spirit made perfect in the faith; especially our most holy . . . Lady Mary, Mother of God and ever Virgin . . . for the holy Prophet, Forerunner, and Baptist, John; for the glorious and highly-praised Apostles; for Saint N. whose commemoration we are celebrating, and all Thy saints; at whose supplications (ἱκεσίας) look upon us, O God. And remember all who have gone to rest before us in hope of the resurrection to eternal life." Then follow the diptychs. The Syriac St. James (Renaudot, *Litt. Orientt.* ii. 36), after commemorating holy Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, St. John Baptist, St. Stephen, the Virgin, and all Saints, proceeds, "Therefore do we commemorate them, that when they stand before Thy throne, they may remember us in our weakness and frailty, and offer with us to Thee this awful and unbloody sacrifice, for the safe-keeping of those who are living, for the consolation of the feeble and unworthy, such as ourselves; for the rest and good memory of those who have passed away in the true faith, our fathers, brethren, and masters." Here the saints departed are represented as joining in one great act of intercession with those on earth, rather than as interceding for them. These may serve as examples of the manner of asking the intercession of the saints in the Eastern church.

Of the Western liturgies, Mabillon's Gallican (Daniel's *Codex Lit.* i. 75) has, after the oblation of the unconsecrated elements, "We pray for the souls of Thy servants, our fathers and former teachers, Aurelian, Peter, Florentinus . . . and all our brothers whom Thou hast vouchsafed to call hence to Thee; . . . for the souls of all faithful servants and pilgrims deceased in the peace of the church; that Thou, O Lord our God, wouldest grant them pardon, and rest eternal: by the merits and intercession of Thy Saints, Mary mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, Stephen, Peter, Paul, John, James, Andrew, Philip, Thomas, Bartholomew, Matthew, James, Simon, Jude, Matthias, Genesius, Symphorianus, Bandilius, Victor, Hilary, bishop and confessor, Martin, bishop and confessor, Caesarius, bishop, vouchsafe in mercy to hear and grant these petitions, who livest and reignest in the unity of the Holy Spirit, God for ever and ever." The Roman has the following in the *Communicantes* of the CANON, "Claiming fellowship with and venerating the memory of, first, the glorious ever-virgin Mary, mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ; and also of Thy blessed apostles and martyrs, Peter and Paul, Andrew, James, John, Thomas, James, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Simon, and Thad-



daeus : Linus, Cletus, Clemens, Xystus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Laurence, Chrysogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian : and all Thy saints : in consideration of whose merits and prayers, grant that in all things we may be guarded by the help of Thy protection." The Ambrosian (Daniel i. 84) has, besides these, the names of Apollinaria, Vitalis, Nazarius and Celsus, Protasius and Gervasius. [Compare IMAGES, § viii.; INSCRIPTIONS, p. 856.]

The rule of the church in St. Augustine's time drew a broad distinction between martyrs and other saints; for that father observes (*In Joann. Tract. 84*), "So at the Table of the Lord we do not commemorate martyrs in the same way that we do others who rest in peace, so as to pray for them, but rather that they may pray for us, that we may follow in their footsteps;" and again (*De Verb. Apost. 17*), "martyrs are recited at the altar of God in that place where prayer is not made for them; for the rest of the dead who are commemorated prayer is made." It is in accordance with this that the Roman canon, besides the Virgin and the twelve apostles, recites as intercessors twelve martyrs. Other churches however, out of respect to their local saints, did not (as we see in the Gallican and the Milanese) draw so rigid a line, and inserted the names of confessors as well as martyrs. The martyrs of the Roman canon seem to be all connected with the city or see of Rome. [See LIBELLI, MARTYRS.]

In the EMBOLISMUS of the Lord's Prayer, the Roman and Ambrosian liturgies pray for peace in our days at the intercession of (intercedente) the Virgin Mary with the apostles Peter and Paul and Andrew and all the saints (Daniel i. 96). In the benediction of incense, in the Roman use (Dan. i. 72), the priest prays that God will bless it, at the intercession (per intercessionem) of Michael the archangel, who stands at the right hand of the altar of incense.

(2.) With regard to the objects of intercession, we may say that Christians have been taught to make intercession for all things of which they know that their brethren have need. Such intercessions are scattered over a great variety of offices or litanies [LITANY]. With regard specially to the intercessions made in the eucharist, we will take the form of the Greek St. James (Daniel, iv. 14) as a specimen of the objects recited in the great eucharistic intercession. When the priest, after consecration, has prayed that the Body and Blood of Christ may be to the partakers for remission of sins, for the strengthening of the Holy Catholic Church, etc., he proceeds—"We offer (προσφέρουμεν) to Thee, Lord, on behalf of (ὕπέρ) the Holy Places, especially Sion; the Holy Catholic Church; holy fathers, brethren, bishops; all cities and countries and the orthodox who dwell there; those who are journeying; those fathers and brethren who are in bonds, imprisonment, mines or tortures; the sick and demoniac; every Christian soul in trouble; those who labour in Christ's name; for all men, for peace, and for the dispersion of scandal and heresy; for rain and fruitful seasons; for those who have adorned the churches or shown pity to the poor; for those who desire to be remembered in our prayers; those who have offered; the celebrant and his deacons; all spirits and all flesh, from Abel even to this day, "give them

rest in the land of the living, in Thy kingdom, in the bliss of Paradise, in the bosom of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, our holy fathers, whence sorrow and grief and mourning have fled away;" for the forgiveness of sins, "by the grace and mercy and compassion of Thy only-begotten Son;" for (ὕπέρ) the Gifts, that God may receive them into His spiritual sanctuary.

Some of the more remarkable peculiarities of the Intercessions of different churches are noted under CANON OF THE LITURGY, p. 273. [C.]

**INTERCESSION, EPISCOPAL.** By a custom which grew up less by any definite enactment than by the general respect attaching to their office, the bishops came to be looked upon as protectors of those who were oppressed by the secular power. The patrimony of widows and orphans was often placed under the protection of the churches and bishops (*Aug. Ep. 252*). Flavian, bishop of Antioch, interceded successfully in A.D. 387 with the Emperor Theodosius, on behalf of the city, which had been guilty of a riot. So Theodoret with the Empress Pulcheria. Many other instances might be cited. These interpositions obtained the technical name of *intercessio*, and were recognised by the law. The bishop was expected to visit the public prisons on Thursday and Friday (*Codex Justinian. lib. i. tit. 4*). They were charged with a special oversight of such as held civil office in their dioceses (*Concil. Arelat. l. c. 56, Conc. Arel. ii. c. 13*, "ut comites judices, seu reliquis populus obedientes sit episcopo, et invicem consentiant ad justitias faciendas, et munera pro judicio non recipiant, nec falsos testes, ne per hoc pervertant judicia justorum," *Conc. Gener. tom. ii. p. 618, ed. Crabbe*). The right of sanctuary for fugitives in the churches grew up in the same period, and was very frequently exercised (*Cod. Theodos. l. ix. tit. 45, ap. Neander*). See Neale, *Introd. to Eastern Church*, and essay by Moultrie in Neale's *Ecclesiology*, pp. 427-474; Neander's *Church History*, vol. iii. sect. 2. [BISHOP, p. 237; IMMUNITIES OF CLERGY, p. 834.] [S. J. E.]

**INTERCESSORES or INTERVENTORES.** In the African churches when a see was vacant the senior bishop appointed one of his suffragans as guardian or procurator. He was styled *Intercessor* or *Interventor*. The fifth council of Carthage made a canon that no intercessor should remain in this office more than a year, and that if the vacancy was not then filled, another should be appointed. No intercessor was permitted to be chosen bishop of the vacant see himself. So also in the Roman province, as we learn from the letters of Symmachus (*Ep. v. c. 9*) and Gregory the Great (*Ep. ii. 16*); Suicer (*Thesaurus, s. v. μεσ(ι)της*); Bingham (*Ant. lib. ii. c. 15, and iv. c. 2*). [BISHOP, p. 237.] [S. J. E.]

**INTERMENT.** [BURIAL OF THE DEAD.]

**INTERPRETER.** Epiphanius (*Expos. Fid. n. 21*) speaks of interpreters of the language employed both in reading the Scriptures and the sermons, and ranks them among the lower orders of the clergy, after the exorcists. An instance of their existence is afforded in the case of Procopius, who is said to have discharged three offices in the church of Palestine, having been reader,

exorcist, and interpreter of the Syrian language. (*Acta Procop. apud Valen.; note in Eusab. Martyr. Palest. c. 1.*) [LITURGICAL LANGUAGE.] [P. O.]

**INTERROGATIO** (sc. de fide). This is a questioning a candidate for baptism as to his belief, before he was baptized, and formed part of the office of baptism from very early times. After the **EXORCISATION** (*Abrenunciatio*) of the devil by the candidate for baptism, and his anointing, and before he was baptized he was questioned as to his faith, and called upon to make public profession of it. The custom is frequently alluded to by the fathers. It is sufficient here to refer: (1) *For the custom*: to St. Augustine (*de Animæ et origine ejus*, l. 10). "Ideo cum baptizantur (i. e. pueri) jam et symbolum reddunt, et ipse pro se ad interrogata respondent." (2) *For the object* to St. Cyprian (*Ep. 70 ad Januarius de baptizandis hæreticis*). "Ipse interrogatio quæ sit in baptismo testis est veritatis." (3) *For its substance*, to St. Ambrose (*de Mysteriorum*, v. 20). "Dumcordati igitur (i. e. in fontem) recordare quid responderis, quod credas in Patrem, credas in Filium, credas in Spiritum Sanctum;" and more fully *de Sacramentis* lib. II. vii. "Interrogatus es: Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem? Dixisti: Credo, et meruisti, hoc est, sepultus es, iterum interrogatus es: Credis in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, et in crucem ejus? Dixisti: Credo, et meruisti; ideo et Christo es circumcissus; qui enim Christo circumcissus, cum Christo resurgit. Tertio interrogatus es: Credis et in Spiritum Sanctum? Dixisti: Credo, tertio meruisti; ut multiplicem lapsum superioris ætatis absolvet trina confessio."

The rite is still retained in the office of Baptism in the Roman church, in the same position as of old; and in the Greek church in the preliminary office of "making a catechumen" (*eis to enstema anagogeponos*).

The forms of the questions closely resemble the old forms (v. *Rit. Rom. de Sacramentis Baptismali*, and *Enchiridion eccl. eis to enstema anagogeponos*). For further details and patristic references see Martene *de Ant. Eccl. Rom.* l. 47. See also **BAPTISM**, §§ 43, 44, pp. 159, 160; **CAROL** § 4, p. 488; **PROCESSION**.

[H. J. H.]

**INTERSTITIA**. These are intervals of time which according to the regulations of the church ought to elapse between the reception of one order and the admission to a superior. Their object was to exercise a cleric in the functions of his order, and to test his fitness for promotion to a higher. The institution is an old one in the church. The tenth canon of the council of Sardica decrees "Habebit autem unusquisque ordinis gradum non minimal scilicet tempore longitudinem per quod et idem et morum probitas et constantia et moderatio possit cognosci." The duration of these intervals was not determined at the first, and it has varied much at different times and places. Zoëmus e.g., A.D. 417 (*Ep. 1 ad Hesychium*) proposes the following rule. "If any one has been designed for ecclesiastical ministrum from his infancy, he is to remain among the readers till his twentieth year. If he has devoted himself to the sacred ministry when grown and of ripe age, provided he has done so immediately after baptism, he is to be kept among the readers or exorcists five years."

QUINT. ART.

Then he is to spend four years as an acolyte or subdeacon. Then if deserving he is to be promoted to the diaconate, in which order he is to remain five years, and, if worthy, promoted to the priesthood." Another canon prescribes that a bishop must have been at least four years a priest. [It must be remembered that in the early church the age required for conferring holy orders was more advanced than is the case at present, twenty-five being the ordinary age for a deacon, and thirty for a priest.]

Gelasius (A.D. 493) shortened the prescribed intervals between the different sacred orders, and in cases of urgency they were occasionally altogether dispensed with. Of this the most conspicuous instance is that of St. Ambrose, who is said to have passed through all the sacred orders and to have been consecrated bishop on the eighth day after his baptism.

In process of time, as the proper functions assigned to the several minor orders fell into disuse, the intervals between them ceased to be observed, and the modern practice is to confer the four minor orders simultaneously. The council of Trent requires a year between the minor orders and the subdiaconate, between the subdiaconate and the diaconate, and between the diaconate and the priesthood. Legitimate exceptions are recognized, and dispensations under certain conditions allowed; but two (major) orders are not to be conferred on the same day: "Duo sacri ordines non eodem die, privilegio ac indultis . . . non obstantibus quibuscunque" (*Con. Trent. Sess. xxiii. col. 2; De Reform.*) [**ORDINATION**.] [H. J. H.]

#### INTERVENTORES. [INTERCENSORES.]

**INTROIT**. *Introitus* is the name commonly given throughout the Latin church to the anthem at the beginning of the eucharistic office. At Rome it was originally called *Antiphona ad Introitum*, as in the earliest editions of the *Ordo Romanus* (l. a. 8, li. a. 2, lii. a. 8, in *Muscos. Rit. tom. ii.*). In *Ordo Romanus VI.* (a. 2, d.), probably a little later than our period, it is first called *introitus* simply. Meanwhile in one *Ordo* (v. a. 5, d.), we find the name of *invitatory* given to it. At Milan it was termed *ingressum* (*Ambros. Misc. Ritum in Pamelii Rituali SS. P.P. tom. i. p. 293*), a word of the same meaning as *introitus*. In Spain (*Misc. Masor. Leslie*, pp. 18, 55, 64, &c.) and in England (the *missals* of Sarum, York, Hereford; Maskell's *Ancient Liturgy*, pp. 30, 31) the *introit* was called *officium*, or *officium missæ*. This arose from a mistake. The several masses in the early missals were headed by the words *Ad Missam Officium* (*Leaite*, u. a. pp. 1, 7, 10, &c.; *Missale Sarum*, coll. 1, 13, 27, &c., ad Forbes), which were the heading of the whole office, but were supposed to refer to the *introit* which followed immediately without any heading of its own. The *antiphon* had this name in all the churches of Normandy, and in many others (*Le Brun, Explic. de la Messe*, p. ii. art. 1), and in the missals of the Carthusians, Carmelites, and Dominicans. This extended use would be a sufficient proof of its great antiquity, were we without the evidence of the Mozarabic ritual. In the barbarous *Exponeus Moyses*, ascribed to Germanus of Paris, A.D. 555, and certainly not much later than his time, the *introit*, as used in the old Gallican liturgy, is

S E

called *praelegere*, or *antiphona ad praelegend*: (*sic*), because it preceded the eucharistic lessons (*Expos.* printed in Martene, *De Ant. Eccl. Rit.* lib. i. c. iv. art. xii. ord. 1).

The origin of the introit is obscure. At the earliest period the office began with lessons from holy Scripture, of which psalms said or sung formed a part, but this psalmody is in the West to be traced in the GRADUAL and TRACT. In the Syrian rite a psalm is sung before as well as after the epistle, but this appears to have had the same origin (*Ordo Communis*; Renaud. *Liturg. Orient.* tom. ii. p. 7). The introit is clearly another rite, and of later introduction. It seems to have been introduced partly as a fitting accompaniment of the solemn entrance (*introitus, ingressa*) of the celebrant into that part of the church in which the altar stood, and partly as a means of employing and solemnizing the minds of the people before the service began. The name *incitatory* suggests that the people were still entering the church while it was being sung.

The *Ordo Romanus* in its earliest state, about 730, gives us some suggestive information respecting the introit as sung in the churches of Rome at that time. The bishop having vested is still in the secretarium, the choir waiting in the church for an order from him to begin "the antiphon for the entrance" (*introitum*). On a signal from him "ut psallant," a subdeacon enters the church, orders the candles to be lighted, and then stands with a censer before the door of the secretarium, while one of the leaders of the choir, who has also been in waiting, carries the order for the singing to commence. As soon as this is heard two deacons enter, and each taking a hand of the bishop lead him into the church, up to the altar. He is preceded by the subdeacon with incense, and seven acolytes bearing candles. On his way to the altar the Sancta or FERMENTUM is brought to him that he may select what is necessary for the celebration. After private prayer at the altar, and giving the peace to the ministers, he stops the singing by giving a signal for the *Gloria Patri* (*Ord. Rom. I.* nn. 7, 8; comp. ii. nn. 4, 5, iii. nn. 7, 8, v. n. 5, vi. n. 3).

The *Liber Pontificalis* is supposed to ascribe the introduction of the introit to Celestine, A.D. 423, when it tells us that he "ordered the 150 psalms of David to be sung antiphonally before the sacrifice" (*Anastas. Biblioth. Vitae Pont.* n. 44). The tradition probably refers to the introit, although the next statement shows that the author connects it with the earlier Gradual. For he adds:—"This was not done before, only the epistles of the apostle Paul were recited and the holy gospel, and so masses were celebrated." It will be observed that the *Ordo* cited calls the introit an antiphon, though it uses the word *psallere*. Gregory the Great, A.D. 595, is said to have compiled the antiphons, selecting proper verses from the psalms, and retaining the *Gloria*, which was then said, as now, at the end of every psalm. Some ancient writers, as Amalarinus (*De Eccl. Officiis*, lib. iii. c. 5), Walafrid Strabo (*De Rebus Eccl.* c. 22), and Micrologus (*De Eccl. Observ.* c. 1), suppose that this selection was the work of Celestine; but Honorius of Autun, more in consonance with the words of the *Liber Pontificalis*, and with the circumstantial

evidence of the case, says,— "Pope Celestine ordered psalms to be sung at the introit of the mass, from which pope Gregory afterwards arranged and compiled antiphons for the introit of the mass" (*Gemma Animae*, lib. i. c. 87). All the psalms in the antiphonary ascribed to Gregory are taken from the old Italic version, as it stood before the corrections of St. Jerome, but this is no proof of an earlier antiquity of the introits than we ascribe to them. For Gregory himself professed to use the Italic and the Vulgate versions of the Bible indifferently (*Ep. ad Leandr.* c. 5, in fine; *Expos. in Lib. Job. praef.*), and Jerome's corrected Italic psalter, long called the Gallican psalter, did not take the place of the original at Rome until the time of Pius V. (Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 3, § 4). The following example of the Gregorian introit is for the first Sunday in Advent:—"Antiph. Ad Te, Domine, levavi animam meam. Deus meus in Te confido: non erubescam neque irideant me inimici meus (*Vulg.* irideant me inimici mei) etenim universi qui Te expectant (*Vulg.* sustinent Te) non confundentur (*Ps.* xxv. 1-3). *Ps.* Vias Tuas, Domine, demonstra mihi et semitas tuas edoce me" (*ib.* v. 4). Durandus (*Rationale*, lib. iv. c. 5, n. 5) tells us that "in some churches tropes are said for the psalms, according to the appointment of pope Gregory, to represent greater joy on account of the coming of Christ." The introit itself had long been thought designed to "bring back His advent to our mind" (*Amalar. De Eccl. Off.* lib. iii. c. 5); but Durandus is without doubt wrong in ascribing to Gregory the attempt to emphasize that meaning by the addition of tropes. We cannot, however, say at what period subsequent to his they first appeared. They were not like the Greek troparia, independent of the antiphons in connection with which they were sung, but were farsings or interpolations in the antiphons of the Gregorian introit. In the following example the farsing is in italics. The antiphon is that for the Epiphany:—"Eja, Sion gaude, et laetare aspectu Dei tui. Ecce advenit dominator Dominus; cuius matrem coeli et terrae famulantur; et regnum in manu ejus. *Ipsi manet Deus (sic) gloriae atque iubilatio: et potestas et imperium*" (*Pamelii, Rationale*, tom. ii. p. 613; comp. p. 73).

Of the Gallican introit we only know that here the Roman it was sung before the office of the mass began. "While the clerks are singing psalms" (*psallentibus*), says Germanus (n. 2), "the priest comes forth out of the sacrum" (*here*=secretarium). The council of Agde, A.D. 506, appears to recognize the introit, when it orders that as in other churches "collects be said in order by the bishops and presbyters after the antiphons" (cap. 30). The following is the introit (taken from the original Italic version of *Ps.* xciii. 1) used in the Mozarabic liturgy on every Sunday between Whitsunday and Advent, and again on the Circumcision and the Sunday before and after the Epiphany:—"Domine regnavit; decorem induit: Alleluia. *Y. laus Dominus fortitudinem et praecinxit se. P. (Presbyter.) Alleluia. Y. Gloria et honor Patri et Filio: et Spiritui Sancto in saecula saeculorum: Amen. P. Alleluia.*" It will be seen that this belongs to the later period, when the celebrant was at the altar before the choir began, a rule which has prevailed in the chant

Rome also for many ages. See Sala, *Annot.* 11, in Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. iii. § 1; and Le Brun, *Explication*, p. ii. art. 1. The Ambrosian ingressa is very simple. The following is for Christmas Day, from ls. ix. 6, Ital. vers. "Puer natus est nobis, et filius datus est nobis, cujus imperium super humerum ejus, et vocabitur nomen ejus magni consilii angelus" (Pamelius, u. s. tom. i. p. 293). "It is an anthem without psalm, or *Gloria*, or repetition" (Le Brun, *Diss.* iii. art. 2).

The following hymn is sung in the liturgy of St. James before the priest enters to the altar. It is preceded by the rubric, "Then the deacon begins to sing in the entrance," which at once suggests an analogy to the Western introit. "Only begotten Son and Word of God, who being immortal didst for our salvation take upon Thee to be incarnate of the holy Mary, mother of God and ever Virgin, and didst unchangeably become man, and wast crucified, O Christ (our) God, and didst by death trample on death, being one of the Holy Trinity, glorified together with the Father and the Holy Ghost, save us" (*Liturgias SS. PP.* p. 6, Bas. 1560). The matter of this hymn proves it to be later than the outbreak of the Nestorian heresy; but its great antiquity is sufficiently attested by its appearing also in the liturgies of St. Mark (Renaudot, *Liturg. Orient.* tom. i. p. 136), in copies, apparently the older, of St. Basil (*Eucholog.* Goar, p. 180, and the old Latin version, *Liturgias, sive Missas SS. PP.* p. 32, Par. 1560), in many copies of St. Chrysostom (Goar, u. s. pp. 101, 105), and in the Armenian (Neale's *Introd. to Hist. of East. Church*, p. 380). In St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, however, we have a nearer approach to, and the probable origin of, the Western introit, viz., in three antiphons, composed for common days, of three or four verses (Rubric in St. Basil, Goar, p. 180, and the old Latin, p. 32) of the 92nd, 93rd, and 95th psalms (as numbered in E. V.). See Goar, pp. 101, 104, 105. While each antiphon is sung, a prayer is said secretly by the priest; and it may be interesting to mention that the "Prayer of St. Chrysostom," in our daily office, is in the Greek liturgy (*Lit. PP.* pp. 45, 81) the "Prayer of the Third Antiphon." The revisers of our offices were familiar with it in the translation of St. Chrysostom by Leo Thuscus, A.D. 1180 (printed by Hofmeister, in 1540), and in the Greek and Latin of the editions of Venice, 1528, and Paris, 1537, and introduced it at the end of the litany in 1544. When the Greek antiphons were first used is not known. Amalarius, writing about the year 833, says that he had heard the 95th psalm sung at Constantinople "in the church of St. Sophia at the beginning of mass" (*De Ord. Antiph.* c. 21). The use of the antiphon by the Nestorians and Jacobites seems to carry us up to the 5th century, in which they were separated from the church. On Sundays the Greek church commonly substituted "typica" (so-called because they were forms prescribed by the rubrics) for the first two antiphons, and the Beatitudes for the third (Goar, pp. 65-67; *Liturg. PP.* pp. 44, 80-82), with verses (*τροπάρια*) commemorating the saint of the day (Goar, u. s.). The liturgic typica are from the 103rd and 146th psalms (Demetrius Ducas, in Lebrun, *Diss.* VI. art. iv.; Leo Allatius, *De Libris Eccl.* Diss. I. p. 14). For the third antiphon may also be used

on common days, the third and sixth canticle (when thus united called *τροπάρια*) of the matin office (Goar, pp. 67, 124). The typica, we must add, are not sung on every Sunday. "It should be known," says the *Typicon* of Sabas, "that from New Sunday to the Feast of All Saints (i. e. from the octave of Easter to that of Whitsunday) the church sings antiphons and not typica. We sing the antiphons likewise in the Twelve Days (between Christmas and Epiphany), and on the memorials of saints which we keep as feasts" (In Leo Allat. u. s.).

The Syrian rite preserves a fragment of the 93rd psalm and nearly the whole of the 95th, at the beginning of the service. They are sung while the veils and the altar are being censed (Renaudot, tom. ii. pp. 3, 4). In the Nestorian liturgies, the priest and deacon, standing near the altar, say, in alternate verses, on common days, parts of psalms 15, 150, 117: and proper hymns on Sundays and the greater festivals (Badger's *Nestorians*, vol. ii. p. 215; Raulin, *Liturgia Malabarica*, p. 294; Renaud. tom. ii. p. 584). In the Armenian, beside the hymn before mentioned, there are hymns proper to the day, sung where the Greek has its antiphons (Le Brun, *Diss.* X. art. 12).

Cardinal Bona (*Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. iii. § 1) suggests that "perhaps Celestine (in adopting the introit) transferred to the Western churches a custom which had long flourished in the East." The great use made, as we have seen, of the 93rd psalm (*Dominus regnavit*) in the introits of Spain, creates a strong suspicion that Spain was a borrower from the Greeks, in whose liturgy that psalm was used on all common days and many Sundays in the year. Hence it is probable that the introit was, like some other rites, derived by Rome from the East through Spain.

[W. E. S.]

INVENTION OF THE CROSS. [CROSS, FINDING OF THE, p. 503.]

INVESTITURE The Latin word *Investitura* (from *vestire*, to put into possession; see Ducange s. v.), is of later date than the 9th century; nor had the thing signified by it really commenced by then, in the sense which concerns us here: the putting ecclesiastics in possession of their temporalities by a formal act of the civil power. When Sigebert, quoted by Gratian (*Dist.* lxxiii. c. 22), in enumerating the privileges supposed by him to have been conferred on Charlemagne by Adrian I., says of that pope: "Insuper archiepiscopos et episcopos per singulas provincias ab eo investituram accipere definivit: et nisi a rege laudetur et investiatur episcopus, a nemine consecratur," he is, apart from the doubtfulness of the fact (on which see De Marca, *de Concord.* viii. 12), making the pope depose, not merely to language, but to customs unknown in his day. Landulph, who was contemporary with Sigebert, is bolder still; making Adrian the inventor of both. "Qui primus," as he says of him, "annulos et virgas ad investiendum episcopatus Carolo donavit" (*Hist. Malis.* ii. 11); but then he couples another incident with this tale, which explains its origin. The absence of notice in the Caroline capitularies of any such custom, and their apparent ignorance of the word itself, seems conclusive against the existence of either at that



date: particularly as the word "vestitura" is of frequent occurrence in them, denoting either possession, or the payment for it. Of course there were symbolical forms also then in use for giving possession, but none peculiar, as yet, to the clergy; and the common name for the act of doing this was "traditio." Hence, probably, the new word arose from joining the two words, "in vestituri," in one; and then understanding it of the special formality by which the clergy were put in possession of their temporalities, on this becoming essential to possession in their case. That Charlemagne, as well as his predecessors, appointed bishops of his own choosing occasionally to see in his dominions, is no more than had been done by the Greek emperors ages before, where investiture in its Western acceptation has never been known. Neither the Theodosian Code, nor the Code or Novels of Justinian exhibit traces of anything approaching to it, though by the latter limits are prescribed to the fees for enthronization (*Novel. cxviii. 3*: see also Du Cange and Hofman, s. v.; Sirmond ap. Baluz. *Capitul. ii. 803*; and Thomassin. *Vet. et Nov. Eccl. Discipl. ii. li. 38*). [E. S. Ff.]

**INVITATORIUM.** In the Gregorian and Benedictine offices the psalm "Venite exultemus Domino" xciv. [E. V. xc.] is said daily at the beginning of Nocturns prefaced by an antiphon which is called the *Invitatorium*. It is of precisely the same character as other antiphons to psalms, and varies with the day, but is said differently from other antiphons, and repeated several times during the course of the psalm as well as at the beginning and end. Thus the ordinary Sunday invitatory is "Adoremus Dominum, qui fecit nos," which is said twice at the beginning of the psalm, and repeated in whole or in part five times during its course, and again after the *Gloria*.

On the Epiphany no invitatory was said; but the psalmody began, and still begins, with the psalm of the first nocturn with their antiphons [*Hodie non cantamus Invitatorium, sed absolute incipimus. Rubricæ ex Antiphonario Vaticano Rom. Eccl.*] and the psalm "Venite" was said with its own antiphon as the last psalm of the second nocturn. [Later it was said as the first psalm of the third nocturn, and its antiphon repeated during its course in the ordinary manner of an invitatory]. Amalarius (lib. iv. c. 33) and Durandus (lib. vi. c. 36) suggest that the reason for this omission may have been to mark the difference between the invitation to the faithful to praise God, and that which Herod gave to the scribes and doctors to find out where Christ should be born. More probably it was omitted [*Martene de Rit. lib. iv. c. 14*] simply because the psalm to which it belonged was said in an-

other place, though why the psalm should be displaced from its ordinary position is not so clear.

The psalm "Venite" is also known as the "Invitatory Psalm."

In the Ambrosian psalter, "Venite" is not said at the beginning of the office, and there is no antiphon which corresponds to the Gregorian *Invitatorium*. [H. J. R.]

#### INVOCATION. [EPICLISE.]

**IRENÆUS.** (1) [HYACINTHUS (1).]

(2) Bishop, martyr at Sirmium under Maximian; "Pasce," March 25 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) [THEODORE.]

(4) Martyr at Thessalonica with Perpetua and Irene; commemorated May 5 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(5) Bishop of Lyons, and martyr under Severus; commemorated June 28 (*Mart. Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(6) Deacon, martyr with Mustela, a noble matron, under the emperor Aurelian; commemorated July 3 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(7) Martyr at Rome with Abundantia, under Decius; commemorated Aug. 26 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(8) and Phocas; commemorated Oct. 7 (*Cal. Armen.*) [W. F. G.]

**IRENE.** (1) Virgin, martyr at Thessalonica; commemorated April 5 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr; commemorated with Agape and Chionia, April 16 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(3) [IRENEUS (4).] [W. F. G.]

#### IRENICA. [IRENEICA.]

**IRELAND, COUNCILS OF** (*Ilernia concilia*). But two such are recorded before A.D. 800, both held by St. Patrick, according to Spelman (*Conc. p. 49 and seq.*), A.D. 450 or 456, viz. in his 80th or 86th year, assisted by his coadjutors, Bishops Auxilius and Lethianus. At least the 34 canons passed at the first run in their joint names. The discipline prescribed in them indicates very primitive manners. By the 6th any clerk, from the doorkeeper to the priest seen abroad without his shirt, and with his nakedness uncovered, if his hair be not tonsured in the Roman style, and his wife walk out with her head unveiled, is to be lightly regarded by the laity, and excluded from the church. Thirty-one canons of a similar description are given in the other council. But these 65 by no means exhaust the number ascribed to St. Patrick. Seventeen more from other sources are supplied by Maasi (vi. 519-22). Another collection of Irish canons, supposed to be earlier than the 6th century, may be seen in Duchery's *Spécil* by Baluze, l. 491 and seq., and a supplement to them in Martene and Durand, *Anec. iv. 1-21*. [E. S. Ff.]

#### IRREGULARITY. [ORDINATION.]

**ISAAC.** (1) The patriarch; commemorated with Abraham and Jacob, Ter 28 = Jan. 25. *Macabreum* 28 = Sept. 23 (*Cal. Ethiop.*); also

\* In the Benedictine Psalter Ps. "Venite" is preceded by Ps. 3; but its antiphon is called "Antiph. Invitatorium."

† Amalarius c. xl. writes: "Nostra regio in processu officii (i. e. in die Epip.) solita est unum cantare de canonicis more, id est Invitatorium." as if the custom were local, but from what he says in the passage referred to in the text, it would seem that it soon became general. Some French churches, however, among which were those of Lyons and Rouen, were in the habit of singing the Invitatory on the Epiphany. At Lyons it was sung with special solemnity (*Martene de rit.*).

intervals of thirty days reckoning from these dates throughout the year; also commemorated alone, Nabasse 24 = Aug. 17 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(3) Armenian patriarch; commemorated Feb. 9 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(3) Dalmata, *Σενς* *πατρις*, in the time of the emperor Valens; commemorated May 31 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(4) Monk, martyr at Cordova; commemorated June 3 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(5) and Meorop; commemorated June 27 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(6) Holy Father, A.D. 368; commemorated Aug. 3 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(7) and Joseph; commemorated Sept. 16 (*Cal. Georg.*).

(8) King of Ethiopia; commemorated Tekemt 30 = Oct. 27 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [W. F. G.]

(9) The Just, patriarch of Alexandria; commemorated Hedar 9 = Nov. 5 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

ISAIAH, the prophet; commemorated May 9 (*Cal. Byzant.*), July 8 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedas, Adonis, Usuardi), Maskarram 6 = Sept. 3, and Ter 8 = Dec. 29 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [W. F. G.]

ISAPOSTOLOS. [APOSTLE.]

ISBODICON. [FRACTION.]

ISEHYRION, martyr at Alexandria; commemorated Dec. 22 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

ISIDORUS. (1) Bishop of Antioch; "Pasion," Jan. 2 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Usuardi).

(2) Saint, of Pelusium in Egypt, *Σενς* *πατρις* circa 415 A.D.; commemorated Jan. 15 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*), Feb. 4 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(3) Bishop of Seville (Hispania); deposition at Seville, April 4 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(4) [HELIAS.]

(5) Martyr at Chios, A.D. 355; commemorated May 15 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*, *Cal. Byzant.*).

(6) [DIOCORUS (3)]. [W. F. G.]

ISMAEL, martyr A.D. 392; commemorated June 17 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

ISSUE OF BLOOD, CURE OF THE. This miracle is repeated on many sarcophagi.



Figure on a Sarcophagus. (From Heribert.)

See Bottari, *tavv.* xix. xxi. xxxiv. xxxix. xli. lxxiv. lxxv. lxxix. cxxxv. She has been taken as representing the Gentile church, particularly by St. Ambrose, lib. ii. in *Luc.* c. viii. She is of small stature in the carvings, like the other subjects of our Lord's miraculous cures. In Eusebius (*Ecol. Hist.* vii. 18) mention is made of a bronze statue of our Lord, or rather of a group of two figures, which existed at Caesarea Philippi, Dan (or Banaas at this day), and was said to have been erected by this woman, who was also represented as kneeling at His feet. Eusebius saw the statue himself, but its being meant for our Lord seems to have been matter of tradition. *Τοῦτον τὸν ἀνδριάντα σκῆπτρα τοῦ ἱεροῦ φέρειν ἔλεγον. Ἐκείνη δὲ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὅτι καὶ ἴδετο παραλαβεῖν τὴν ἐπιμήσαντας ἀντιπρὶς τῇ πόλει.* (See *JESUS CHRIST, REPRESENTATIONS OF.*) [R. St. J. T.]

ISTRIAN COUNCIL (*Istriensis Concilium*). Held by the partisans of the Three Chapters at some place in Istria, A.D. 591, according to Mansi, to petition the emperor Maurice in their own behalf, and that of Severus, bishop of Aquileia, their metropolitan, who had been forced by the exarch into condemning them at Ravenna, and was now summoned with his suffragans to Rome. Their remonstrance, to which eight names are affixed, was successful, and the pope was ordered to leave them in peace for the present (Mansi, x. 463-7). [E. S. Ff.]

ITALIAN COUNCILS (*Italiae Concilia*). Three councils are given under this heading in Mansi. 1. A.D. 380, at which Maximus the Cynic, who had just been deposed at Constantinople, was heard (iii. 519). 2. A.D. 381, at which St. Ambrose was present, and whose proceedings are preserved in two letters addressed in his name and that of his colleagues to the emperor Theodosius, in one of which an attempt to introduce Apollinarian errors among them is noticed; and in the other the claims of Maximus, and the consecration of Nectarius to the see of Constantinople are discussed with some anxiety (ib. 630-3). 3. A.D. 405, at which the emperor Honorius was petitioned to intervene with his brother Arcadius in favour of St. John Chrysostom (ib. 1162). [E. S. Ff.]

IVENTIVUS, EVANTIUS, or EVENTIVUS, confessor at Pavia; commemorated with Syrus Sept. 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

## J

JACINTHUS. (1) [FELICIANUS (4).]

(2) [HYACINTHUS.]

JACOB, the patriarch; commemorated Nabasse 25 = Aug. 18 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). See also ISAAC. [W. F. G.]

JADER. [FELIX (24).]

JAMBlichus, one of the seven sleepers of Ephesus; commemorated Oct. 22 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

JAMES THE GREATER, ST., LEONARD AND FESTIVAL OF.

1. *Legend.*—By the name of James the Greater, the son of Zebedee is distinguished from the other apostle of the same name. *See*

epithet would seem to have regard either to stature or to age, though some, with apparently less likelihood, would make it refer (1) to priority in the call to the apostleship, or (2) to higher privileges in intercourse with Christ, or (3) to the dignity of an earlier martyrdom.

The elder brother of St. John, universally believed to have been the last survivor of the apostles, St. James was the first to be called away, having been beheaded by Herod Agrippa I., shortly before the Passover of 44 A.D. Out of a mass of tradition concerning him, the only point supported by any adequate evidence is the incident related by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. 9) on the authority of Clement of Alexandria, of the conversion of St. James's accuser as the apostle was led away to death. Struck by his steadfastness, he too embraced Christ, and the apostle and his accuser suffered together.

The stories, however, of St. James's connection with Spain are deserving of very little credit. In spite of such plain statements as Acts viii. 1 (very lamely met by Baronius), the apostle is made to undertake a missionary journey into Spain after the death of Stephen, returning to Jerusalem before A.D. 44. The ancient evidence for such a story is of the weakest. Isidore of Seville (ob. 636 A. D.) does say (*de Ortu et Obitu Patrum*, c. 71; *Patrol.* lxxxiii. 151), if indeed the work is his, which is certainly doubtful, that St. James preached the gospel to the natives of Spain and the Western regions;\* and the same statement is found in the *Collectanea*, once wrongly attributed to Bede (*Patrol.* xciv. 545). Mere unsupported statements, however, of so late a date can amount to very little. It is worthy of notice too that at a much earlier period, Innocent I. (ob. 417 A.D.) states that no church had been founded throughout Italy, Gaul, or Spain, except by those who owed their authority directly or indirectly to St. Peter (*Ep.* 25 *ad Decentium*, c. 2; *Patrol.* xx. 552). With every allowance for the desire of a bishop of Rome to exalt the see of St. Peter, so sweeping a statement could hardly have been ventured on, had there been a strongly established tradition as to St. James's connection with Spain. Ambrose evidently knew no such legend, for he speaks of St. Paul's projected journey into Spain being "quia illic Christus non erat praedicatus" (*Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.* xv. 24; *Patrol.* xvii. 176); nor did Jerome, for he mentions St. Paul's journeys having reached even to Spain, immediately after referring to the apostle's never building "super alterius fundamentum, ubi jam fuerat praedicatum" (*Comm. in Amos*, v. 8 sqq.; vol. vi. 291, ed. Vallarsi). Baronius (notes to *Martyrologium Romanum*; July 25), in summing up concerning these legends, can only urge "non esse adeo impossibilia, vel haberi pro monstro, ut putant aliqui."

The story of the translation of the apostle's body into Spain is obviously totally apocryphal. It is to the effect that after his body had been interred at Jerusalem, his disciples removed it to Iria Flavia, in the far north-west of Spain. (For an elementary form of the story see the *Martyrologies* [July 25] of Usuard and Notker;

\* This writing speaks of St. James as buried "in Mar marica" (al. Carmarica, &c.), a name which does not seem to have been satisfactorily explained.

*Patrol.* cxxiv. 295, cxxxi. 1125: those of Bede and Wandalbert ignore it.) Here it was discovered early in the 9th century, and removed to Compostella (a corruption of *Giacomus Postula ad Jacobum Apostolum*), a few miles distant, by order of Alphonso II., king of Asturias and Leon (ob. 842 A.D.). For a very full account of these legends, see Cuper in the *Acta Sanctorum* (July, vol. v. pp. 3 sqq.); also Mariana, *De adventu Jacobi Apostoli majoris in Hispaniam*, in his *Tractatus*, Col. Agr. 1609; Tolra, *Justification historico-critica de la venida de Santiago el Mayor a España, y de su sepulcro in Compostela*. Madrid, 1797; Arevalus, *Isidoriana*, c. 61 (*Patrol.* lxxxii. 382 sqq.), and sundry writings in connection with St. James, wrongly attributed to pope Callixtus II. (*Patrol.* clxiii. 1370 sqq.). Strangely, however, in spite of this lack of evidence, the legend took such root in Spain, as practically to count there as an article of faith, and thus we find Luther holding it necessary to protest against such a view (*Sämmtliche Schriften*, xv. 1864, ed. Walch).

For the wild legends connecting St. James with the false teachers Hermogenes and Philetus, reference may be made to the *Historia Apostolica* of the pseudo-Abdias, lib. iv., in which, it may be remarked in passing, there is no allusion whatever to Spain (Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus Novi Testamenti*, vol. ii. p. 516 sqq. ed. 1719).

2. *Festival of St. James.*—The date when St. James was first commemorated by a festival cannot be determined very closely. It is well known that at first the only apostles who had a special festival were St. Peter and St. Paul, and that the others gradually obtained separate commemorations afterwards. In the case of St. James, the notices are such as to point to the conclusion that the festival was one which only made its way very gradually, and that the date at which it had attained general observance was quite late. We find a mention, it is true, in the ancient *Kalendarium Carthagenense*, where for December 27 is this notice: "vi. Kal. Jan. Sancti Joannis Baptistae [here probably Evangelistae should be read] et Jacobi Apostoli, quem Herodes occidit" (*Patrol.* xiii. 1228). On the other hand, many ancient Sacramentaries give no indication of the existence of a festival of St. James. The Ambrosian (Pamelius, *Liturgg. Lat.* i. 403) and Gregorian (col. 115, ed. Menard), as we now have them, do so, the forms being almost identical in the two cases; but the Leonine and Gelasian pass it over. In the ancient Gallican Liturgy edited by Mabillon, to which we have referred below, it will be seen that St. James is commemorated, together with his brother, on December 27, but in the Gallican Lectionary the festival is of St. John alone, and in the *Martyrologium Gellonense* (D'Achèry's *Spicilegium*, xii. 390), the notice is "vi. Kal. Jan. Ordinatio Episcopatus Jacobi Apostoli fratris Domini et Adsumptio Sancti Joannis Evangelistae." In the Gothic Breviary edited by Lorenzana, a form is provided for a festival of St. James on December 30 (*Patrol.* lxxxvi. 1306), but there is none in the Mozarabic Missal. The Pontifical of Egbert, archbishop of York (ob. 766 A.D.) has no notice of such a festival. Additional evidence to the same effect may be found in the fact that the earliest traces of a vigil of a festival of St.

James are of very late date. Binterim (*Denkm.* v. 1. 401) asserts that the vigil does not occur at all in calendars before the 10th century. Even so late, however, as the 13th century, the festival itself does not appear to have attained universal acceptance; for in the canons of the council of Oxford (1222 A.D.) it is not included in the list of the chief festivals observed in England (can. 8; Labbe xi. 274). At the council of Cognac in France (1256 A.D.) the case is somewhat doubtful, yet taking the context into consideration (cf. can. 19), the words "duodecim Apostolorum, et maxime Petri et Pauli, Andreae, Jacobi . . ." perhaps point to separate festivals and not to the collective festival of the apostles (can. 21; Labbe xi. 749: cf. *Conc. Tolosanum* [1229 A.D.], can. 26, *op. cit.* 433, where the probability seems to incline the other way). We may appeal, however, finally to the proceedings of the synod of Exeter (1287 A.D.), where the festivals to be observed are named in their several months, and where the entry for July is, "Translationis S. Thomae martyris, Sanctae Mariae Magdalenae, S. Jacobi Apostoli majoris" (can. 23, *op. cit.* 1288).

Besides this vagueness as to the date of the origin of the festival, the utmost latitude also prevails as to the day when it was to be celebrated. We have evidence indeed of a kind which is wanting in the case of every other apostle, for from Acts xii. 4 we may assume that St. James was put to death shortly before the Passover. Still, in the Western church, perhaps from the wish not to have a celebration of a martyrdom in Lent and Eastertide, we generally find St. James's festival on July 25.<sup>b</sup> The calendar of the church of Carthage associates him, as we have seen, with his brother John on December 27; as does also the Gothico-Gallic Missal, where the heading for the day is "in Natale Apostolorum Jacobi et Johannis" (Mabillon, *de Liturgia Gallicana*, lib. iii. p. 196). [In the Gothic calendar, however, prefixed to Lorenzana's edition of the Gothic Breviary, we find on December 30, "Jacobus frater Joannis Apostoli et Evangelistae," following the notice on December 29, "Jacobus, frater Domini," *Patrol.* lxxvi. 19.] The same combination too meets us in the calendar of the Armenian church on December 28 (Neale, *Eastern Church*, Introd. p. 804), and in that of the Ethiopic church on September 27 (Ludolf, *Fasti Sacri Ecclesiae Alexandrinae*, p. 5). The calendar of the Byzantine church appoints April 30 for the commemoration of St. James, and so we find in the Greek metrical *Ephemerides* prefixed by Papebroch to the *Acta Sanctorum* for May (vol. i. p. xxv.) κτεῖνε μάχαίρα φόβου Ἰάκωβον ἐν τριακόστῃ. In the martyrology given by Cardinal Sirletus, besides the commemoration on April 30, there is also noted on November 15, "Natalis SS. Baruch et Jacobi, fratris Joannis Theologi" (see Canisius, *Theaurus*, vol. iii. pp. 427, 486).

The spring period is also recognised in the Ethiopic and Coptic calendars. In the former, besides the festival mentioned above, there are also commemorations on February 4 and April

12 of St. James, apparently the son of Zebedee (Ludolf, pp. 20, 26). The Coptic calendar has generally a very close affinity with the preceding, and, like it, has a festival of St. James (defined as the son of Zebedee) on April 12; and also on February 12 of a James, presumably the present, and on April 30 of a James, defined as the son of Zebedee.<sup>c</sup>

3. Whether or no it is due to the early date of this apostle's martyrdom, but little literature is directly associated with his name. The canonical epistle of James is indeed assigned to him in the subscription of a Corbey MS. of the old Latin version cited by Tischendorf (*in loc.*), and also in the passage of Isidore already referred to. This theory, however, is exceedingly improbable, and need not be further referred to here.

A pretended discovery was made near Granada in Spain in 1595 A.D. of the remains of two of St. James's disciples, and with them of eighteen books on leaden plates, including several by St. James, which with the others were condemned by Innocent XI. in 1682 A.D. (Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus Novi Testamenti*, i. 352, iii. 725; *Acta Sanctorum*, May, vol. vii. pp. 285, 393).

For further remarks on the subject of the preceding article reference may be made to Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Katholischen Kirche*, vol. v. part i. pp. 400 sqq.; Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archäologie*, vol. iii. pp. 237 sqq.; Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire Ecclésiastique*, vol. i. pp. 342 sqq., 625 sqq. ed. Paris, 1693; Cajetan Cenni, *Dissertat. i. de Antiq. Eccl. Hist.* c. 2, Rome, 1741. [R. S.]

#### JAMES THE LESS, ST., LEGEND AND FESTIVAL OF.

1. *Legend, &c.*—It does not fall within our present province to discuss the question whether James, the son of Alphaeus, one of the twelve apostles, is or is not the same as James, the Lord's brother, bishop of Jerusalem. The probability seems to incline in favour of the non-identity of the two, but there are considerable difficulties attending either hypothesis; and the matter will be found discussed at length in the *DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE*. Of ancient liturgies, martyrologies and calendars, some identify, while others distinguish them; and hence it may perhaps be most convenient here to collect together the various notices under either designation.

It may be remarked at the outset that if James, the son of Alphaeus, be a different person from James the Lord's brother, there is almost a complete lack of tradition as to his history. The ancient so-called *Martyrologium Hieronymi* speaks of his being martyred in Persia (*Patrol.* xxx. 478), and the Greek metrical *Ephemerides*, which we have cited below, assert that he was crucified; but it is impossible to say what amount of belief is to be given to either of these statements. James, the

<sup>b</sup> The statement of some writers (e. g. Augusti, *Denkw.* iii. 227) that this particular day is the anniversary of the translation of the saint's remains to Compostella, is one whose proof and disproof is equally impossible.

<sup>c</sup> It should be noticed that sundry slight variations from Ludolf's calendar of the Egyptian church occur in those given by S. Iden (*de Synodis Veterum Ebraeorum*, pp. 210 sqq.; ed. Amsterdam, 1679). Here one calendar gives Feb. 11 the other Feb. 12; one April 11, the other April 12: and one (the other has no entry) has April 20 for April 30.



Lord's brother, on the other hand, fills a prominent place in the history of the Acts, he is referred to by St. Paul in the Epistle to the Galatians in a way that sufficiently indicates his importance, and there can be no doubt that it is to him we owe the so-called Catholic Epistle of St. James. Ecclesiastical tradition also tells much concerning him, and the account of his martyrdom given by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. 23) from Hegesippus is doubtless substantially correct. It is not, however, necessary to repeat here what has already been said in the Bible Dictionary, to which reference may be made.

2. *Festival*.—The exact date of the rise of a special festival of St. James, whether as the son of Alphaeus or as the Lord's brother, is hard to fix. Like those of most of the apostles, it is comparatively late. Among the earliest witnesses, we may mention the *Martyrologium Hieronymi*, the metrical martyrology of Bede, and the ancient liturgies referred to below. The first of these, as well as other early Roman martyrologies, commemorates James, the son of Alphaeus, on June 22, and also James, the Lord's brother, on March 15, April 25, and December 27. On the last of these there is associated with the "Assumptio S. Joannis Evangelistae," also the "Ordinatio episcopatus S. Jacobi fratris Domini," a combination to which we shall again refer. There is also in this martyrology, as we now have it, a commemoration of James, not further defined, but obviously the present, on May 1. The metrical martyrology of Bede commemorates St. Philip and St. James together on May 1, the latter, it will be seen, defined as the Lord's brother,

"Jacobus Domini frater plus atque Philippus  
Mirifico Malas venerantur honore Calendas."

This has been the general custom throughout the Western church, and so we find it in the Gelasian (*Patrol.* lxxiv. 1161), Gregorian (col. 101, ed. Menard) and Ambrosian (Pamelius, *Liturgg. Lat.* i. 370) liturgies. The reason for this combination of apostles, and for the choice of this particular day does not appear. Schulting (*Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* ii. 130) simply states that it is because of the translation of the relics of the two on that day in the Pontificate of Pelagius I. (ob. 560 A.D.). We are not aware that anything can be adduced in support of this statement beyond the remark of Anastasius Bibliothecarius that under Pelagius I., "initata est basilica Apostolorum Philippi et Jacobi" (*Vitae Pontificum*; Pelagius I. *Patrol.* cxxviii. 614), where we see the two names already associated.

It is stated by the *Micrologus* that this festival was originally one of all the apostles; there seems, however, to be no real evidence for the assertion "ideo etiam invenitur in martyrologiis sive in Sacramentariis festivitas Sanctorum Jacobi et Philippi et omnium Apostolorum" (*de Eccl. Observ.* c. 55; *Patrol.* cli. 1017). This is followed, however, by sundry liturgical writers, e.g. Honorius Augustodunensis (*Gemma Animae* iii. 140; *Patrol.* clxxii. 681), and Durandus (*Rat. Div. Off.* vii. 10).

Besides the festival of May 1, the Ambrosian liturgy also commemorates on Dec. 30 the "ordinatio B. Jacobi Alphaei Apostoli" (*op. cit.* 309), resembling the already cited notice of the

*Martyrologium Hieronymi*; and we may again refer to the entry in the *Martyrologium Gallicanum* quoted in the preceding article. The Gallican liturgy, published by Mabillon, omits altogether the festival of St. James, whether as son of Alphaeus or as brother of the Lord; but in the Mozarabic missal we find a commemoration of "S. Jacobus, frater Domini" on Dec. 29. We may take this opportunity of adding that the prophetic lection, epistle and gospel there are respectively Wisdom xviii. 20-24; i. Tim. i. 18-ii. 8; Luke viii. 23, 27, John xii. 24-26, xiii. 16, 17, 20, xv. 6, 12, 13 (*Patrol.* lxxxv. 104). In the Mozarabic Breviary, the form is merely headed "in festo S. Jacobi Apostoli" (*Patrol.* lxxxvi. 136), but there are numerous references to the martyrdom of James, the Lord's brother, at Jerusalem.

The Byzantine calendar distinguishes the son of Alphaeus from the Lord's brother, the former being commemorated on Oct. 9, the latter on Oct. 23; and so we find in the Greek metrical *Ephemerides*, published by Papebroch in the *Acta Sanctorum* (May, vol. i. p. xlvi.),—ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνάτης ἰδίας τοῦ ἐν σταυρῷ τεταμένοντος, καὶ ἐκείνου ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ τριτάτου ξύλου εἰσάδει πλῆξεν. In the Armenian church, besides the commemoration of the two sons of Zebedee on Dec. 28, there are also commemorations on August 31 of "Thomas and James, Apostles," and on Dec. 23 of "James, Apostle" (Neale, *Eastern Church*; *Introd.* pp. 801, 804). In the calendars of the Egyptian and Ethiopic churches given in Ludolf's *Fasti Sacri Ecclesiae Alexandrinae*, we find that the former commemorates James, the son of Alphaeus, on October 2, and James, the Lord's brother, on October 23, and that they both commemorate this latter on July 12. Besides this, the Coptic calendar has on Feb. 12, and the Ethiopic on Feb. 4, a James, an apostle, not otherwise specified.\*

It may be remarked here that many of the customs which still characterize the day on which the Western church commemorates St. James, have obviously sprung from lingering heathen usages. These are, as a rule, connected with the idea of the return of spring, and thus are in some sense parallel to those associated with the festivals of Christmas and St. John the Baptist's day, which dwell on the idea of the returning and retreating sun. [CHRISTMAS; JOHN THE BAPTIST, ST., FIRE OF.]

Thus the gathering of flowers and the adorning of houses with them on May-day morning may fairly be connected with the Roman festival of the *Floralia* held on the five days following April 28; similar festivals to which were also held in other places, as the *Anthephoria* in Sicily, etc.

A trace of the ancient sun-worship is still to be found in one of the customs prevalent on this day among Celtic peoples, and notably the Irish and Highland peasantry, viz., the lighting of great fires in the open air; and thus the common Irish name for the day, is *La Bealtine* (day of Beal's or Baal's fire), and similarly in Gaelic.

\* It may be noted that one of the Egyptian calendars given by Selden (*de Synodis Veterum Aegyptiorum* pp. 215, 219; ed. Amsterdam, 1673) puts Feb. 11 for Feb. 12, and July 11 for July 12.

## JAMES

Curious also with the same central idea existed among the ancient Gothic nations (see Olaus Magnus, *Historia de Gentibus Septentrionalibus* xv. 8, p. 503, ed. Rome, 1555).

3. With the name of the person or persons now before us, more literature is associated than in the case of Zebedee. Besides the Canonical Epistle of St. James, there are still extant the so-called *Protogospelium Jacobi*, the most respectable of the Apocryphal gospels, and the so-called liturgy of St. James. It is possible too that at one time there existed other pseudonymous writings bearing the name of St. James, for we find Innocent I. in alluding to sundry works of this class, mention those which "sub nomine . . . Jacobi minoris . . . damanda" (*Ep. 6 ad Eusebium* a. 7, *Patrol.* xi. 502). Again, in the records of a council held at Rome in 494 A.D., under the episcopate of Gelasius, it is ruled "Evangelium (al. Evangelia) nomine Jacobi minoris, Apocryphum" (*Patrol.* lxx. 162, 175, 176). Apocryphal letters to St. James from St. Peter and St. Clement are prefixed to the various editions of the Clementine Homilies (see e.g. Cotelierus, *Patres Apost.* i. 602, ed. 1700). The *Apostolic Constitutions* again (viii. 23), cite James, the son of Alphaeus, as giving rules respecting confessors and virgins; and some forms of the text, but apparently not the best, give (c. xlii.) rules as to divine service claiming the authority of James, the Lord's brother.

Besides works already cited, reference may be made to Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten der Christlich-Ätholischen Kirche*, vol. v. part i., pp. 365 sqq.; Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archäologie*, vol. iii. pp. 337 sqq. [R. S.]

**JAMES.** (1) Bishop, *Seis* *επίσκοπος* and *ἀποστόλος*—circa 824 A.D.; commemorated March 21 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Patriarch of Alexandria, 1830 A.D.; commemorated Oct. 8 (*Cal. Copt.*).

(3) Patriarch of Antioch; commemorated Tokent 11 = Oct. 8 (*Cal. Etyiop.*).

(4) Martyr of Persia, A.D. 386; commemorated Nov. 27 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(5) Presbyter, martyr in Persia under Sapor with Malchus the bishop, and Acropolus the bishop (circa 345 A.D.); commemorated April 22 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(6) Of Nisibis, confessor under Maximian; commemorated Dec. 14 (*Cal. Armen.*); July 15 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(7) Deacon, martyr under Decius apud Lambetanum urbem with Marianus the reader; commemorated April 30 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*); May 6 (*Cal. Carth.*). [W. F. G.]

**JANUARIA.** [SCHILITA, MARTYR OF.]

**JANUARIUS.** (1) [FELIX (1).]

(2) [FELIX (5).]

(3) *λεπιδόφρος*; commemorated with companion martyrs, April 21 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(4) [FELIX (15).]

(5) [FELIX (16).]

(6) [SCHILITA, MARTYR OF.]

(7) Martyr with Pelagia at Nicopolis, in Lesser Armenia; commemorated July 11 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

## JERUSALEM, COUNCIL OF 379

(8) [FLORENTIUS (1).]

(9) [SIXTUS (2).]

(10) Bishop of Beneventum, martyr at Naples with Festus and Proculus, deacons, Daddarius, Euticus, and Acutus, under the emperor Diocletian; commemorated Sept. 19 (*Mart. Bedae, Usuardi*).

(11) [FAUSTUS (6).]

(12) [FELIX (23).]

(13) Saint; commemorated Dec. 2 (*Cal. Armen.*). [W. F. G.]

**JASON.** (1) [HILARIA (3).]

(2) And Scipater, apostles; commemorated April 28 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**JEREMIAH.** (1) The prophet; commemorated May 1 (*Mart. Usuardi, Bedae, Cal. Byzant.*); Sept. 5 (*Cal. Copt.*); Aug. 29 (*Cal. Armen.*); Gihob 5 = April 30 (*Cal. Etyiop.*). [W. F. G.]

(2) [PETER (8).]

(3) [EMILIANUS (4).]

**JERUSALEM, COUNCILS OF** (*Hierosolymitane Concilia*). (1) A.D. 47, says Cave (*Hist. Lit.* i. 38); Baronius and others, A.D. 51: the third, in chronological order, of the meetings of the Apostles recorded in their Acts, but the only one deserving the name of a synod. Its proceedings are described there (c. xv.). A controversy having arisen at Antioch, over which according to Eusebius (*Chron.* ad l.) Eusebius had been appointed bishop as far back as A.D. 43, on the necessity of circumcising the Gentile converts and obliging them to keep the law of Moses, it was referred to the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem for decision, SS. Paul and Barnabas being sent thither for that purpose. The Apostles and elders came together, accordingly, to consider of it. St. Peter spoke first, and gave his opinion against burdening the disciples with any such yoke. Then all the multitude—in other words, the body of believers, or brethren who were present—listened to the reports given of the conversion of the Gentiles that had been achieved on their first expedition as missionaries into Asia Minor by SS. Paul and Barnabas. After which St. James, as bishop, doubtless, of Jerusalem, delivered his "sentence;" which was embodied in the synodical letter, addressed in the name of the Apostles and elders and brethren, finally, to the brethren of the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, and sent by two principal men of their own number, in addition to SS. Paul and Barnabas. On reaching Antioch, the bearers of this epistle gathered the multitude together and delivered it, when its contents having been read caused great joy.

(2) Mosaic's reasons for dating this council A.D. 349 seem conclusive (li. 171, note). Constantine, who ruled in the West, threatened his brother Constantius with hostilities, if St. Athanasius, in whose favour the Sardican council had pronounced two years before, was not restored to his see; and Gregory, his rival, having died in the early part of this year, his return was allowed. In his way he stopped at Jerusalem, when a synod was held under its orthodox bishop, Marimian, and a letter despatched from it to congratulate the Alexandrians on this act of grace on the part of the emperors: which Constantine, however, did.

not live to see carried out, as he was slain in Jan. 350. And Maximus having held this synod without leave from his metropolitan, Acacius, bishop of Caesarea, was ejected by him in another synod a few months later, to be succeeded by St. Cyril, then catechist, and a supposed Arian.

(3) A.D. 399. A synod of bishops, met to celebrate the feast of the dedication of the church there, acknowledge the receipt of a synodical epistle from Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, condemning some of the errors of Origen lately revived in his diocese, and profess their agreement with it (Mansi, iii. 989-92).

(4) A.D. 415. What we should call a diocesan synod: of presbyters, that is, under their bishop, John. Orosius, the historian, then on a mission from St. Augustine to St. Jerome, was present at it, and gives an account of its proceedings. Pelagius being there, and accused by him of heresy, was invited to come in, and put on his defence. Neither what he said, nor what Orosius said, were considered altogether unexceptionable by the bishop, who proposed that letters should be sent to Pope Innocent of Rome on the subject, and that all should abide by what he decreed (Mansi, iv. 307-12).

(5) A.D. 518, to express its adhesion to the Constantinopolitan synod of the same year (see the art.): its own synodical letter being also preserved in the subsequent council under Mennas.

(6) A.D. 536, Sept. 19: under Peter, its patriarch, on receipt of the acts of the synod of Constantinople under Mennas, between four and five months previously, with the edict of the Emperor Justinian confirming them, and a letter from Mennas to Peter acquainting him with their contents (see the article on this council). The deacon and notary present having recited them, they were received synodically by Peter, and subscribed to by forty-eight bishops, with himself at their head (Mansi, viii. 1164-76).

(7) A.D. 553, under its patriarch, Eustochius, at which the acts of the 5th council were received and confirmed.

(8) A.D. 634, under Sophronius, on his elevation as patriarch, to condemn Monothelism, against which he had contended with so much ardour as monk previously. The encyclical epistle sent by him on this occasion to the bishops of Rome and Constantinople is preserved in the 11th action of the 6th council where it was recited (Mansi, x. 649-52). [E. S. Ff.]

JESSE, ab Silcania; commemorated Dec. 2 (Cul. Greg.). [W. F. G.]

JESUS. [JOSHUA.]

JESUS CHRIST, REPRESENTATIONS OF. I. The symbolic representations of the Lord are discussed severally, as under the titles FISH, IXOTC, LAMB, VINE; see also SYMBOLISM. For the pictorial types of the Lord derived from the Old Testament, see OLD TESTAMENT IN CHRISTIAN ART; for pagan types used to represent Him, see PAGANISM IN CHRISTIAN ART. For representations on gems, see GEMS, §§ xii. and xiii. p. 718; on the bottoms of cups, see GLASS, CHRISTIAN, p. 732. See also IMAGES, p. 813; and NUMISMATICS. Setting aside such representations as these, it is to be observed, in the first instance, that He is represented in the human form from the earliest times of Christian

art as the Good Shepherd; and this symbolic picture, though in no case whatever considered as a portrait, must have made the idea of representations of His human form a very familiar one at all times in the Roman and other Western churches—and in earlier centuries, in the Byzantine also. One of the latest, and the most important perhaps of all these, is the often described Good Shepherd of the chapel of Galla Placidia at Ravenna, middle fifth century: and one of the earliest ideal portraits of our Lord is found in the church of St. Apollinaris, built a century later within the walls of that city. In art these two figures mark the transition from the elder Graeco-Roman ideas and traditions of art to the later style, properly called Byzantine. The leading difference in feeling and principle between them will be illustrated in the course of this article: for the present it may briefly be thus stated: that in the earlier illustration of the Lord's Parable of Himself, the attempt at beauty predominates, and is far from unsuccessful; whereas in the Byzantine picture of St. Apollinare, though considerable beauty of feature is retained, the tendency to the ascetic or melancholy ideal of later art, both Italian and German, is unmistakably visible.

It is perhaps fortunate that the words of St. Augustine (*De Trinitate* viii. 4, 5) put it apparently beyond question, that the world cannot possess now, and did not possess in his time, any authentic record whatever of the bodily appearance of Jesus Christ the God-Man on earth. "Nam et ipsius Dominicae facies Carnis innumrabiliū cogitationum diversitate variatur et fingitur; quae tamen una erat, quaecunque erat." Two centuries before, indeed, St. Irenaeus (*contra Haeres.* 1. 25) had spoken, with indignant absence of comment, of certain Gnostic representations of Christ, both painted and sculptured, as it appears. "Quasdam quidem [imagines] quasi depictas, quasdam autem et de reliqua materia fabricatas habent, dicentes formam Christi factam a Pilato, illo in tempore quo fuit Jesus cum hominibus. Et has coronant, et proponunt eas cum imaginibus mundi philosophorum, videlicet cum imagine Pythagorae, et Platonis, et Aristotelis." These passages seem conclusive to the effect that no real portrait of our Lord existed, or was remembered as existing, in the 2nd century. Indeed as Martigny observes, the controversy (dating from the 2nd century) with regard to the human comeliness of our Lord's body visible on earth, makes it perfectly certain, were proof necessary, that no authentic portrait of Him ever existed. Augustine acknowledges without blame the universal tendency of thought to picture to itself persons and events by imaginative effort, instancing St. Paul in particular, and taking it for certain, as it probably may be, that each of all the innumerable readers of the epistles will form a different idea of his own about the author's appearance, though none can say whose will be nearest the truth.

In his mind then, and indeed in our own, all ideal or fancy portraits of our Lord, so called, are merely symbolic of His humanity; and in this view, the crucifix itself may be taken as a symbol only of the fact of His death and the doctrine of His sacrifice for man; however the word sacrifice be defined or enlarged upon: and this may certainly make its presence in Christian churches not only allowable but desirable. We

may observe on the different relation of the church to the arts in Augustine's days, when christian art of a well marked and distinctive character existed, from the state of things in the time of Tertullian, who protests against all mulactra, likenesses, or representations whatever, and, as he well might in the presence of the whole Pantheon, considers all images or likenesses practically the same as idols.<sup>2</sup>

Human art, however, was adopted by the church along with human thought and learning. We cannot tell whether Tertullian knew or cared for the catacomb-paintings of Rome. Some of them, as those in the more ancient part of St. Omotilla, were certainly in existence before his time; but he seems, in the presence of the syncretism, to protest against all paintings whatever, and the fact that St. Augustine not unwillingly accepts them, is an illustration of a highly natural change of Christian feeling on the matter.<sup>3</sup>

The more ancient usage of representing the Lord as the Good Shepherd culminates in the mosaic of Galla Placidia's chapel. A far higher antiquity is claimed for the no-longer existing portrait-head of Christ, which Beolo represents, on a chapel of the Callistine catacomb.



Head of Christ from the Callistine catacomb. (Hartung.)

There is a general opinion that it may have been as early date as the 2nd century; and what we know of it may well induce us to believe that it was the original of that ideal of our Lord's countenance which has passed, through Leonardo da Vinci, into all Christian painting. Mr. Lindsay, however, says that the traditional head with which Europe is so familiar, was unknown in the West till the 4th century, when the original was sent to Constantinople, sister of Constantine, by Eusebius of Caesarea. It is therefore of Byzantine or Eastern origin. The nearest example, he continues, is a supposed 4th century mosaic, found originally in the Callistine, and now in the Vatican. See Eusebius's

<sup>2</sup> *De Idololatria*, c. iii. "Idolonia aliquammodo retro non ita; he says, "sola templa et vacuae sedes. At ubi istos statuarum et imaginum, et ornata generis simularum diaboli seculo intulit (unde illud negotium memos talismantibus) et nomen de Idolis consecutum."

<sup>3</sup> Tertullian begins his book against Hermogenes with reproaching him for his profession as a painter: "Plagiat, nobilem auctoritatem: legem Dei in libidine defecit, artem contemnit: de salutis et castitatis et stylo emittit," &c. Athenagoras (*Legat. pro Christ.* c. 30) also of images or statues in general as portraits of men.

letter in Labbe, *Conc.* t. vi. col. 493 sq. This letter repudiates (rhetorically but with sincerity) any idea of our Lord's real appearance, and from it and the passage in *Bid. Eoc.* (viii. 19) it appears that Eusebius had not seen any historic portrait which he (or indeed others) believed on evidence to be a genuine likeness [IMAGES, § III.]. Others of the same type are repeated on sarcophagi, dating from that of Junius Bassus, A.D. 359; see Bottari, *tav.* xv. xxi.-xxv. xliii. xlii.; the latter represents the paintings in the catacomb of St. Pontianus, probably renewed over older pictures in the time of pope Adrian I. (A.D. 772-775). This catacomb also contains a highly ornamented cross, which is evidently intended to represent the person of our Lord [CROSS].

The assertion of the idea that our Lord not only took upon Him the flesh of mankind, but the "form of a servant," or slave, all bodily ugliness instead of beauty, is derived from meditation on the prophetic text (Isa. liii. 2), "He hath no form nor comeliness;" as the natural thought of His beauty from the Messianic Psalm (xlv. 3), "Thou art fairer than the children of men." The former view seems to have been entertained, or is nowise discouraged by Justin Martyr, who twice uses the word *delphos* of our Lord: meaning evidently to repeat the expression of Isaiah (*Dial. cum Tryph.* cc. 85 and 88). So Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* iii. 1) appeals to the two texts to which we have referred on the same side. Compare Stromata, ii. 5, § 22; iii. 17, § 103; vi. 17, § 151. Tertullian may be supposed to have thought likewise (*Adv. Jud.* c. 14): "Na aspectu quidem honestus;" (*De carne Christi*, c. 9) "Adeo nec humanas honestatis corpus fuit." He infers from the cruelty of Jews and soldiers at the crucifixion, that such insults could not have been offered to the Lord, had His person possessed any beauty. So Origen (*c. Cel.* vi. 75, p. 327, Spencer), who, however, held that the Lord could appear in whatever form he pleased (*Isa.* ii. p. 99 f.). A list is given by Molanus (*Hist. Sacramentum Imaginum*, p. 403) by which it appears that St. Jerome (*in Matt.* ix. 9; *Epist.* 65, ad Primum. c. 8), St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom (*Rom.* 27 [al. 28] in *Matt.* p. 328; and on Pa. 44 [45] p. 162), and Theodoret, followed the text which speaks of Him as fairest of all men, St. Basil and St. Cyril of Alexandria (little to our surprise) taking the other side. This unedifying controversy belongs to art rather than to theology. The Oriental, or Egyptian, or ascetic view of the human body, would necessarily have weight on the ill-favoured side, theologically speaking. And in practical art, the want of skill, and also of models possessing any degree of earthly good looks, must have borne strongly in the same direction. Beauty of expression was too subtle a thing for the hands of the Monks of the 8th and 9th centuries.

There were various reasons why the ideal of bodily beauty should gradually be lost, up to the 12th century. It has often been remarked that as the ascetic life was more and more severely enforced on the faithful, and the sufferings of the later Roman world bore more and more severely on the whole community, the honour of the body of man was lost and forgotten. In the earlier Gothic days, strength and



manly beauty must have been associated in the eyes of the Monastic Church only with the ignorance and ferocity of barbarian soldiers. The Christian assembly on earth, under the hands of Alaric and Genseric, Attila and Alboin, was utterly hopeless of any good on earth. The eastern end of a Byzantine or Romanesque church from the 6th century, begins accordingly to be adorned as a mystical representation of heaven, beyond the wilderness of earth, with the portrait figure of Christ as its centre. The Lord, whom all seek so piteously, shall suddenly come to His temple; and the eyes of distressed congregations are allowed a vision in symbol of His presence breaking in on the distresses of later days. One of the earliest examples of churches thus ornamented is that of SS. Cosmas and Damianus at Rome. Here the figure of our Lord coming with clouds and standing on the firmament, is grand and sublime in the highest degree, and is perhaps the earliest or greatest instance of very early date, in which passionate conception, supported by powerful colour, forces itself, without any other advantage, into the foremost ranks of art-creation. The towering and all commanding form of the Lord must have seemed to "fill the whole temple;" with the symbolic hand of the First Person of the Trinity above His Head, and the Holy Dove on His right hand. The mystic Jordan, or River of Death, is at His feet, and on its other side, with small rocks and trees to indicate the wilderness of this world, are the twelve sheep of His flock, with the houses of Jerusalem and Bethlehem; He, Himself, appearing again in the centre on earth as the Lamb of the elder dispensation. The same idea is similarly treated in the early 9th century decorations of St. Praxedis. The form of the Lord is tall and spare, not without grandeur, but markedly ascetic: the signs of the other Two Persons of the Holy Trinity are with Him, and He is surrounded with all the imagery of the Apocalypse; with this grand addition, that on the spandrels of the Arch of Triumph before Him, the twenty-four elders are inlaid in white and gold mosaic, in the united act of casting their crowns before Him. He appears below as the Lamb; and the same symbol is repeated at the top of the Arch of Triumph, laid on an ornamented altar-table—as the Paschal Lamb that was slain. The Offering of the Crowns by the Elders was also represented on the triumphal arch of S. Paolo fuori le Mura, and the author of an interesting article on Portraits of Christ (*Quarterly Rev.* Oct. 1867) says it still exists, having been rescued from the flames in 1823. There were, or still exist, similar figures, in the Vatican Basilica of St. Peter (*De Sacr. Aedif.* xlii. xiv.) in St. Constantia, (ib. xxii.) St. Andrew in Barbara (V. M. I. lxvi.) St. Agatha Major in Ravenna (I. xlv.) and St. Michael of Ravenna (II. xvii.) &c. The greater part of these mosaics will be found photographed in the unique collection of Mr. J. H. Parker, which, in spite of all the deficiencies of the photographs, gives an idea of the tessellated work which does not exist elsewhere. To historians, or students of Christian art, their importance is, that by the presence of the sheep of Christ's church, they connect His Glorified Form with the more ancient catacomb representations of the Good Shepherd.

In St. Andrea in Barbara, the Lord stands on the Rock of the Four Rivers, and He is thus represented very frequently on the sarcophagi. See Aringhi, vol. I. p. 280 (Probus and Praxedis) and pp. 293, 297. On that of Junius Bassus (Aringhi I. 277) and elsewhere, He is sitting above a half-veiled figure representing the firmament or clouds of Heaven [FIRMAMENT].

The figure described above from SS. Cosmas and Damianus possesses awe and grandeur, and can dispense with regularity or evenness of feature. But the very earliest ideal portraits certainly possessed this; and it is one instance of the cheerfulness of spirit which Mr. Lecky notices in the Primitive Church, that the remnants of Græco-Roman skill were devoted to such works as Rome's picture (above) must have been; or the other mentioned by Boldetti (*Observazioni sopra i Cimiteri* pp. 21 and 64) as "moneta figura del Salvatore, come quella dipinta nel cimitero di Pozziano." The question stands on and indicates one of those great human divergences of character and thought, which determine the lives and conduct of whole generations: and it will be remembered how the Mediaeval German or hard-featured ideal was set forth against the Lionardesque; not altogether without the countenance of Dürer and Holbein. On this subject, the last chapter but one of vol. iv. of Ruskin's *Modern Painters*, is worthy of grave attention. There is no doubt, further, that Protestant asceticism often resembles that of earlier days, in a certain suspicion of beauty as carnal and idolatrous.

The Gnostic images of our Lord (see St. Irenæus *supra*) are also worthy of attention. One was set up by Marcellina (Aug. *de Heres.* vii.), a follower of Carpocrates, and adored along with others of St. Paul, Homer, and Pythagoras; and the eclectic Lararium of Alexander Severus, containing the statues of Christ, of Abraham, Orpheus, and Apollonius of Tyana, is mentioned by Lampridius (*In Alex. Severum* xix.). Rami Rochette (*Discours sur les types sacrés* p. 21) is



Portrait on Ivory. (4th cent.)

referred to by Martigny for a "pierre basilidienne," which he thinks may give an idea of the type of portraiture which was in vogue among that class of sectaries. It is altogether different, in any case, from that of the Callixtine and other catacombs; and for further contrast with it, he gives a woodcut (reproduced above) of that which he considers, on De Rossi's authority, indisputably the most ancient of all representations of our Lord. It is taken from a portrait

on ivory, in the Christian Museum of the Vatican.

The classic type which insists on personal beauty, is by far the most common on the sarcophagi, and all early monuments. Christian artists in fact seem, as was natural, to have invested their ideal with comeliness as long as they had skill to do so. The dress (of course excepting the Good-Shepherd representations), is invariably the tunic and pallium, sometimes ornamented with the stripes or clavi (Ciampini *Vet. Mon.* ii. p. 60, l. 184, xvi.). The idea of white raiment generally seems to be intended, though gold, dark imperial blue, and other colours are used in the mosaics. The white and glistening raiment of the Transfiguration will account for this (Ciampini *Vet. Mon.* ii. tab. xvi. l. tab. lxxvii.). Our Lord is generally shod with sandals, if at all. The cothurnus is given apparently in Aringhi, vol. i. lib. ii. c. x. pp. 332, 333, and something resembling it is worn by the Good Shepherd (Aringhi, vol. ii. pp. 63, 67, 75, 79, &c.)

Portraits of our Lord are generally youthful, as symbolizing His eternal nature, even (Aringhi, vol. ii. p. 213) when He instructs the apostles (Bottari, *ext.*). In the dispute with the doctors His youth is of course insisted on, but He is not made small of stature, whereas in pictures of the miracles, as has been frequently remarked, His figure greatly exceeds His human companions in height. This is the case also (Aringhi, i. pp. 307, 313 and *passim*), where any dead persons are carved on their tomb as presented before him, as in many 'bisomatus' sarcophagi of husband and wife. A beautiful illustration of this tradition of early Christian work in later times will be found in Ruskin's *Stones of Venice*, vol. iii. p. 78, where this distinction is used by the artist, with the detail of the human figures partly hiding themselves in the folds of the robes of attendant angels, who are inferior in size to the divine figure, though of superhuman stature. The Lord sometimes stands or sits on a sphere (Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.* i. 270, tab. vii.), probably to give the idea of all things being put under his feet. He is accompanied by attesting angels, or His form is represented, full length or half-size, on a medallion supported by angels, as in the diptych of Rambona, and very frequently in the mosaics of Rome and Ravenna. These medallions are sometimes called *IMAGINES CLIPATAE*, the use of them being probably derived from portrait-images on shields of ancient times. The cross sometimes represents our Lord thus borne. This seems to point to the Ascension, and to his glory as Lord of Hosts or of Sabaoth. It is not our work to follow the idea into its various developments in the angelic choirs of the middle ages, for which we may refer to Lord Lindsay, and to Mrs. Jameson's *Sacred and Legendary Art*. But a curious example of transition from the circular or oval medallion into the Gothic quatrefoil, containing the figure of our Lord, and supported by angels, still remains in the College-Hall or Refectory at Worcester, and is certainly derived from classic or Byzantine antiquity.

Our Lord frequently bears a rod or wand, especially in representations of the miracles, apparently as an emblem of his power over nature, or as the leader of His people in the wilderness, with a reference to Moses. The roll

or volume very often appears in His hand, as committed to St. Peter and St. Paul or other apostles, or when He instructs the disciples. The full-grown rather than the youthful type appears in such examples, as in Bottari, *clxxvi.* See woodcut reproduced below.

Frequent representations of the Second Person of the Trinity as present at some transaction narrated in the Old Testament, or as the anti-type of some typical event or person. Martigny mentions a glass vessel in Garrucci (*Vetri*, xiii. 13), in which He is with Daniel, who is giving the cakes to the dragon. A more certain and satisfactory example is in His appearance with the three holy children in the furnace, Bottari, *xxii. xii.* See also Gori (*Thes. diptych.* t. iii. tab. 8) where He stretches the cross out over the flames. The representation of the holy Three appearing to Abraham (Gen. xviii. 2), in S. Vitale at Ravenna is well-known, and Ciampini's plate is now supplemented or super-



The Lord, with book. (Martigny)

seded by the photographs of Mr. Parker and others. [TAMM].

We may conclude with the mnemonic lines of St. Damasus (*Carm. vi. Patrolog. Migne*, t. xlii. col. 378), of the symbolic or other names and titles applied to our Lord up to his days.

"Spes, Vita, Salus, Ratio, Sapientia, Lumen, Judex, Porta, Gignax, Rex, Gemma, Propheta, Sacerdos, Messias, Zebaoth, Rabbi, Sponsus, Mediator, Virgo, Columna, Manus, Petra, Filius Emmanuelque, Vineæ, Pastor, Ovis, Pax, Radix, Vita, Olera, Fons, Pater, Agnus, Vitulus, Leo, Propitiator, Verbum, Homo, Rosa, Lapis, Domus, omnia Christus Iama.

[R. St. J. T.]

II. Besides the representations of the Lord which strictly belong to art, there are others which have an archaeological rather than an artistic interest. We have ancient accounts (1) of portraits of the Lord produced in the ordinary manner; and (2) of portraits of the Lord produced miraculously. Some of both kinds are even believed still to exist.

(1) *Ordinary Representations.* — Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* vii. 18) tells us that at Caesarea Philippi [Panaea] there existed a group in bronze

representing a woman kneeling before a dignified man, who stretched out his hand benignantly towards her. This group Eusebius says that he had himself seen. He adds, that it was long unknown whom this statue represented; but as it was observed that a plant of healing virtues grew at its foot, care was taken at last to cleanse it, so as to make the inscription legible; then it was discovered that the woman cured of the issue of blood, who lived at Paneas, had erected the statue in honour of the Saviour. On this discovery it was at once removed into the Diaconicum or Sacristy of the church. That such a statue existed seems past all doubt; as to its original intention, the opinion of most modern archaeologists is, that it had been erected in honour of Hadrian, or some other who had benefitted the province, which was represented as a kneeling woman at the feet of her benefactor. Similar representations are frequently found on coins, especially of the time of Hadrian. Supposing some such expression as "σωτήρι," or "σωτήρι τοῦ κόσμου"—titles at that time very frequently given to emperors—to have been found on the inscription, while the name had become illegible, the statue would naturally be referred by the Christians of the fourth century to the true "Saviour of the World" (Hefele, *Beiträge*, ii. 257). The emperor Julian, angry at the respect paid to this statue, caused it to be thrown down and his own substituted. This is related by Sozomen (*H. E.* v. 21), who adds, that the statue of Julian was soon afterwards struck by lightning and partly destroyed, while some fragments of the statue of Christ, which the heathens had dragged about the street, were collected by the Christians and restored to the church. Philostorgius (*Hist. Eccl.* vii. 3) gives nearly the same account, except that he says nothing of any edict of Julian, but attributes the whole transaction to the pagan inhabitants of Paneas, and that he gives the more exact detail, that the *head* of the statue was preserved. This however was again lost at a later period. Asterius of Amasea (*Conc. Nic. II.*, Labbe, vii. 210) gives again a different account, attributing the destruction of the statue to Maximin, who (he says) was nevertheless unable to destroy the fame of the miracle related in the Gospel.

Eusebius also says (*H. E.* vii. 18) that he had discovered that, besides this statue, there existed coloured pictures of Christ (εἰκόνας διὰ χρωμάτων ἐν γραφαῖς), as well as of the apostles Paul and Peter.

In the time of the Iconoclastic controversy, pope Gregory II. asserted in his letter to the emperor Leo III., about A.D. 727, that portraits of Christ, of St. James the Lord's brother, of St. Stephen, and of other martyrs, had been made in their life-time (Labbe, vii. 12). And it was probably about this time that the legend arose that St. Luke had painted portraits of Christ, of His Mother, and of SS. Peter and Paul. This story is found in Simeon Metaphrastes, in the Menologium of the emperor Basil, and in the history of Nicephorus Callisti (ii. 43). At a yet earlier date (about A.D. 518) Theodorus Lector (fragment in Valesius, p. 551, ed. Mentz) spoke of a portrait of St. Mary painted by St. Luke, which was sent by Eudocia to Pulcheria, but said nothing of any picture of Christ. Such portraits of the Virgin are said

even still to be in existence; one is shown, for instance, in the church of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome.

Nicodemus is sometimes described as a wood-carver, and an image of Christ of cedar-wood from his hand is said by Aringhi (*Roma Sott. lib. iv. c. 47*) to have existed at Lucca. Some have ventured to identify this with a wonder-working image at Berytus, mentioned in the pseudo-Athanasian document read before the second council of Nicaea, A.D. 786 (Labbe vi. 217). Leo Diaconus, in the tenth century, says that his contemporary, the Byzantine emperor Nicephorus, placed this statue in the church of the Saviour at Constantinople; but neither he nor the pseudo-Athanasius says anything of its having been the work of Nicodemus. The legend attached to the image of Lucca is of course destitute of every shadow of probability.

Among the likenesses of the Lord reported once to have existed, we must reckon one said to have been the work of the Virgin herself, described in Adamnan's account of Arculf's visit to the holy places in the seventh century (*De Locis Sanctis*, i. 10; in Mabillon's *Acta SS. Ben. saec. iii. pt. 2*, p. 460). Among the wonders of Jerusalem he mentions a napkin, partly red and partly green, said to have been woven by the Virgin Mary herself, containing pictures of the twelve apostles and of the Lord Himself.

(2) *Images not made with hands.*—Another class of portraits of Christ are the εἰκόνες ἀχειροποίητοι, images of miraculous origin, of which the most famous are (a) the Abgarus portrait, (b) the Veronica.

(a) The story of a correspondence between the Lord and Abgarus of Edessa is found as early as the time of Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 13). Evagrius, in the sixth century\* (*H. E.* iv. 27) speaks also of a divinely-fashioned likeness (εἰκὼν θεόεικτος) which Christ sent to Abgarus on his desiring to see him, and which saved Edessa when it was besieged by Chosroes in the year 540.

This story is alluded to by Gregory II. in his letter to Leo before referred to, when the famous picture had already become an object of pilgrimage. "Send"—he adjures the iconoclastic emperor—"to that image not made with hands, and see; to it flock all the peoples of the East, and pray; and many such there are made with hands." His contemporary, John of Damascus (*De Fide* (*Orthod.* iv. 16) gives more detail. A story was current, he says, that Abgarus, king of Edessa, sent a painter to take a portrait of the Lord; and that when he was unable to perform his task in consequence of the brightness of His countenance, the Lord himself put his outer garment (ἱμάτιον) to His own face and impressed upon it a perfect likeness (ἀκριβὲς εἰκὼν) of His countenance, which He sent to Abgarus. Leo Diaconus (*Hist.* iv. 10, in Niebuhr's *Script. Byzant.* xi. 70) adds to this a wonderful story of a tile having received the impression from this robe. The tile is also alluded to by Zonaras (*Annal.* xvi. 25). The image on the cloth was brought to Constantinople in the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenetes, A.D. 944; its translation is celebrated by the Byzantine church on August 16, which is a great festival. What

\* Hefele states that this is mentioned at a somewhat earlier date by Moses of Chorene.

became of the picture when the city was taken by the Turks is not recorded, but pictures claiming to be this miraculous portrait are found in Italy. The Genoese lay claim to the possession of it, and say that it was brought to their city by Leonardo de Montalto, who presented it to the Armenian church of St. Bartholomew, where it is still exhibited once a year. St. Sylvester's at Rome also claims to possess the original Abgarus-picture. This is (according to Hefele) of the Byzantine type, and represents the countenance of the Lord in the bloom of youthful power and beauty, with high and open forehead, clear eyes, long and straight nose, parted hair, and a thick, auburn, bifurcated beard. Dr. Gluckselig contends that the Edessa portrait furnished the type for the pictures of Christ in mosaics from the fourth century onward; before that time (he believes) no attempt at portraiture of the Lord was made, the early representations in the catacombs being mere symbols or adaptations of pagan types.

(b) The opposite of the calm and beautiful face represented in the Abgarus-portrait is the "Veronica" picture of the suffering Saviour crowned with thorns. The legend attached to this picture is, that as the Lord was bending under the cross on his way to Golgotha, a pious woman, Veronica, offered Him her veil, or a napkin, to dry the sweat on His face; an image of the face remained miraculously impressed on the cloth. In the *Martyrology* of Usuard, for instance, (ed. Greven.) we have under March 25, "Veronicae sanctae matronae cui Dominus imaginem faciei suae sudario impressam reliquit." Gervase of Tilbury (*Otia Imperialia*, c. 25, in Leibnitz's *Scriptt. Bruns.* i. 968), who wrote in the thirteenth century, speaking of the "figura Domini quae Veronica dicitur," informs us that some say that it was brought to Rome by an unknown person, Veronica; but the account given by the most ancient writers is (he proceeds) that the woman who brought it was Martha, the sister of Lazarus. From the tradition of the elders we learn that she had a likeness of the Lord's countenance painted on panel, which Volusianus, a friend of Tiberius Caesar, who was sent by the emperor to Jerusalem to report on the deeds and miracles of Christ, caused to be taken away from her, that by means of it Tiberius might be healed of his disease. Martha, however, it is said, followed the "countenance of her guest," came to Rome, and at the very first sight healed Tiberius. Whence it came to pass (continues the veracious chronicler) that Christianity was known in Rome before the arrival of the apostles, and that Tiberius, instead of the mildest of sheep, became the fiercest of wolves, raging against the Senate because they refused to recognise Christ according to his wish—certainly a remarkable way of accounting for the aberrations of Tiberius's later years.

The Veronica-portrait is said to have been brought to Rome as early as the year 700; in the year 1011 an altar was dedicated in its honour, and even to this day it is one of the relics exhibited in St. Peter's, though only on extraordinary occasions. It was exhibited on the 8th December, 1854, when Rome was crowded with bishops assembled to be present at the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. On that occasion it was seen by M.

Barbier de Montault, who describes it as follows (*Quarterly Rev.* No. 246, p. 491):—

"The Holy Face is enclosed in a frame of silver, partially gilt, and square, of a severe character, and little adorned. The simplicity of the bordering gives prominence to the interior of the picture, which is protected by a thin plate of crystal. Unfortunately, by one of those customs so common in Italy, a sheet of metal covers the field, and only leaves apparent the figure indicating its outline. By this outline one is led to conjecture flowing hair reaching to the shoulders, and a short beard, bifurcated and small. The other features are so vaguely indicated, or so completely effaced, that it requires the liveliest imagination in the world to perceive traces of eyes or nose. In short, one does not see the material of the substance because of the useless intervention of a metal plate, and the place of the impression exhibits only a blackish surface, not giving any evidence of human features."

For many years the explanation of the name Veronica given by Mabillon and Papebroch was generally adopted; that "Veronica" is simply an anagram of "vera icon," a true image. Mediaeval writers do in fact use the word Veronica rather to designate the picture itself than as the name of a woman. Thus Gervase of Tilbury, as we have seen, speaks of "figura Domini quae veronica dicitur;" and he afterwards uses the expression, "Est ergo veronica pictura Domini vera." But more recently W. Grimm has maintained a different view. He notices the fact, that the woman with the issue of blood who was healed, is said in the gospel of Nicodemus (c. 7), probably of the fifth century, and by John Malalas, a Byzantine historian of the sixth (*Hist. Chron.*, p. 305, ed. Oxon. 1691), to have been named Beronice (*Βερονίκη*); and supposes that the legend of the veil or napkin in question arose from some confusion of the Paneas statue with the Abgarus-portrait; the Veronica-legend is, he believes, no more than a Latin rival-story or metamorphosis of the Greek Abgarus-legend, with the Veronica introduced from another source. M. Maury (*Croyances et Légendes*) connects the name *Βερονίκη* with the Gnostic feminine symbol *ἡ Προβρυκός*, but this conjecture seems rather ingenious than sound.

(3) In the eighth century the iconoclastic party, seeing the great variety of pictures of Christ, very naturally asked which they were to consider the true portrait; were they to adopt the Roman type, or the Indian, or the Greek, or the Egyptian? To this Photius (*Epist.* 64) replies, that the difference between these representations is much the same as the difference between the gospels circulating in the several countries, which are written in one character by the Romans, in another by the Indians, in another by the Hebrews, in another by the Ethiopians, and which differ, not only in the forms of letters, but in the pronunciation and significance of the words. If Photius's illustration is to be taken exactly, it seems to imply that all the pictures of which he knew anything represented the same face, and were only made to differ by the peculiarities, whether individual or national, of the painter; and it is probable enough that the Byzantine type was so far determined in his time, that all the pictures which he had



seen might have passed for copies, of various degrees of merit, of one original.

(4) The descriptions of the Lord given by John of Damascus in the eighth century, and by the supposed Publius Lentulus at a later period, no doubt had considerable influence on the representations of Christ. The former (*Epist. ad Theoph.*, c. 3), referring to the testimony of still earlier writers, describes the Lord as having been somewhat bent even in youth, with meeting eyebrows, beautiful eyes, large nose, curling hair, dark beard and tint the colour of wheat, like His mother. The latter is supposed to be written to the Senate of Rome by one Publius Lentulus, a friend of Pontius Pilate. The age of this document is unknown (see Gabler, *de abbatibus Epistolae Pub. Lentuli ad Senatum*; Jena, 1819), but it does not seem to be quoted in its present form by any earlier writer than Anselm of Canterbury († 1109). Another description of the Lord's person is given by Nicephorus Callisti (*H. E.* i. 40), but this, as it is of the fourteenth century and does not claim to rest on earlier authorities, may be passed over.

*Literature.*—Besides those portions of works on Christian Art which relate to representations of the Lord, as Molanus, *De sacris Picturis et Imaginibus*; Alt, *Heiligenbilder*; Münster, *Smalbilder und Kunstvorstellungen*; Piper, *Mythologie und Symbolik der Christl. Kunst*; v. Weissenberg, *Die Christlichen Bilder*; J. G. Müller, *Bildliche Darstellungen in Sanctuarium der Chr. Kirchen vom v.-xiv. Jahrhdt*; Lord Lindsay, *Sketches of Christian Art*; St. John Tyrwhitt, *Art Teaching of the Primitive Church*; we may mention the following special works:—

1. *On Representations of the Lord in general.* P. E. Jablonsky, *Dissertatio de Origine Imaginum Christi in Ecclesia*, in *Opera*, iii. 377 ff. ed. te Water; J. Reiske, *Exercitatio. Hist. de Imaginibus Jesu Christi*; L. Glückel, *Christusarchäologie*; Peignot, *Recherches sur la Personne de Jésus-Christ*; Pascal, *Recherches édifiantes et curieuses sur la Personne de N. S. Jésus Christ*; Mrs. Jameson and Lady Eastlake, *The History of our Lord as exemplified in Works of Art*; T. Heaphy, *Examination into the Antiquity of the Likenesses of our Blessed Lord*, in *Art Journal*, New Ser., vol. vii. (1861); Hefele, *Christusbilder*, in *Beiträge zur Kirchengesch. Archäol. u. s. w.* (Tübingen, 1864); Martigny, *Dict. des Antig. Chréti.* s. v. 'Jésus Christ'; [Baring-Gould], *Portraits of Christ*, in *Quarterly Review*, No. 246 (Oct. 1867), p. 490 ff.

2. *On the Images not made with hands.* Gretzer, *Synagma de Imag. non manu factis*, etc., in *Opera*, vol. xv., Ratisbon, 1734 ff.; Beausobre, *Des Images de Main Divine*, in *Biblioth. Germanique*, xviii. 10; W. Grimm, *Die Sage vom Ursprung der Christusbilder*.

3. *On the Panos-Skutue.* Th. Hassel's *Dissert. II. de Monumento Panodensi*, Bremen, 1726; also in his *Sylloge Dissert.*, pt. 2, p. 314. [C.]

**JEWS AS REPRESENTED ON CHRISTIAN MONUMENTS.** The Jews of our Lord's time appear in various sculptures of His life and works (Bottari, *tav. lxxv. et passim*; Millin, *Midi de la France*, pl. lxiv. et *passim*). They are generally distinguished, especially in all subjects connected with the Wilderness, by wearing a flat cap or beretta, as in the above plates from sarcophagi. The Old

Testament mo without the li and armour pri of St. Peter co though Aring against him, the group in q attacked by th ness, when (E to stone him. panies that of complaints w St. Peter (wh always has bl other Hebrews tunics, cloaks sandals (Exod. a common or d

**JEWS, TE**  
of the Jews : matters of gen relation towa church will b (ii. 167-203) summary of th connivance w the Jews thei for Judaism w ther the ritas was HERESY; *ibid.* XVI. viii *tania*. But : fences, Christi selves separat Thus resting denounced (A its being a reli den (*ibid.* oc. 3 or uncleaned in their feast participating i in the Apostoli excommunicat council (c. 11 305, initiating Jews which through the ti 49) any landlo crops; and i Christian fro nition against regarded certa many subsequ a. 12; *Conc.* 3 *Conc. Aurel.* Inter-marriage strictly as wi 3 *Conc. Aurel.* *Conc. Tol.* c supposed to l are exemplific Homilies in J *primo Pasch.* *Judasorum jei* One of the mai by the church Christian sla (Euseb. *Vit.* considerably r have fallen i

Orleans, A.D. 538 (c. 13) recognizes Christian servitude, but decrees that if a Christian slave takes sanctuary because his Jewish master interferes with his religion, the slave is not to be surrendered, but redeemed at a fair valuation. This decree was repeated and enlarged by subsequent councils (4 Conc. Aurel. c. 30, 31; 1 Conc. Maastricht, c. 15). In Spain the 4th council of Toledo, A.D. 633 (c. 66) sanctioned the royal decrees which declared it altogether unlawful for a Jew to hold a Christian in bondage, but the desire of gain was too strong for both church and state, for a little later the 10th council, A.D. 656, complains that even the clergy sold Christian captives to the Jews. The treatment of the Jews in Spain occupies no inconsiderable portion of the numerous canons of the synods held in Toledo in the 7th century. Under the reign of Remond, the first Gothic king, and again under Sisebut, the Jews had been subjected to fierce persecution. The 4th council of Toledo, A.D. 633, over which Isidore of Seville presided, gave them some relief, but this leniency was partial and short-lived. In the 57th canon of that council it was enacted that no Jew should be converted by violence; but the later canons contain more stringent regulations; children of Jews, who have been baptized, are to be separated from their parents and placed in monasteries or in God-fearing families (c. 60); the testimony of Jews is to be rejected (c. 64), because those who are unfaithful to God cannot be faithful to man; and (c. 65), they are to be excluded from all public offices. A few years later all traces of toleration had disappeared, owing perhaps to the absence of Isidore, who had died in the interval, and the civil law which banished Jews from the kingdom, was ratified by the church (6 Conc. Tolos. c. 3; 8 Conc. Tolos. c. 13). The 12th council, A.D. 681, in response to an exhortation from the king to extirpate the pest of the Jews, prescribed (c. 9) in detail each distinctive Jewish practice. Shortly afterwards the Saracenic invasion swept over the Peninsula, and the Jews enjoyed more peace. In France there is no notice of the Jews earlier than the 6th century. The 3rd council of Orleans, A.D. 538, contains an ordinance (c. 30), forbidding Jews to appear in the streets or hold any intercourse with Christians for four days, from Maundy Thursday till Easter Monday (1 Conc. Maastricht, c. 14). The council of Narbonne, A.D. 589 (c. 9) forbade Jews to hold religious services at the burial of their dead, under a fine of six ounces of gold, a sum which indicates their wealth at that date. By the 5th council of Paris, A.D. 615 (c. 15) no Jew was to hold any public office which made Christmas subordinate to him, except on condition of being baptized with his whole family (Conc. Armon. c. 11; Conc. Cahul. c. 9). Later, under Charlemagne, Jews were not only tolerated but treated with consideration. [G. M.]

JOACHIM, "Arms Christi;" commemorated Michael 7 = April 2 (Cal. Armen.); with ANNA, Aug. 27 (Cal. Armen.), and Sept. 9 (Cal. Byzant.). [W. F. G.]

JOANNA, wife of CHUR; commemorated May 24 (M. t. Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

JOANNICUS, the Great, *Servus servorum*, A.D. 728; commemorated Nov. 4 (Cal. Byzant.). [W. F. G.]

CHRIST. ANT.

JOB, the patriarch; commemorated May 6 (Cal. Byzant.); Sept. 8 (Cal. Armen.); May 16 (M. t. Rom. Vol., Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

JOCUNDIANUS, martyr in Africa; commemorated July 4 (M. t. Rom. Vol., Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

JOEL, the prophet; commemorated Tokent 21 = Oct. 18 (Cal. Ethiop.); Oct. 19 (Cal. Byzant.); Nov. 19 (Cal. Copt.); July 13 (M. t. Rom. Vol., Adonis, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

JOHN THE BAPTIST, ST., FESTIVALS AND LAUREL OF.

1. *History of Festivals.* (a.) *Nativity of Baptist.*—The Festival of St. John the Baptist stands in remarkable contrast with those of other saints commemorated by the church, in that with these it is their death which is celebrated, as the birth into the better life, whereas here it is the actual birthday; a circumstance only elsewhere commemorated in the case of our Blessed Lord Himself, that of the Virgin Mary on September 8 being of quite later date; and thus we find St. Augustine saying (Serm. 287, vol. v. 1692, ed. Ganne) "solum dum natales celebrat ecclesia, hujus [i.e. Johannis] et Christi." There is a very obvious reason to be found for this exceptional state of things from the close historical connection between the birth of the Forerunner and that of the Saviour. This reason is plainly dwelt on in many ancient liturgies, and the Preface in the first mass for the festival in the Leonine Sacramentary may specially be noted.

What claims June 24, the day on which this nativity is celebrated, has to be considered the actual birthday of St. John, it is of course impossible to say definitely. We know from Luke i. 26, that the Baptist was six months older than our Lord, and therefore the difficulty resolves itself into the more important matter as to the correctness of the view which places Christmas on December 25, a question which will be found discussed elsewhere\* [CHRISTMAS].

Attention has there been called to the coincidence of Christmas Day with the period of the winter solstice, and the possible reasons underlying that coincidence. The festival of the Nativity of St. John will consequently coincide with the period of the summer solstice, which, like the winter solstice, was a time specially observed in many of the older heathen religions. From this source many superstitious heathen observances in connection with this day passed into early Christianity. One of these, the so-called Fire of St. John the Baptist, will be found touched upon in the following article: another is reproduced by Augustine, "Natali Johannis . . . de solemnitate superstitiosa pagana Christiani ad mare veniebant et ibi se baptizabant . . . Adjure per ipsum, qui hodie natus est, nemo faciat" (Serm. 196 in Nat. Dom. vol. v. 1310).<sup>b</sup>

A curious mystical idea was early suggested by the times on which the two birthdays were

\* It is true that in the present church year, beginning with Advent, the festival of the Nativity of the Baptist comes to follow by six months that of our Lord; but of course, when, as was originally the case, the year began with Easter, the natural order of sequence prevailed.

<sup>b</sup> This practice, as existing among the Vandals, is referred to before.

kept, in connection with the Baptist's own words (John iii. 30), "He must increase, but I must decrease," so that from our Lord's nativity the days began to lengthen, and from St. John's to shorten. This idea is found dwelt upon in Augustine (*Serm.* 287, § 4, vol. v. 1692. See also a sermon formerly attributed to Augustine [*Serm.* 197 in *Append.* § 2, ib. 2856], but now referred to Caesarius of Arles:) and Maximus Taurinensis (*Serm.* 4 in *Append.*, *Patrol.* lix. 850); and the presence of numerous homilies for the festival of the Baptist among the writings of this father show at how early a date it was commemorated. A remark of his may further be added, that it was kept "majorum traditione" (*Serm.* 292, § 1, vol. v. 1717). Consequently with all allowances for a rhetorical way of speaking, this will carry back the festival at any rate as far as the middle of the fourth century. We find it also mentioned in the ancient *Kalendarium Carthaginense*, where the notice is "viii. Kalend. Jul. Sancti Joannis Baptistae" (*Patrol.* xiii. 1221)<sup>c</sup>. It is wanting, however, in the calendar of Bucherius, which is generally referred to the middle of the fourth century, and in the list of festivals in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 33). These, however, are mere passing exceptions, for its otherwise universal presence in ancient liturgies, martyrologies, and calendars, and the numerous homilies for it in the writings of the fathers (Augustine, Maximus Taurinensis, etc.) are evidence of the wide-spread observance and early date of the festival. The council of Agde (506 A.D.) in ruling concerning private chapels, includes the Nativity of St. John the Baptist among the most important festivals on which a man was not to forsake his proper church, the only others specified being Easter, Christmas, Epiphany, the Ascension, and Whitsunday (*Conc. Agathense*, can. 21; Labbe, iv. 1386).

It may next be remarked that, as might have been expected from the interdependence of the dates of the natiivities of our Lord and of the Baptist, the East agrees almost unanimously with the West as to the particular day on which the latter is to be commemorated. See *e.g.* besides the regular Byzantine calendar, the notice in the Greek metrical *Ephemerides*, published by Papebroch in the *Acta Sanctorum* (May, vol. i. p. xxxii.), Προδρομον ἀμφὶ τετάρτῃ εἰκάδι γελνατο μήτηρ; the curious design in the Moscow pictorial calendar (*ibid.*); and the calendars of the Egyptian and Ethiopic churches published by Ludolf (*Fasti Sacri Ecclesiae Alexandrinae*, p. 32). So far as we have observed, the Armenian church, the only church that does not celebrate Christmas on December 25, is also the only one that does not commemorate the Nativity of the Baptist on June 24, keeping it on Jan. 14 (Neale, *Eastern Church*, Introd. p. 797).<sup>d</sup>

We may add a few words here as to the vigil and octave of the festival. The former is recognized,

<sup>c</sup> The other mention in this calendar of St. John the Baptist [vi. Kal. Jan. Sancti Joannis Baptistae et Jacobi Apostoli quem Herodes occidit] is probably due to a copyist's error, because of the constant association of St. John the Evangelist with Dec. 27. It has been maintained, however, that this is an early African form of the festival of the Decollation of St. John the Baptist.

<sup>d</sup> For a possible variation from general usage in the case of the church of Tours, see Grigor. Turon. Hist. Fr. x. 31 (*Patrol.* lxxi. 566).

as we have shown below, in the Leonine Sacramentary, though not specified by name as in the Ambrosian. We need not, however, with Papebroch, consider St. Ambrose to have been the first to institute the vigil. It is also found included in the later Roman Sacramentaries, the Gelasian and Gregorian, and its observance throughout Gaul and Germany is shown by its presence in ancient martyrologies and calendars of those countries, *e.g.* [in one form of] the *Mart. Gellonense* (D'Achèry, *Spicilegium*, xiii. 424), the *Mart. Autissiodorensis* (Martene, *Collectio Amplius*, vol. vi. 709), and a calendar of the 9th century described by Binterim. This writer refers also to a German Sacramentary published by Gerbert, where the notice for the day is, "jejunium S. Joannis Baptistae, una cum Missa pro more vigiliarum" (*Denkw.* v. i. 377). It may be mentioned that the council of Seligenstadt (1022 A.D.) ordered that all Christians should abstain from flesh and blood for fourteen days before the festival of St. John the Baptist (can. 1, Labbe ix. 844).

As regards the octave, it would appear that Papebroch is in error in considering that no earlier traces of it could be found than of the 13th or 14th centuries, for Binterim cites several calendars of the 9th and 10th centuries which mark it, *e.g.* the *Cal. Frisingense* of the 10th century (Eckhart, *Franc. Orient.* i. 835). It will be remembered that this octave has a special importance of its own, as being the day on which the Baptist was circumcised and received the divinely declared name of John, and on which the speech of Zacharias was miraculously restored.

(β.) *Decollation of the Baptist.*—Besides the festival of the Nativity of St. John, there are other Johannine festivals of comparatively minor importance, the chief of which is that of the Decollation, generally commemorated on August 29,<sup>e</sup> the chief exception being that the Armenian church celebrated it on April 13, and the Gallican church, according to one view, on the octave of the Nativity of the Baptist, and according to another view on September 24.<sup>f</sup>

This festival, too, must be of comparatively early date, for we find it in the Gelasian and [in some forms of] the Gregorian Sacramentaries, to its presence in which Bede alludes (*Expos. in Marc.* lib. ii.; *Patrol.* xcii. 192). Again in the Eastern church, we may appeal to the Byzantine and Russian calendars, and reference may be made to the Moscow pictorial calendar and the Greek metrical *Ephemerides*, the notice in the latter being, εἰκάδι ἀμφ' ἐνάτῃ Προδρομον τέμναι αὐχένα ξίφος. See also Ludolf's Egyptian and Ethiopic calendars (p. 1): here, however, there is a simple commemoration of the Baptist on August 29, and the festival of the Decollation on August 30.

With reference to the usage of the Gallican church alluded to above, the fact that in their liturgy the festival of the Decollation almost im-

<sup>e</sup> The *Martyrologium Hieronymi* (*Patrol.* xxx. 488), and a MS. of the Martyrology of Bede (*Patrol.* xciv. 1025), place it on Aug. 30. So also the Egyptian calendar in Selden (p. 221, ed. Amsterdam, 1679).

<sup>f</sup> Augusti (*Denkw.* ii. 156) argues that the Decollation was not originally a distinct festival from that of the Nativity of the Baptist, but the evidence for this view, if not be said, is hardly conclusive.

mediately followed the Nativity of the Baptist, induced Papebroch (*Acta Sanctorum*, June, vol. v. p. 608) to maintain that the former commemoration was probably held there on the octave of the latter. Mabillon, on the other hand, appeals to a letter which bears the name of Augustine, to one Bibianus, a Gallican bishop, which asserts that the conception and death of St. John fell on the same day (i.e. Sept. 23 or 24), and further refers to August 29 as the day "quando inventum legitur caput dominici praecursoris" (*Patrol.* lxxii. 431). This letter, while obviously spurious, may be taken as evidence as to ancient Gallican custom, and we find the same usage, at any rate partially, among the Goths of Spain. (See Leslie's notes to the Mozarabic Missal; *Patrol.* lxxxv. 837.)

*Legend.*—This will perhaps be the most convenient place to give a very brief *résumé* of the legends respecting the body of St. John. This was said to have been buried at Sebaste, a town on the site of the earlier Samaria. In the time of the emperor Julian, the coffin was broken open, the bones burnt, and the dust scattered abroad. With this definite statement, it might have been thought that the history of the relics was at an end; but the story runs that the Christians saved some of the remains, which were sent to Jerusalem, and afterwards to Alexandria to Athanasius (Rufinus, *Hist. Eccles.* xi. 28; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 3; vol. iii. 918, ed. Schulze and Noesselt; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, vol. i. 117, ed. Classen); part also were obtained by Theodoret for his own church of Cyrus (see his *Relig. Hist.* vol. iii. 1245). In order to contain the relics of the Baptist, a church was some time afterwards (circa 390 A.D.) built in Alexandria on the site of the temple of Serapis by the emperor Theodosius, and finished in the reign of his son Arcadius. Concerning the Head of the Baptist also there is a long series of traditions. These are often plainly conflicting, and it is to be regretted that a scholar with Papebroch's great learning should have wasted time on the attempt to reconcile them. The Head was said to have been buried in Herod's palace, where it was first discovered about the year 330 A.D. and taken into Cilicia. In the time of the emperor Valens it was moved as far as a place named Cosilaus, but about 390 A.D. Theodosius transferred it to Constantinople (Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* vii. 21). Besides all this, however, we read of a finding of the Head at Emesa in 454 A.D., a discovery which can hardly harmonize with the preceding, and which was not improbably due to a growing demand of the age for relics. However, there is a further story of another translation of the Head, from Emesa to Constantinople in 850 A.D., to preserve it from the Saracens, and here it remained till 1204 A.D., when Constantinople was taken by the Latins. The Head then, or part of it, was brought to France by one Walo de Sartone, a canon of Amiens. The further legends given by Papebroch, compared with which the above almost rises to the dignity of history, we pass over.

We find at a comparatively early period evidence of the existence of literature on the subject of the Finding of the Head, for at a council held at Rome in 494 A.D. under the episcopate of Gelasius, such writings are with others ordered to be read with caution. ("Scripta

de inventione capitis Joannis Baptistae novellae quaedam relationes sunt, et nonnulli eas Catholicis legunt. Sed cum haec ad Catholicorum manus pervenerint, beati Pauli apostoli praecedat sententia, *Omnia probate, quod bonum est tenete.*" *Patrol.* lix. 161.)

(γ.) We are now naturally brought to the third of the Johannine festivals, the *Finding of the Head*. It would appear that different supposed findings are commemorated, and that this accounts for the various days on which the commemorations are held. The letter of the Pseudo-Augustine already quoted names August 29 as the day on which the Head was found, and in connection with this we may cite one form of the martyrology of Bede, "Passio et decollatio vel potius inventio capitis beati Joannis Baptistae . . . ." (*Patrol.* xciv. 1025). That day, however, has ordinarily been reserved for the Decollation, and Feb. 24, for the Finding. In that arrangement, generally speaking, Western, Byzantine, Coptic, and Ethiopic calendars agree: and the Byzantine also commemorates another finding on May 25. There is besides a commemoration of the "Apparitio corporis" ["inventio ossium" Copt.] in the Ethiopic and Coptic calendars on May 27, and of the "depositio capitis" on Oct. 27 [26, Selden] in the latter. The notice for Feb. 24 in the Greek metrical *Ephemerides* is *εὐκλόστην προδρομοῖο φάνη κάρη ἀμφὶ τετάρτην*.

(δ.) The festival of the *Conception of the Baptist* on Sept. 23 [or 24] is also found in the above calendars, and in many Western martyrologies. It is not recognised, however, in the Armenian calendar. The notice for Sept. 23, in the Greek metrical *Ephemerides*, is *εὐκλόδι δὲ τρίτῃ γυστῆρ λάβε πρόδρομον εἶσω*.

(ε.) Besides the two preceding, comparatively unimportant festivals, we find also a commemoration of the imprisonment on Aug. 24 in the Ethiopic calendar (Ludolf, p. 39), and general commemorations of the Baptist in the same, on Aug. 29 and April 10 (*ib.* pp. 1, 25): and on June 6 and September 5 in the Armenian calendar (Neale, pp. 799, 801).

2. *Liturgical Notices.*—The oldest Roman Sacramentary, the Leonine, contains no less than five masses for the festival of the Nativity of the Baptist. The first of these evidently belongs to the vigil, for though included with the second and third under the general heading *Natale S. Jo. Bapt.*, still the point is settled by the words of the preface (also occurring, be it said, in the Gregorian and Ambrosian liturgies in the service for the vigil) ". . . . exhibentes solemne jejunium, quo nati Joannis Baptistae natalitia praevenimus" (*Leonis Opera*; vol. ii. 28, ed. Ballerini). The fourth and fifth masses, portions of which are also found in the Gelasian Sacramentary, are headed *ad fontem*, showing the use made of the day as a solemn season for baptism. The Gelasian Sacramentary both has services for the vigil and Nativity, each with its own title (*Patrol.* lxxiv. 1165), and also for the Decollation (*dies passionis*) of the Baptist (*ib.* 1175): and the same too is the case with the Ambrosian (Pamelius, *Liturgg. Latt.* i. 392, 420), and the Gregorian Sacramentary (coll. 108, 126; ed. Menard). In this last, while the first mass is headed in *vigilia*, the second bears the title *In prima missa de nocte*.



In the ancient Gallican Lectionary, published by Mabillon, we find no mention of a vigil: the prophetic lection, epistle and gospel, are respectively Isaiah xl. 1-20; Acts xiii. 16-47; Luke i. 5-25, 39-47, 56-68, [to the words *Dominus Deus Israel*], 80. This is immediately followed by the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, and this by the "Passio S. Joannis Baptistae" for which the prophetic lection, epistle and gospel are respectively Isaiah xliii. 1-13, 22, —xliv. 5; Heb. xi. 33—xii. 7; Matt. xiv. 1-14 (*de Liturgia Gallicana*, lib. ii. pp. 158, 160). The same too is the case in the Gallican missal, save that there the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul is immediately followed by a mass "In Natale unius Apostoli et Martyris" (*Op. cit.* lib. iii. 271, 275). In the Mozarabic missal we find forms given for the Sunday "pro adventu S. Johannis," as well as for the festival of the Nativity itself, and for that of the Decollation. The prophetic lection, epistle and gospel in the three cases are Isaiah xl. 1-9, Eph. iv. 1-14, Mark i. 1-8; Jer. i. 5-10, 17-19; Gal. i. 11-24, Luke i. 57-70, 80; Wisdom iv. 7-15, 2 Cor. xii. 2-10, Matt. xiv. 1-15. Sundry variations to the above occurring in ancient lectionaries are mentioned (*in loc.*) in the notes to Leslie's edition of the Mozarabic missal. (*Patrol.* lxxxv. 751, 756, 837; and for the Breviary [June 24, Sept. 24], *Patrol.* lxxxvi. 1129, 1133, 1209.)

3. *Miscellaneous Notices.*—We have hitherto spoken of the Baptist solely from the Christian point of view, we shall now dwell briefly on some further references. Josephus's account (*Antiq.* xviii. 5. 2) is practically the same as that of the New Testament, but he adds that, besides other causes, Herod Antipas was more or less moved to the murder of St. John by political reasons, the dread of a revolution.\*

There are, moreover, some curious associations connecting St. John with some semi-Christian, or rather non-Christian, religions. The Clementine Homilies (ii. 23) make Simon Magus to have been the chief (*πρωτος και δοκιμωτατος*) disciple of St. John, who is further described as a *ημεροβαπτιστης* (see Hegesippus apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 22; Justin Martyr *Dial. cum Tryph.* c. 80; and esp. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 17). We may perhaps, therefore, connect the *Hemero-baptistae* with the so called Mandaean (or properly Mandaean), known also as the Zabians, disciples of St. John, Christians of St. John. This sect, which still exists, chiefly near the Tigris, claims to be the lineal successors of the actual disciples of St. John, respecting whom they give some wild traditions, and whom they regard as superior to Christ. They totally ignore his beheading, and say that on his death-bed he bid his disciples to crucify his body, in reference to the death that should befall his kinsman Jesus. The body was then preserved in a crystal sarcophagus at Sjuster in Persia. (Ignatius a Jesu, *Narratio originis, rituum et errorum Christianorum Johannis*. Romae, 1652; Kaempfer, *Amoenitates Exoticae* pp. 435-454, Lemgoviae 1712; Norberg, *De religione et lingua Sabaeorum*; Petermann in Herzog's *Réal-Encycl.* s. vv. *Mendäer*, *Zabier* :

Chwolsohn, *Die Sabier und der Sabismus* pp. 100-138, St. Petersburg, 1856.) They celebrate in August (or April, according to Ignatius a Jesu) an annual festival of three days' duration, in honour of the Baptist, and an annual festival in June of five days' duration, when all the sect receive baptism. (Kaempfer, p. 446.) This reminds us of Augustine's protest cited above. Their chief sacred book, the *Sidra Adem* or Book of Adam, edited by Norberg (*Codex Nazarenus, liber Adami appellatus*, Hafniae), and recently by Petermann (Lipsiae, 1867), contains several references to St. John (see vol. i. 108, vol. ii. 20, 22, 24, 60; ed. Norberg). They also possess a "Book of John [the Baptist]" reported to have been given to their ancestors by John himself; of which there is a MS. in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* at Paris (Norberg *de lingua*, &c., p. 4). Among their most curious superstitions is one in connection with the baptism of our Lord by St. John, which accounts for the view they take of blue as an unholy colour (Kaempfer, p. 447).

For a possible connection of the sect of the Elxaites with the teaching of St. John, see Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem receptum* iii. 158. Chwolsohn (*Op. cit.* p. 112) views Elxai as the actual founder of the Mandaean, another point of coincidence.

Among the Mohammedans, St. John is accounted as a prophet, and he is mentioned in the Koran in terms of high respect (*Sura* iii. 39). The passage in Sale's translation runs, "John, who shall bear witness to the word which cometh from God, an honourable person, chaste, and one of the righteous prophets."

We must in conclusion only allude in the briefest terms to a point, which though not strictly within our province, must not be absolutely passed over, the position of St. John the Baptist as the patron saint of the Knights Hospitallers of St. John, and his association in some form with the esoteric rites of the order of the Templars, though probably here there has been at times a confusion with St. John the Evangelist. For the possible connection with St. John the Baptist in such rites as the Baphomet, the dissevered head, etc., see Von Hammer, *Mysterium Baphometis revelatum*. Vindobonae, 1818. Reference may also be made to Von Wedekind, *Das Johannis-Fest in der Frey-Maurerei*. Frankfurt, 1818.

For the matter of the present article, we have to express considerable obligations to Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten der Christ-Katholischen Kirche*, vol. v. part 1, pp. 373, sqq.; 446 sqq.; Augusti *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archäologie*, vol. iii. pp. 152 sqq. Papebroch in *Acta Sanctorum* (July 25). Reference may also be made to Paciaudius *de Cultu S. Johannis Baptistae*. Romae 1755. Wawewitz *Turtur Joannae*. Magdeburg, 1659. [R. S.]

JOHN THE BAPTIST, ST., FIRE OF. We called attention in the previous article to the way in which early Christian writers dwell on the mystical significance of the fact that the festival of St. John the Baptist coincides with the period of the summer solstice, and we also referred in passing to various superstitious rites and customs, which Christianity evidently inherited from heathenism. The most prominent of these is that which has long been known under the name of the Fire of St. John the Baptist,

\* As a parallel to this we may mention the story of Herod the Great's attempt to slay the infant John from the fear lest he might hereafter prove the king of Israel (*Prot. Jacobi*, c. 23).

which, with numerous attendant customs, is obviously nothing more than a relic of ancient sun-worship, connected with that period of the year when the sun has reached the turning point of his annual course. This custom of kindling great fires in the open air on Midsummer's Eve has been shown to exist (and in not a few places even to the present day) among almost all European nations, as well as in the East\* (see Jac. Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie* pp. 583 sqq., ed. 2); and it can hardly be rightly viewed unless we associate it with the universally observed festival at the winter solstice, the *Natalis Invicti*, when the sun is, as it were, born again for the coming year [CHRISTMAS], with that on May-day, the *la Beal-tine* of the Irish, when the sun's warmth has awakened the dormant earth [JAMES THE LESS, ST., FESTIVAL OF], and with other similar instances.

Thus, it will be seen, there is plainly no *original* connection of St. John the Baptist with the practice now under consideration. The birthday of our Lord having been once fixed, by whatsoever means, at the winter solstice (and there is certainly no inconsiderable body of evidence pointing to the conclusion that the well-nigh universal prevalence of a festival at that time of the year had much to do with the matter, and that it is a case of the transference of worship from the material sun to Christ, the sun of righteousness), then, since there was a difference of six months between the ages of our Lord and of the Baptist, the birthday of the latter would naturally be assigned to the summer solstice. The existing heathen practices, at first strongly opposed by the church, gradually came to be tolerated and finally to be recognised; while the attempt was continually made to associate the customs of the day with the saint whose festival had thus happened to coincide with the older celebration.

A curious view on this subject, which may just claim a passing notice, is found in Hislop's *Two Babylons* (p. 184), which refers the great Midsummer festival of many heathenisms *primarily* to the Babylonian festival of Tammuz, who is further identified with Oannes, the Fish-God mentioned by Berosus (lib. i. p. 48, ed. Richter). It is there maintained that this name was suggestive of that of Joannes, and thus a Christian festival grew out of a heathen one, with hardly a change in the name of the object of the festival. More evidence, however, and less theorizing is wanted, before such a view can be seriously entertained.

To return now to the main part of our subject;—we shall cite, as showing the church's original point of view in the matter, a passage from one of the sermons of Augustine first edited by Frangipane in 1819, where he protests strongly against this practice of the lighting of fires on St. John's Eve:—"Cessent religiones sacrilegiorum, cessent studia atque joca vanitatum; non fiant illa quae fieri solent, non quaedam jam in daemonum honorem, sed adhuc tamen secundum daemonum morem. Hesterno die post vesperam putrescentibus flammis antiquitus more daemo-

niorum tota civitas flagrabat atque putrescebat, et universam aerem fumus obduxerat" (*Serm.* 8 de *S. Joh. Bapt.* § 3; *Patrol.* xlv. 996). Theodoret again (*Quaest. in iv. Reg.* [xvi. 3], *Interpr.* 47, vol. i. 539, ed. Schulze) in referring to Ahaz's "causing his sons to pass through the fire," sees in it an underlying reference to a custom existing in his time, of lighting fires in the streets, over which men and boys leaped, and even infants were carried by their mothers. Theodoret states that this was done once a year, and though he does not further define the time, there is a probable reference to the Midsummer fire. The Quinisext or Trullan council (circa 692, A.D.) forbids the lighting of such fires before houses, etc., and the leaping over them; and penalties are laid down for all, cleric or lay, who followed the practice (can. 65, Labbe vi. 1172). In this last case, however, the periods are distinctly specified as the times of the new moon, but the superstition legislated against is clearly a parallel one; and, at any rate, Theodore Balsamon (cited by Paciaudius, *infra*), in his comments on this canon, makes special mention of the fires on St. John the Baptist's Eve. One more such instance may suffice: the German council, which sat under the authority of St. Boniface, either at Augsburg or Ratisbon in 742 A.D., forbids "illos sacrilegos ignes, quos *Nodfratres* [*Nodfyr*, *Niedfyr*] vocant" (can. 5, Labbe vi. 1535).

We have already referred to the change of feeling with which such practices were regarded by the church as time went on, and to the consequent attempt to connect them directly with the Baptist. As examples of this we may cite Joh. Belet (Rat. div. off. c. 137; *Patrol.* ccii. 141), who wrote about 1170 A.D., and Durandus (Rat. div. off. vii. 12. 10). In these passages reference is made to three customs practised at this season, the lighting of fires (which are described as being made of "ossa et quaedam alia immunda"), the carrying of firebrands about the fields, and the rolling of a wheel. After a strange explanation of the first of these as being a means for driving away dragons, another reason is given, namely, that it was done in memory of the burning of the bones of St. John the Baptist at Sebaste (see last article). The carrying about of firebrands is explained as having reference to him who was a "burning and shining light" (John v. 35); while the rolling of the wheel, which has an obvious reference to the course of the sun, is made further to refer to the glory of St. John waning before Him who was the True Light.

An attempt to disprove the idea of the connection of the Fire of St. John with heathen rites is made by Paciaudius (*de Cultu S. Joh. Bapt. Antiquitates Christianae*, pp. 335 sqq.), who, however, is mainly combating the idea of its connection with the Roman *Palilia*, a point urged by Reiske, Zeumer (*infra*), and other writers. The arguments here, however, though ingenious, rest altogether on too narrow a footing.

In addition to works already cited, reference may also be made to F. C. de Khantz *de ritu ignis in Natali S. Joh. Bapt. accensi*. Vindob. 1759: Reiske, *Untersuchung des bei den alten Deutschen gebräuchlichen heidnischen Nordfyr, ingleichen des Oster- und Johannis-feyers*. Frankfort 1696: Zeumer, *Dissertatio de igne in festo S. Johannis*

\* Nor need this remark be confined to the old world, for we find the same class of rites prevailing also among the Peruvians under the dominion of the Incas (Prescott, *Conquest of Peru*, i. pp. 96 sqq.; 10th ed.).

*accendi solito.* Jenae 1899: Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, vol. i. pp. 186 sqq., ed. 1841. [R. S.]

### JOHN THE BAPTIST, ST., IN ART, ETC.

1. *Iconography.*—We find abundant evidence that representations of St. John the Baptist were very frequent in early Christian times. Epiphanius (*Conc. Nic. II. Act. vi.*; Labbe, vii. 538) tells us that those who delighted in "soft clothing" were rebuked by the figure of the Baptist in his "raiment of camel's hair;" in this garb, indeed, he is most usually represented, especially in the Baptism of the Saviour (see JORDAN), a subject of very frequent recurrence in early Christian art, as for instance, in the well-known painting in the cemetery of Pontianus, in many mosaics (Ciampini, *Vet. Mon. ii. tab. xxiii.*), and on various engraved stones and bronze medals (Vettori, *Num. aer. explic.* p. 68 and frontispiece), where he is shown in the act of pouring water from a shell on the Lord's head; he carries a staff in his left hand.

Sometimes the Forerunner points with his



St. John the Baptist. From Paciaudi.

finger to the Messiah, represented in the form of a lamb, or in person (*Concil. in Trull. can. lxxii.*). He has been figured by some artists in tunic and pallium, as for example on the bottom of a cup given by Buonarrotti (*Vetri, tav. vi. No. 1*), and assigned to St. John the Baptist. If this assumption be correct, we have here one of the most ancient representations of this saint, but many competent judges believe that it is a representation of St. Paul. Be this as it may, we find the Baptist clad in a similar manner, and also nimbed, in a mosaic of the 8th century (Ciampini, *Vet. Mon. tab. xxxi.*), in the centre of an ivory cross of almost the same date (Paciaudi, *De cultu Joan. Bapt.* p. 182, see woodcut), in an ancient diptych figured by Gori (*Theaur. Diptych. vol. iii. p. 235*), and also in bust upon a chalcidony attributed to the 5th century (Paciaudi, *u. s. p.* 189).

In the Mennae of the Greeks the figure of St. John the Baptist is winged, in allusion to

the passage of Isaiah quoted by St. Mark (i. 2), and applied by the Lord Himself to the Forerunner: "Behold! I send My Messenger before Thy Face which shall prepare Thy way before Thee." His right hand is raised in the act of exhortation, and in his left he carries a cross, and a scroll inscribed with these words.

The announcement of the birth of the Baptist is depicted in mosaic on the great arch of St. Maria Maggiore, A.D. 443. The angel is addressing Zacharias, who stands before the altar of incense (Ciampini, *Vet. Mon. vol. i. tab. xlii. nn. 1, 2, 3*). In the ancient mosaic on the portico of St. John Lateran the head of John the Baptist is carried in a dish by a licitor, while the decapitated body remains still kneeling before the executioner whose sword is still raised.

2. *Dedications.*—The first church dedicated to him was probably the basilica built by Constantine, and dedicated to the Forerunner, upon the Coelian Mount, near the Lateran. It is, however, not improbable that the name was transferred to it from the baptistery of Constantine, a short distance from it, which was dedicated to St. John.

Anastasius Bibliothecarius states that Constantine built churches dedicated to the same saint at Ostia and at Albano (in *S. Sylvest. §§ 45, 46*; Migne, cxxvii. 1524 f.), and De Cange mentions one at Constantinople (*Constantinop. Christ. lib. iv. § 4*), of which, however, we can find no other record. At Naples it is commonly asserted that a church, dedicated to St. John the Baptist, was built in that city by Constantine on the site of the temple of Hadrian, in fulfilment of a vow made during a violent storm on his voyage from Sicily. But it has been proved by Majocchi, that this founder could not have been Constantine the Great, though he may possibly have been the younger Constantine, son of Constantine (*De Cath. Neap. part. ii. § 3*). It appears certain that at Florence in early times a church was dedicated to St. John the Baptist, who became the tutelary saint and protector of the city (Villani, *Chronicle*, l. i. c. 60). St. Benedict dedicated to the Baptist one of the two oratories which he erected on the site of the temple of Apollo on Mount Cassino (*Greg. Dialog. ii. 8*, in Migne, lvi. col. 152 a). Tradition asserts that at Milan a temple of Janus was converted into a church, and dedicated as "Sancti Joannis ad quatuor facies" (Castellione, *Medicev. Antiq. pars 1, fasc. 7*). There were at Ravenna in the 6th and 7th centuries two churches dedicated to this saint, one of which, called *In Marmorario*, specially commemorated his decollation (Rubens, *Hist. Ravenn. ii. and iii.*). At Monza, queen Theodelinda built a church in honour of St. John the Baptist, on which she lavished wealthy endowments and precious gifts of every description. Agilulph, her husband, followed her example at Turin (Paciaudi *u. s. p.* 15 and 16). Paciaudi enumerates many other churches dedicated to the Baptist in different places and in later times. Altars dedicated to him were usually to be found in the baptisteries; these were always placed under his protection, adorned with paintings and sculptures in which he is the principal figure, and sometimes enriched with his relics. (Paciaudi, *De Cultu Joann. Bapt.*; Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chré. u. v.*) [C.]

## JOHN THE EVANGELIST, ST., FESTIVAL OF.

1. *History of Festival.*—It is not necessary to enter here upon a discussion of the various early legends respecting St. John the Evangelist, which will be found treated of in the Bible Dictionary, to which reference may be made. We shall here merely speak of the festivals of St. John, and add a notice of the chief pseudonymous works attributed to him.

We hardly find the festival of St. John standing out in early times with that prominence which we should expect in the case of one so essentially of the chief of the apostles. As we have already mentioned in the article on the festival of St. John the Baptist, there is a not improbable commemoration of the evangelist in the ancient *Calendarium Carthaginense*, if, as seems reasonable, we assume the word *Baptistae* to have been written "per incuriam scribae" for *Evangelistae*. The notice is "vi. Kal. Jan. Sancti Joannis Baptistae, et Jacobi Apostoli, quem Herodes occidit" (*Patrol.* xiii. 1228). On this assumption then we have a joint commemoration of the two brothers, the sons of Zebedee; and the same combination is also found in the Gothico-Gallic missal (*infra*). The Armenian church commemorates the two brothers together on Dec. 28 (Neale, *Eastern Church*; *Introd.* p. 804); and the Ethiopic church on Sep. 27 (Ludolf, *Fasti Sacri Ecclesiae Alexandrinae*, p. 5).

In the West, however, the name of St. John alone is ordinarily found associated with Dec. 27, a day which by its close proximity to Christmas seems especially appropriate for the commemoration of the beloved disciple, as also those of the Innocents, the first martyrs for Christ, and of Stephen the first conscious martyr. This idea is often dwelt upon by mediaeval writers, some of whom allude further to a tradition that the Evangelist died on the day which is now the festival of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, but that his commemoration was transferred to a day in the octave of Christmas (see e.g. Durandus, *Rat. Dic. Off.* vii. 42). As we have implied above, however, there is a lack of recognition of this festival in the writings of the earlier fathers, scarcely any of whom furnish us with homilies for the day, even those who have written them for the festivals of St. Stephen and the Innocents.

It may be noted here that in many ancient calendars December 27 is marked not as the *Natale* or *Nativitas*, but as the *Assumptio* or *Transitus* of St. John. Thus we find, e.g., in the ancient so-called *Martyrologium Hieronymi* "vi. Kal. Januarii Assumptio S. Joannis Evangelistae apud Ephesum" (*Patrol.* xxx. 137), and similarly the *Martyrologium Gellonense* (D'Achèry, *Spicilegium* xiii. 390). This wording is doubtlessly due to the belief in some of the curious legends as to the death of this apostle. Of this we find no trace in the earliest writers; thus Polycrates, a near successor of St. John, simply says ἐν Ἐφέσῳ κεκοίμηται (Polycr. apud Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 31). Soon, however, the legendary element showed itself, and as early as the time of Augustine the story prevailed that the apostle had been laid in the tomb merely in the semblance of death, but that he really lived was shown by the movements of the

ground where he was laid, and the appearance as of dust expelled from the grave by the process of breathing (August. *Tractatus* 124 in Joannem c. 2; vol. iii. 2467, ed. Gaume). Later writers speak of this dust by the title of manna (see e.g. Gregor. Turon. *de Gloria Martyrum* i. 30. *Patrol.* lxxi. 730; Hildebert Turon. *Serm. in festo S. Johan.*, *Patrol.* clxxi. 726 sqq.). It is this which appears to be specially dwelt on by the Greek church in their commemoration of St. John on May 8 (*infra*). In some writers the legend makes St. John live to the end of the world, to witness with Enoch and Elijah to the truth (see e.g. Ephraemius Antioch. apud Photium, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 229; *Patrol. Gr.* ciii. 985). According to another form, he died in the ordinary course of nature, and was immediately raised from the dead and translated into paradise (see e.g. Nicephorus *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 42). All these legends have doubtlessly grown from a misunderstanding of our Lord's words in John xxi 22.

We may add further that the festival of St. John "ad portam Latinam" on May 6, which commemorates the apostle's having been thrown at that place into a cauldron of boiling oil and escaping unhurt, is often noted as the "Nativitas (Natalis) ad portam Latinam" (e.g. in the Gregorian Sacramentary and some forms of the *Martyrologium Hieronymi*) the apostle having there as fully won the martyr's crown as though no miraculous deliverance had been wrought.\* Whatever truth there may be in this story, it is at any rate as old as the time of Tertullian (see *de Praescript.* c. 36; cf. Jerome, *adv. Jovinian.* i. 26, vol. ii. 280 [where he appeals to Tertullian], *Comm. in Matthaeum* xxi. 23, vol. vii. 155).

In later times a church was built near the Latin gate in memory of this event. It may reasonably be inferred that it is to this church that Anastasius Bibliothecarius refers as being restored by Adrian I. (ob. 795 A.D.), though he describes it as "ecclesiam beati Johannis Baptistae sitam juxta portam Latinam" (*Vitas Pontificum*, Adrian I.; *Patrol.* cxxviii. 1191). On this point see further G. M. Crescimbeni, *L'Istoria della chiesa di S. Giovanni avanti Porta Latina*; Roma, 1716.

In the Greek church St. John is commemorated on May 8 and September 26, regard being had on the former day to the miracle of the "manna," and on the latter to his translation. Thus in the Greek metrical *Ephemerides* published by Papebroch in the *Acta Sanctorum* (May, vol. i., pp. xxvii. xlii.) the notices are ὁ γδοάτη τελέουσι ῥοδισμόν<sup>b</sup> Βροντόγονοιο, πρὸς γε θεὸν μετέστη βρόντης παῖς εἰκάδι ἔκτη. The latter festival is also found in the calendars of the Ethiopic and Coptic churches<sup>c</sup> (Ludolf, p. 5), which also commemorate St. John on December 30, and also his translation on May 11 (*ib.* pp. 16, 28).

Before passing on to the next part of our subject, we may refer briefly to a custom prevalent in the middle ages of sending to

\* Polycrates (l.c.) calls St. John μάρτυρ, and the Gothico-Gallic Missal (*infra*) speaks of the two sons of Zebedee together as martyrs.

<sup>b</sup> So Ephraemius (l.c.) τὸ ἅγιον ἐκείνου μυστρίον.

<sup>c</sup> In one form of the calendar given by Selden (*de Synedris veterum Horacorum*, p. 212, ed. 1679), the date is given as September 24.





him are to be found on two glass cups, where he is figured in bust conversing with St. Peter; the names SIMON, JOHANNES being given (Garrucci, *Vetri orniati di fig. in oro*, tav. xxiv 4 and 5). In some mosaics of the 6th century we find him as a young man—all representations make him young—with long hair; a nimbus surrounds his head; he wears the tunic and pallium, and carries his Gospel pressed to his heart. In the church of St. Vitale at Ravenna a mosaic of A.D. 547, shows the Evangelist seated, holding the codex of his Gospel open in his hands; before him is a small table with a pen and ink-bottle, and the symbolical eagle appears above his head. (See woodcut.) Lamberti (*Biblioth. Casar. Vindobon.* vol. ii. pars i. p. 571) gives an illumination from a very early Greek manuscript in which St. John is represented seated, dictating his Gospel to a deacon.

We find him standing with a volume in his hand in a mosaic which dates from the 9th century, in the church of St. Maria Novella. This



St. John the Evangelist, in St. Vitale at Ravenna. From Ciampini.

figure and those of three other apostles occupy four small niches, which are placed two on each side of a large niche, containing the seated figure of the Virgin with the infant Jesus on her lap (Ciampini, *et. Mon.* vol. i. tav. liii.).

In the crypt of St. Urban in Caffarella, at Rome, we find a somewhat coarse and very curious painting of the same date, in which St. John appears with similar surroundings. He stands on the right of the Virgin and St. Urban on the left (Perret, vol. i. p. lxxxiii.).

The attempted martyrdom of St. John before the Latin Gate is figured in an ancient mosaic on the portico of St. John Lateran (Ciamp. *De Sacr. Aedif.* tab. ii. 8). The scene is now very imperfectly represented because the mosaic is much damaged, but the flagellation of the apostle can still be distinguished, and also the cutting off of his hair. In the oldest representations of the Crucifixion, St. John uniformly occupies the position he assumes in his own narrative (John xix. 25, 26), standing with the Virgin at the foot of the cross, the faces of both resting upon their

hands in token of grief. He appears thus in a fresco in the cemetery of St. Julius (Bottari, *excidi.*) and in the celebrated diptych of Rambona, figured by Buonarrotti (*Letri Ornati*, p. 285). Over his head are the words, DISCIPULO (*scilicet*) ECCE MATER TUA.

An almost identical representation is found upon the very ancient ivory tablet in the form of a pax, mentioned by Florentino, taken from the collegiate church of Civitalis, in the diocese of Aquileia. St. John stands by the Lord's side with this inscription: AP. ECCE M. TVA (Apostole ecce mater tua).

Basilicas were dedicated to St. John the Evangelist in very early times; among others, we may mention that of St. John Lateran. The ancient Vatican had also an altar raised to his honour by pope Symmachus (Ciamp. *De Sacr. Aedif.* p. 60, 1 D.). (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chréti.* s. v.) [C.]

JOHN (1) and Gabriel; commemorated July 12 (*Cal. Georg.*).

(2) and Cyrus, martyrs, *Θαυματουργοί, ἁγιογυροί*, A.D. 292; commemorated Jan. 31 (*Cal. Byzant.*); their translation, A.D. 400, commemorated June 28 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(3) Ab Zedaeon et tredecim patres Syriac; commemorated May 7 (*Cal. Georg.*).

(4) Twenty-ninth patriarch of Alexandria, commemorated Gmbot 4 = April 29 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(5) Patriarch of Alexandria, †577; commemorated Ter 16 = Jan. 11 (*ib.*).

(6) Patriarch of Jerusalem; commemorated March 9 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(7) Patriarch of Alexandria, A.D. 685; commemorated Gmbot 10 = May 5 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(8) Archbishop of Alexandria, A.D. 615; commemorated Nov. 12 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(9) *Ἰωάννης ὁ κτῆς, ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως*, †A.D. 570; commemorated March 30 (*Cal. Byz.*).

(10) Patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 619; commemorated Sept. 2 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(11) Damascus, *Ἰωάννης ὁ κτῆς*, †A.D. 735; commemorated Dec. 4 (*ib.*).

(12) Palaco-laurita, *Ἰωάννης ὁ κτῆς*; commemorated April 19 (*ib.*).

(13) Presbyter, deposition in monast. Reomacensi, Jan. 28 (*Mart. Adonia, Usuardi*).

(14) Saint, Penarensis; commemorated March 19 (*ib., Mart. Rom. Vet.*).

(15) Eremita, deposition in Egypt, †193 A.D.; March 27 (*ib.*).

(16) The pope, martyr at Rome (†624 A.D.); commemorated May 28 (*Mart. Usuardi*); deposition, May 28 (*Mart. Bedae*).

(17) Presbyter, martyr under Julian; commemorated June 23 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonia, Usuardi*).

(18) Martyr at Rome with Paulus; commemorated June 28 (*ib., Mart. Hieron., Bedae*).

(19) Presbyter, martyr at Rome with Crispus under Diocletian; commemorated Aug. 18 (*Mart. Adonia, Usuardi*).

(20) Martyr at Tomi, with Marcellinus and his wife Manna, Serapio, and Peter (*Mart. Hieron., Adonia, Usuardi*).

(21) Martyr at Nicomedia, under Diocletian; commemorated Sept. 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonia, Usuardi).

(22) Martyr with Adulfus at Cordova; commemorated Sept. 27 (*Mart. Usuardi*).


(23) Martyr in Tuscany; commemorated with Festus, Dec. 21 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonia, Usuardi).

(24) Calybita, A.D. 460; commemorated Jan. 15 (*Cal. Byzant.*) [W. F. G.]

JONAH, the prophet; commemorated Mar. 25 = Sept. 22 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). [W. F. G.]

JONILIA, martyr at Langres with Leonidas, Speusippus, Elasiippus, and Melasiippus; commemorated Jan. 17 (*Mart. Adonia, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

JORDAN, THE RIVER, IN ART. The representations of the river Jordan in early Christian art, especially those sculptured on sarcophagi (Bottari, *tav. xlix.*), are generally copied, with more or less exactness, from the river-gods of pagan antiquity. Thus we find him personified as an old man with a crown and sceptre of reeds, sometimes leaning upon an urn from which flows a stream of water. He is thus represented in the mosaic in the baptistery of St. John in fonte at Ravenna, with the name



Mosaic at Ravenna. From Ciampini.

JORDANN, written over his head (Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.* i. *tav. lxx.*, see woodcut); also in an illumination in a copy of the Book of Judges, in the Vatican. The same mythological type appears again at Ravenna, in a mosaic in the church of S. Maria in Cosmedin; in this instance, however, two horns are substituted for the crown of reeds on the head of the figure (*Id. ibid.* II. *tav. xxiii.*).

The Jordan, simply as a stream, appears in some sculptured representations of the translation of Elijah (Bottari, *Scultura*, *tav. lii. 2*), in a painting of the baptism of the Lord in the cemetery of Pontianus, in another fresco in the cemetery of Callixtus (Bottari, *lxix.*), on a bronze medallion of the baptism of the Lord with the name of the river below, JORDA (Vettori, *Nun. Aer. explic. frontisp.*), in some bottoms of cups, where it flows at the feet of the Saviour (Buonarrotti, *tav. vi. 1*), and in various mosaics, that of SS. Cosmas and Damian at Rome, for example, with the inscription

JORDANES (Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.* *tav. xvi.*). See JESUS CHRIST, p. 878. On some sarcophagi the Lord appears seated, in the act of teaching, and, at his feet, a half-length human figure holding with both hands a piece of cloth, which inflated by the wind, spreads above his head in the form of an arch. This has been supposed to be another emblem of the river Jordan (Cavdoni, *Ragguol. crit.* p. 50), on the banks of which several of the Lord's discourses were delivered. But see FIRMAMENT. (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chréti.* s. v. 'Jourdain'.) [C.]

JOSEPH (1) Of Thessalonica, *Sanctus verus et apologetus*; commemorated July 13 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Husband of the Virgin Mary; commemorated Hamle 26 = July 20 (*Cal. Ethiop.*)

(3) Ab Alaverdi; commemorated Sept. 15 (*Cal. Georg.*).

(4) Patriarch of Alexandria, †849 A.D.; commemorated Tekemt 23 = Oct. 20 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).

(5) The Just; commemorated July 20 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonia, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

JOSEPH, ST. Early Christian art has left us no work in which St. Joseph appears alone,



St. Joseph. Carving in ivory, from Martigny.

or even as a principal figure. In such subjects as the Nativity, the Adoration of the Shepherds, and of the Magi, and the finding of Jesus in the Temple, he appears only as an accessory; never in an exalted, seldom even in a prominent position.

He is represented as a middle-aged man, sometimes bald (Bottari, *tav. lxxvi.*), sometimes with thick hair (*Id. lxxv.*; Alleganza, *Monum. Sacr. di Milano*, *tav. iv.*); he is generally robed in tunic and pallium, and carries some carpenter's tool, as the distinctive mark of his calling (Molanus, *de Hist. SS. Imag.* p. 269). Thus in a diptych in Milan cathedral he is represented with a saw (Bugati, *Monum. di S. Celso*, p. 282), on the sarcophagus of Celso, also in Milan, he carries an adze (Bugati, *u. s. p.*

242), and wears the everyday costume of an artisan.

In all these cases St. Joseph retains the unobtrusive position assigned to him in the gospel narratives—always in the background, and apparently full of earnest thought. He appears absorbed in his duty as the protector of the Holy Family; in an attitude of watchful love he stands behind the Virgin while the Holy Child sleeps upon her knees; sometimes his hand is stretched over them in token of protection (Perret, vol. v. pl. xii.); sometimes, seated near the cradle, he guards the slumbers of the Divine Infant.

Bandini gives an ancient ivory (*In tabulam eburn.* in fine; see woodcut), which shows two scenes in the life of St. Joseph. Above, the dream; an angel standing by a bed extends his arm over the sleeper in the attitude of exhortation. Below, we have the journey to Bethlehem: an angel leads the ass on which the Virgin is seated; her arm encircles Joseph's neck, and his whole attitude expresses the most reverent affection. (Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chret.* s. v.) [C.]

**JOSHUA**, the son of Nun; commemorated Sept. 1 (*Cal. Byzant.*); Senne 25 = June 19 (*Cal. Ethiop.*). Also with GIDEON. [W. F. G.]

**JOURNEYING.** All travellers and strangers were expected to bring **COMMENDATORY LETTERS**, i.e. testimonials from their own bishop, and were then admitted to communicate in the Eucharist. Persons who had not provided themselves with these, might share if they needed it, in the hospitality provided by the churches and religious houses, but were not admitted to communion. This was to guard against the admission of excommunicated persons. The Apostolical Canons order that if any person was received without commendatory letters, and it afterwards appeared that he was excommunicate, both the receiver and received should be cast out of communion (*Can. xiii.*). From an allusion in the letters of Gregory the Great, we learn that those who travelled by sea sometimes took the reserved sacrament in both kinds with them in the ship, so as not to be deprived of communion. (Gregor. *Dialog.* III., c. 36, apud Baron. an. 404). "Peregrina Communio," or the Communion of Strangers, is a well-known phrase in Canons, but is not well understood (Bingham, xvii. 3; and **COMMUNION, HOLY**, p. 417). From the fifth century downwards, these rules were of continual application, in consequence of the increasing practice of going on pilgrimages. [**PILGRIMAGE.**] [S. J. E.]

**JOVINIANUS**, the reader of Auxerre; Pasio, May 5 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**JOVINUS**, martyr at Rome with Basileus, under Gallienus and Valerianus; commemorated March 2 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**JOVITA.** [**FAUSTINUS** (1).]

**JUDAS ISCARIOT.** The subjoined woodcut is taken from Assemani's *Catalogus Bibl. Laurentianae*, and represents one of the illuminations in the great MS. of Rabula, in that collection. The subject is very rare in early Christian art. The Betrayal of our Lord afterwards became specially popular with painters;

but is not found that we are aware of (except possibly in MSS.) within the limits of our period.



Martigny makes no mention of it, and Guénébault's earliest example is of the 12th century. [R. St. J. T.]

#### JUDE THE APOSTLE, ST., LEGEND AND FESTIVAL OF.

1. *Legend, &c.*—With the name of this apostle considerable difficulties are associated; the questions as to the identity of Jude with Lebbaeus and Thaddaeus, the identity of Jude the apostle with Judas the Lord's brother, and, on the hypothesis which distinguishes these two last, the question as to which was the author of the canonical epistle. As to the first point, in spite of some curious complications, we can hardly hesitate to assume the identity of the three; it is not conceivable that the Evangelists should have actually varied in the lists of the Twelve. It is not necessary to enter at length into this point here, as it will be found discussed in the **DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE**; a few further remarks, however, may be made. The most prominent tradition in connection with the name of this apostle is the mission to Abgarus, king of Edessa, to which we shall again refer. The case is, however, complicated by the fact that some writers describe this Thaddaeus as the apostle (e.g. Jerome, *Comm. in Matt.* x. 4; vol. vii. pt. 1, 57, ed. Vallarsi; and the *Acta Thaddaei, infra*), while others (e.g. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* i. 13) speak of him as one of the Seventy disciples, who was sent to Edessa by the apostle Thomas. This last writer introduces another difficulty by stating (*l.c.*) that the name of Thomas was really Judas.\* Yet another element of confusion has been brought in by those who identify Lebbaeus with Levi (cf. Origen *contra Celsum*, i. 62). Any discussion, however, on these theories is quite beyond our present province, and we shall therefore assume the identity of Jude, Lebbaeus, and Thaddaeus; and in collecting the various notices of Thaddaeus we shall include all as belonging to the apostle, except those which distinctly refer to him as one of the Seventy. As to the varying forms of the traditions about Thaddaeus's labours and death, it is utterly impossible to say how far they are to be viewed as distinctly conflict-

\* In the Syriac *Acts* of Thomas, published by Dr. Wright, the name Thomas appears as a mere occasional addition to Judas. See also Assemani, *Bibl. Or.* i. 318.



ing legends, and how far they are to be explained as referring to two different men.

We shall now proceed briefly to glance through the various legends. The *Martyrologium Hieronymi* speaks in its Prologue of St. Simon and St. Jude having suffered together "in Susia, civitate magna apud Persidem" (*Patrol.* xxx. 451), though in the body of the work the scene of the martyrdom is simply given as "alibi" (*ib.* 495). The Martyrology of Bede speaks of previous labours of St. Jude in Mesopotamia (*Patrol.* xciv. 184): so also the Western Martyrologies<sup>b</sup> generally, see e.g. those of Wandalbert (*Patrol.* cxxi. 616) and Usuard (*Patrol.* cxxiv. 630). So also Isidore, who refers to labours in Mesopotamia, Pontus, and Armenia (*de ortu et obitu Patrum*, c. 78, *Patrol.* lxxxiii. 453) and Venantius Fortunatus (*Carm.* viii. 6; *Patrol.* lxxxviii. 270). Paulinus of Nola does indeed speak of his labours among the Libyans (*Poema* xix. 82; *Patrol.* lxi. 514), but a mere unsupported statement of this kind need not count for much.<sup>c</sup> The account given by Nicephorus (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. 40) varies somewhat, and, as will be seen, we cannot account for the variation by referring it to the other Thaddaeus. The apostle is spoken of as labouring in Judaea, Galilee, Samaria, Idumaea, Arabia, Syria, and Mesopotamia, finally living peaceably at Edessa; on his arrival at which place he found that Thaddaeus, one of the Seventy disciples, had been there before him. The Apocryphal Acts of Thaddaeus (*infra*) differ again. According to these, Thaddaeus was a native of Edessa, who was a disciple of St. John the Baptist before he followed Christ. Abgarus, king of Edessa, having been healed by a miraculous portrait sent him by our Lord, is visited by Thaddaeus after the Ascension. The apostle, after making many converts, journeys to Amis on the Tigris, and thence to Berytus in Phoenicia where he apparently dies a natural death.

Syrian traditions almost universally distinguish Thaddaeus, the apostle of Edessa, from St. Jude; though, like Western authorities, they assign Mesopotamia to the latter as the sphere of his labours; the former, however, whom they ordinarily name Adai, they maintain to be one of the Seventy (see Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* i. 318; iii. part 1, 297, 302; from which last reference it appears that practically the only exception to the general character of the stream of Syrian tradition is Jesubabus, bishop of Nisibis, with whom Adai is the same as the apostle St. Jude:—for the history of this Adai, see *Op. cit.* iii. part 2, pp. 8–13).

2. *Festival*.—As in the case of not a few others of the apostles, there is a lack of evidence for any early special commemoration of St. Jude; and its absence from the earlier Sacramentaries, as well as the fact that hardly any ancient Homilies<sup>d</sup> are extant for such a festival, points in the same direction. In the West the commemoration of St. Jude has been joined with that of St. Simon on October 28, but this combination does not occur in Eastern calendars. The reason for this association of the two names it is impossible to ascertain; it may have been from the belief that the two apostles were brothers, or from the tradition of their having suffered martyrdom on the same day, but as in the parallel case of St. Philip and St. James it is perfectly useless to theorize. It may merely be remarked that as regards the first of these theories, there is no trace of such a combination of St. Peter and St. Andrew, and but little of one of St. James and St. John: as regards the latter, the tradition can have been by no means a wide-spread one, inasmuch as only the Western church commemorates the two apostles on the same day.

We have already remarked as to the absence of this festival from the oldest liturgical authorities. Thus we find no trace of it in the Leonian or Gelasian Sacramentaries, in Mabillon's Gallican liturgy, in Muratori's Gregorian Sacramentary and in the calendar of Fronto: nor is it recognized in the Pontifical of Egbert, archbishop of York (ob. 766 A.D.). It is found, however, in the Gregorian Sacramentary as edited by Menard (col. 137), where also a separate mass is provided for the vigil. The vigil is also recognized with the festival in Menard's Gregorian Antiphonary (col. 711), and in the St. Gall MS. of the *Martyrologium Gellonense* (D'Achèry, *Spicilegium*, xiii. 427). A mass for the festival is given in the Ambrosian liturgy, part of which is the same as that in the Gregorian (Pamelius, *Liturg. Lat.* i. 427); and in the Mozarabic missal, where, however, it must be noticed that the greater part of the service is borrowed from that for another festival, that for St. Peter and St. Paul (*Patrol.* lxxv. 888, where see Leslie's note: also for the form in the Mozarabic breviary, see *Patrol.* lxxxvi. 1236). The *Comes Hieronymi*, as published by Pamelius (*Liturg. Lat.* ii. 53) gives an Old Testament lection [or epistle] and gospel for the vigil and the festival, Wisdom iii. 1 sqq., John xv. 1 sqq., and Roman viii. 28 sqq., John xv. 17 sqq.

Besides the festival of October 28, it may be noted that some Western calendars give other commemorations of St. Simon and St. Jude: thus the *Martyrologium Hieronymi*, as given by D'Achèry from the Corbey MS., adds one on July 1 (*Patrol.* xxx. 464), and the *Martyrologium Gellonense* (D'Achèry, 405) two, on June 29 and July 1.

In the Eastern church, as we have already said, St. Jude is commemorated apart from St. Simon, on June 19. There is also a festival on August 21 of Thaddaeus, whom we should assume to be the apostle of Edessa viewed as distinct from St. Jude. Papebroch, however (*infra*), evidently refers both to the same St. Jude in his notes to the Greek metrical *Ephemerides* published by him in the *Acta Sanctorum* (May, vol. i. pp. xxxii. xl.). The notices here are—*Ἰούδας καὶ δεκάτη θνήσκε βελέεσσιν Ἰούδας*, and *εἰς αὐτὴν πρώτη Θαδδαῖος βιώτοις ἀπέβη*. In the Armenian calendar we find commemorations of Thaddaeus on July 20 and of Thaddaeus and Bartholomew on November 30 (Neale, *Eastern Church*, Introd. pp. 800, 804). Whether, however, both of these are to be referred to St. Jude we are unable to say. We may refer lastly to the com-

<sup>b</sup> The *Martyrologium Gellonense* speaks of St. Jude's having been buried "in Nerito Arminiae urbe" (D'Achèry, *Spicilegium*, xiii. 390). This is probably a false reading for "in Beryto;" so Isidore (*l.c.*) "in Beryto Armeniae."

<sup>c</sup> Muratori (*not. in loc.*) tries to account for the discrepancy by supposing Libya to be the place of sepulture, but not of death, but this is palpably over-refining.

<sup>d</sup> Among the very few, we may note that of Nicetas Paphlago (*Patrol. Gr.* cv. 254); that once attributed to Bede (*Patrol.* xciv. 489) is spurious.

endars of the Egyptian and Ethiopic churches published by Ludolf (*Fasti Sacri Ecclesiae Alexandrinae*). Here we find "Jude, Apostle," commemorated by the former church on Jan. 26 and May 10 (pp. 19, 28); and a commemoration by both churches of Thaddaeus on June 26 (p. 32), and of the Translation of the body of Thaddaeus on July 23 (p. 35). The last two are perhaps to be referred to Thaddaeus viewed as external to the Twelve.

3. Whether the apostle St. Jude is to be considered as the author of the canonical epistle bearing the name of Jude, we do not discuss here: reference may be made on this point to the *DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE*. But little pseudonymous literature is connected with the name of St. Jude; an apocryphal gospel bearing the name of Thaddaeus is mentioned in some forms of the records of the council held at Rome in 494 A.D. under the episcopate of Gelasius (*Patrol. lix.* 162). It has been suggested, but does not seem probable, that *Thaddaei* is a false reading for *Matthiae*. There are also extant *Acta Thaddaei*, of which the Greek text was first published by Tischendorf (*Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, pp. 261 sqq.). In this is contained the letter of Abgarus to our Lord in a somewhat different form from that given by Eusebius. The *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 25) give, in the name of "Lebbaeus, surnamed Thaddaeus," the regulation as to the order of widows in the church, and also as to exorcists. Finally, we may refer for the legendary history to the *Historia Apostolica* of the Pseudo-Abdias (lib. vi.; Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphus Novi Testamenti*, i. 591 sqq., ed. 1719). In addition to works already cited, see also Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archäologie*, vol. iii. pp. 206 sqq. Van Hecke in the *Acta Sanctorum* (October, vol. xii. pp. 437 sqq.); Assemani, *Kalendarium Ecclesiae Universae*, vi. 432 sqq. [R. S.]

**JUDGE.** The early ecclesiastical jurisdiction was exercised without formality or strict adherence to legal rights and requirements, in a quasi-paternal manner. [Compare *DISCIPLINE*.] No special training was therefore required for it. The bishop himself was the usual and "ordinary" judge: and appeals from him went to the provincial synod or to the metropolitan, primate or patriarch in person. [*APPEAL*; *AUDIENTIA EPISCOPALIS*; *BISHOP*, p. 236.]

The earliest officer of the bishop occupying in any sense an independent position was the *OECONOMUS* or treasurer. This office was often united with that of the *defensor* or guardian and advocate of the liberties of the church, who is spoken of in the 2nd canon of the council of Chalcedon. [*ADVOCATE OF THE CHURCH*.] Gothofredus (in *Cod. I. iii.* 33. 2) says that the *defensor* became in time a judge in small causes: and his office is supposed by Ayliffe (*Parerg.* 160) to have been the original of the modern official or chancellor.

The word "official", the technical word in later times (as in the 12th century) for the officer exercising coercive jurisdiction on behalf of the bishop or metropolitan, is not used in this sense in the Code or in the Novells. The word indeed often occurs in them, but as the name of a secular officer.

The 9th canon of the council of Chalcedon

speaks of arbitrators being chosen with the bishop's consent to determine civil controversies between clerks, instead of the bishop.

The greater formality and style of the ecclesiastical courts grew up with the increase of jurisdiction over civil matters and with the appointment of "officials" in the 12th century. The presence of a registrar to make solemn record of the decrees of the court was first ordered in the council of Lateran held under Innocent III. A.D. 1215; though it was probably customary to have a scribe or notary present at the formal sittings of the courts for some time before this; and we actually hear of notaries at the pseudo-council of Ephesus, A.D. 449. Apparitors or summoners to the bishop's courts are spoken of in the Code and Novells, where the fees to be taken by them are specially regulated.

In what has been said as to the bishop being the "ordinary" judge, it is not intended to imply that he decided, at any rate grave cases, alone, or without the advice and concurrence of his clergy.

Similarly the metropolitan, even if he did not convene the whole provincial synod, collected some of the bishops of the province to assist him in deciding the causes brought before him. In some cases the canons or imperial laws speak of the metropolitan, in others of the synod, as the proper court.

The jurisdiction of abbots [*ABBAT*] had hardly grown up during the period of which we are treating. They had at the utmost a sort of parental authority subordinate to the bishop. [*JURISDICTION*.] [W. G. F. P.]

**JULIA.** (1) Virgin, martyr in Corsica; commemorated May 22 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(2) [*FLORENTIUS*.]

(3) Virgin, martyr at Troyes; commemorated July 21 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(4) Martyr in Lusitania with Venerissima and Maxima (s.).

(5) Virgin, martyr at Augusta Eufrestesia; commemorated Oct. 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Adonis, Usuardi*).

(6) Virgin, martyr at Emerita (Merida) with Eulalia; commemorated Dec. 10 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**JULIANA.** (1) Martyr "apud Augustanam urbem" with Quiriacus, Largio, Crescentianus, Nimmia, and 20 others; commemorated Aug. 12 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Virgin, martyr at Cumae, in the time of Maximinian; commemorated Feb. 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) Martyr of Nicomedia, A.D. 299; commemorated Dec. 21 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

**JULIANUS.** (1) Martyr with Maximinus and Lucianus (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) and Basilissa, martyrs at Antioch under Diocletian and Maximian; commemorated Jan. 6 (*Mart. Rom. Vet., Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi*); Nov. 25 (*Cal. Armen.*).

(3) Martyr in Egypt with five others; commemorated Feb. 16 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(4) Martyr in Africa with Publius; commemorated Feb. 19 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(5) Martyr at Alexandria; commemorated Feb. 27 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(6) Bishop; deposition at Toledo, March 6 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(7) [SYMPHOROSA.]

(8) Tarsensis, martyr; commemorated June 21 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(9) Martyr at Damascus with Sabinus, Maximus, Macrobius, Cassius, Paula, and 10 others; commemorated July 20 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(10) Martyr at Rome with Peter and 18 others; commemorated Aug. 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(11) Saint in Syria; commemorated with Macarius, Aug. 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(12) Martyr at Clermont; commemorated Aug. 28 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(13) Presbyter, martyr at Terracina with Caesarius the deacon in the time of Claudius; commemorated Nov. 1 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi).

(14) Patriarch of Alexandria, †A.D. 189; commemorated Magabit 8 = March 4 (*Cal. Ethiop.*).  
[W. F. G.]

**JULITTA** or **JULIETTA**, martyr at Antioch with her son Cyricus or Cyrillus, A.D. 296; commemorated June 16 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi); Jan. 21 (*Cal. Armen.*); July 15 (*Cal. Byzant.*).  
[W. F. G.]

**JULIUS**. (1) The pope, martyr under Constantius: commemorated April 12 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Hieron., Adonis, Usuardi, *Cal. Bucher.*).

(2) [FELIX (5).]

(3) Senator, martyr at Rome under Commodus; commemorated Aug. 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(4) Martyr in Thrace; commemorated Dec. 20 (*Mart. Hieron.*, Usuardi).

(5) Martyr in Mesia at Dorostorum; commemorated May 27 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adonis, Usuardi).

(6) Martyr with Potamica, civ. Thagorā; commemorated Dec. 5 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

**JUNCA, COUNCIL OF** (*Juncense concilium*). Of Junca in Africa, A.D. 523 (see **AFRICAN COUNCILS**). A canon attributed to it by Ferrandus (n. 26) is to the effect that no bishop may claim anything for himself in a flock that is not his own (Mansi, viii. 633).

[E. S. Ff.]

**JUNIA** and Andronicus, apostles, (Rom. xvi. 7); commemorated May 17 (*Cal. Byzant.*).  
[W. F. G.]

**JURISDICTION**. Before the time of Constantine the Great such jurisdiction as was exercised in the church must have been of a purely spiritual character, and its sanctions must have been purely spiritual. Sinners were brought before the tribunal of the bishop, who judged and inflicted spiritual censures, and inflicted them probably without appeal.

Upon the recognition by Constantine of the church as a *collegium licitum*, these spiritual

judgments and censures began to have an effect of which the civil law could take cognizance, and a civil effect was given to them. They were also made use of to assist or sometimes even take the place of the sanctions of the civil law.

In criminal causes where the accused was a clerk, or in any way specially connected with the performance of religious observances, there was an early tendency to make the bishop the judge, first in conjunction with the lay judge and in time as the sole judge. Judging as a spiritual judge over spiritual persons, a confusion arose between the sentences which he imposed in execution of the discipline of the Church, and those which he imposed as a delegate of the power of the State and armed with the authority of a criminal judge. The two matters are so intertwined, that it will be convenient to discuss together the *jurisdiction in spiritual matters* and that *over spiritual persons*.

A second fountain of jurisdiction in the courts of the church was arbitration. Bishops were encouraged by the Christian Emperors to arbitrate on moral grounds between Christians disputing as to matters of right and property, and the civil law gave a civil force to their judgments. Where clerks were parties, the propriety of a recourse to the tribunal of the bishop was considered to be greater. Where a clerk was defendant, his right to escape the annoyance of appearing before a secular tribunal was paralleled to and strengthened by his privilege to be tried by the bishop when defendant on a criminal charge. Hence arose *jurisdiction between parties generally*.

Lastly, certain special matters of civil litigation began to be considered, irrespective of the parties, as being peculiarly fit for the cognizance of the ecclesiastical judge. Hence arose a *jurisdiction over special civil causes*.

*Jurisdiction in spiritual matters and over spiritual persons*.—We have here first to consider the difference between the *forum internum* and the *forum externum*. The *forum internum* was the tribunal in which the bishop or sometimes the priest decided on cases of conscience, gave spiritual directions, and counselled with fatherly authority penitential discipline. The procedure and the decision of this tribunal were not, except in the cases where public penance was required, necessarily known to any but the penitent and his judge. The terror of conscience was the only sanction, and there could be no formal appeal. But along with this *forum* the church from its earliest time possessed also a *forum externum* (see 1 Cor. v.; 1 Tim. i. 20). [PENITENCE.]

When the gravity of the offence altered the relation of the parties and converted the father into the avenger, or made it necessary to prefer the public weal of the community to the individual welfare, the sentences of deposition or excommunication were inflicted.

These sentences on clerk or layman were inflicted by the bishop. They were or ought to be recognized by all other bishops, and there was originally no appeal. The so-called Apostolical Canons, though requiring the imposition of these sentences in several cases, are silent as to the procedure by which they were to be inflicted. The Nicene Canons for the first time provide a limited right of appeal.

The 5th canon says that clerics or lay people

separated from communion by their own bishop, shall be held everywhere to be so separated; but that in order that no one should be expelled from communion through a contentious or harsh spirit of their bishop, the occasion of their expulsion shall be inquired into by the provincial synod, which is to be held for this purpose twice a year. The decision of the synod is to be final. It was not till considerably later, when, it does not exactly appear, that further appeals were allowed. [APPEAL; INDULGENCE.]

The original discipline of the church had made all crimes as importing sins the subjects of the penitential discipline or the *forum internum*, and by consequence in the graver and more public cases, or where penitence was not shown, of the *forum externum*. It became however obviously impossible, as the church tribunals took a more formal shape and as appeals came to be allowed, that ordinary criminal offences against the laws of the state should be tried in any fashion by the church courts; and hence a division arose, whereby certain offences became the subject of the almost exclusive jurisdiction of the church courts, while on other offences they were not allowed to sit in judgment.

Offences of laymen subject to the jurisdiction of the church courts were heresy (Van Espen *Jus Eccles. Univ.* pars iii. tit. iv. cap. 2, and the article HERESY), magic (can. 10, caus. 26, q. 5), blasphemy, to be punished by bishop or count according to the capitularies of the Frank kings (lib. vi. cap. 101), and probably cases of laying violent hands on clerks. It seems that incest and incontinence were not distinctly reckoned as offences over which the church had coercive jurisdiction till late in the 9th or the 10th century, though they were of course subject to penitential discipline [FORNICATION; HARLOT; INCEST].

Every offence which when committed by a layman subjected him to the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical court, subjected *a fortiori* a clerk.

But the subjection of clerks to the *ecclesiastical* tribunals was much wider than this. In A.D. 376 a law of Gratian and Valentinian is said to have subjected clerks for small offences or offences of an ecclesiastical nature to their diocesan synod (L. 23, *Cod. Theod. de Episcopis et Clericis*). But a special exception was made of such offences as gave rise to a criminal action before the ordinary or extraordinary judges or the higher officials classed as the Illustrious. So in A.D. 399, Arcadius and Honorius are said (L. 1, *Cod. Theod. De Religione*) to have ordered causes relating to religion to be tried by the bishops, but questions which related to the civil law to be tried according to the law (*i.e.* by the lay judges). Rather stronger is an edict attributed to Valentinian Theodosius and Arcadius (L. 3 *Cod. Theod. de Episcop. Jud.*) Van Espen (*Jus Eccl.* pars iii. tit. iii. cap. i.) cites a constitution of Honorius, A.D. 412 (L. 41, *Cod. Theod. de Episcop. et Cleric.*) which would apparently subject the clerk for all offences to the bishop; but it is held that the words, though vague and general, do not really refer to other than ecclesiastical offences.

We come next to Justinian. The Code contains an enumeration of the courts by which an accused clerk is to be tried as follows: he is to be tried before his bishop. If the bishop be

"suspected" there is to be an appeal (or possibly an original trial) before the metropolitan. If his decision be not satisfactory, an appeal lies to the provincial synod and thence to the patriarch, whose judgment (subject to certain peculiar rights in the patriarch of Constantinople) is to be final. The law then proceeds as follows: "As for these proceedings, if they relate to ecclesiastical matters, we order that they be of necessity tried only by the most religious bishops or metropolitans, or by the sacred synods, or by the most holy patriarchs. But if there is a controversy as to civil matters, though we will allow those who wish it to bring the question before the bishops, yet we will not compel them, since there are civil tribunals, if they prefer to go to them, before which tribunals also criminal proceedings can be had" (*Cod. i. iv. 29*).

This law seems to confuse civil and criminal proceedings, and has a relation to both. The 83rd Novell is more precise. It recites a request of Menas or Mennas, the patriarch of Constantinople, and proceeds to confer certain privileges upon clerks. The first relate to civil suits. As to criminal causes, it enacts that where they relate to secular matters they shall be tried before the lay judge; but before the lay judge proceeds to execute the sentence, he shall allow the bishop to depose or degrade his clerk. Criminal causes relating to *ecclesiastical* matters are to be tried by the bishop. The 123rd Novell effected a further alteration (cap. xxi.) Making the same reservations as to ecclesiastical causes, it provides that a clerk accused of a secular criminal offence shall be brought before the bishop, who if he find him guilty shall depose him *ab honore et gradu*, from his office and order, and send him to the lay judge for secular punishment; or he may be brought before the lay judge first, in which case the lay judge is to transmit the evidences of his guilt to the bishop, who is to depose him and send him back to the lay judge for secular punishment. This Novell extends to monks, deaconesses, and nuns.

Van Espen (*loc. cit.*) quotes some canons of the 6th century as going further in this respect, and the capitularies of the Frank kings enact that clerks shall not be judged by lay judges, but by ecclesiastical ones (lib. i. cap. 38); and that no one shall presume to accuse a clerk, monk, or nun before a lay judge (lib. v. cap. 378).

In England it is well known that the distinction between secular and ecclesiastical courts did not exist during the Anglo-Saxon rule, the sheriff and the bishop sitting side by side on the same bench.

The punishments or censures inflicted by the episcopal tribunals were at first mere acts of penance, the discipline retaining its original penitential character. So early indeed as the Theodosian Code (L. 21 *De Haereticis*) a fine of ten pounds of gold seems to have been imposed on any clerk or bishop who was convicted of heresy; but it does not appear whether this fine was imposed by the ecclesiastical judge or by the lay judge after sentence by the ecclesiastical judge. [FINES, p. 671.]

Seclusion in a monastery both for laymen and more especially for clerks and bishops was an earlier punishment. It seems to be mentioned in the Epistles of St. Gregory (lib. 2 *Epist.* 27, 40), and in a canonical rule of about the year 816 as



a substitute for scourging. [IMPRISONMENT, p. 829.]

The 123rd Novell (cap. xi.) orders that any bishop who has been by law expelled from his see, yet returns to the city, shall be shut up in a monastery.

Relegation or banishment from the city they disturbed, or in which the public offence was committed, seems to have been first used as an ecclesiastical punishment towards the close of the period of which we are writing (see *Epist. of St. Gregory*, lib. 9, *Ep.* 66). It is very doubtful though whether it was ever exercised *in invitum*, unless it was supported by a special decree of the civil authority. The bishops of large towns, particularly Constantinople, were however often armed with a power of sending back to their own dioceses clerks disorderly frequenting the capital.

Scourging, as a means of penitential discipline, is mentioned by St. Augustine (*Epist.* 133) and St. Gregory (*Epist.* lib. 2, *Epist.* 52, lib. 9, *Epist.* 66) [CORPORAL PUNISHMENT]. It seems to have been used by bishops with reference to their younger clerks, and by abbots with reference to monks. In the canon law (can. 10, caus. 26, q. 5) an epistle of St. Gregory is quoted in which he orders practisers of magic if they be slaves to be scourged, if free men, to be secluded till they are penitent. The 38th of the Apostolical Canons orders that any bishop, priest, or deacon, who endeavours to make himself feared by scourging either sinners or men outside the Christian community who have done wrong shall be deposed. St. Paul requires as a qualification of a bishop that he should be "no striker" (1 Tim. iii. 3). The 123rd Novell (cap. xi.) forbids the bishop to beat any one with his hands.

Besides these corporal punishments, the ecclesiastical courts continued to administer and inflict their old censures, now become also of worldly import, of excommunication and deposition or degradation.

So clearly was the distinction between these last censures and matters of internal and penitential discipline now marked, that St. Augustine seems to say that bishops cannot prohibit any one from communicating unless the penitent has confessed his crime or been convicted by a secular or an *ecclesiastical* judge; "*nos a communione prohibere quenquam non possumus . . . nisi aut sponte confessum, aut in aliquo sive saeculari sive ecclesiastico iudicio nominatum atque convictum*" (*Serm.* 351, § 16; *Opp.* v. 1359, ed. Bened.). Conformably to this the 123rd Novell (cap. xi.) forbids the excommunication of any one till after a full trial.

It should be said here that monks, who were originally subject to their bishops like any other laymen, were made in a special and further degree subject to them by the council of Chalcedon at the suggestion of the emperor Marcian (Van Espen pars III. tit. xii. cap. 1). There seems to have been no question of their exemption from episcopal authority till the 6th century; and even then the exemptions conferred on them were not exemptions from jurisdiction, but from despotic invasion of their internal rights.

The abbot or dean exercised a subordinate jurisdiction, such as remains now with our

deans and chapters; and actual exemption from their bishop's authority sometimes was conferred on monasteries. [EXEMPTION OF MONASTERIES]

The trial of bishops has been reserved for separate mention.

It is first provided for in the Apostolical Canons (can. 74). This is the more remarkable as there are no provisions in these canons regulating the trials of clergy or laity.

This canon provides that a bishop when accused by credible persons shall be summoned by other bishops (that is, the other bishops of the province), to appear before them. If he appears and confesses, or is convicted, his punishment is to be decreed. If he does not appear, he is to be summoned a second time personally by two bishops, and so if necessary a third time, after which he is to be tried and condemned in his absence. The 75th canon prevents heretics from giving evidence against a bishop, and requires the evidence of two witnesses.

The Nicene Canon (can. 5) as to the appeal of clerks and laymen to the diocesan synod (quoted p. 894 *supra*) has been held by many, notably by St. Augustine (see Van Espen, pars III. tit. iii. cap. 5) to relate also to the trial of bishops. However this may be, the 6th canon of the council of Constantinople undoubtedly provides for the trial of bishops. After refusing the evidence of heretics, excommunicated persons and persons accused of crimes, it proceeds to enact that if any not disqualified person has any ecclesiastical charge to prefer against a bishop, he shall bring it before the provincial synod. If the synod cannot correct the crime, the bishops thereof shall go before the greater synod of that "diocese" (diocese is here used in the imperial sense of a larger province, exarchate or patriarchate), but shall not bring their accusation till they have submitted to undergo a like penalty, if they are found calumniators. The decree is to be then made by the greater synod, and there is to be no appeal either to the emperor or to a general council from it.

The 9th canon of the council of Chalcedon seems to relate primarily to civil suits. It orders that any dispute between a clerk and a bishop (whether his own bishop or not) shall be tried by the provincial synod. If bishop or clerk have a dispute with the metropolitan, the trial should be before the exarch of the diocese or the emperor.

The 123rd Novell provides (cap. viii.) that a bishop shall not, whether in a pecuniary (civil) or criminal cause, be brought against his will before any civil or military judge; and (cap. xxii.) that disputes between bishops, whether on ecclesiastical or other matters, shall be tried in the first instance by the metropolitan and his synod, with an appeal to the patriarch; while bishops accused of crimes are to be tried by the metropolitan (apparently alone), from whom an appeal lies first to the archbishop (that is probably the primate or exarch or president of the greater synod), and thence to the patriarch.

*Jurisdiction between parties.*—In the early days of the church, when Christians formed a small and separate society, it was natural and almost necessary that disputes between them should be settled by arbitration within their own body, to avoid the scandals to which references to heathen judges might give rise. St. Paul expressly



reprobates the practice of "brother going to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers" (1 Cor. vi. 6).

The arbitrator chosen would naturally be the bishop, and this appears to have been the case.

After the recognition of the church by Constantine, provision was made for giving a legal sanction to these arbitrations. Constantine himself is said (Van Espen, pars III. tit. i. cap. 2) to have allowed litigants to choose the bishop instead of the lay judge, and to have ordered effect to be given to the sentence of a bishop so judging. A constitution of Arcadius and Honorius is preserved in the Code (I. iv. 7) allowing litigants to go before the bishop in civil matters only and as before an arbitrator.

Another constitution of Honorius and Theodosius (Cod. I. iv. 8) orders that the bishop's judgment shall be binding on all those who have chosen him as judge, and shall have as much force as a judgment of the praetorian prefect, from whom there could be no appeal.

It appears that at this time Jews had the privilege of trying their disputes if they pleased before their rabbi or "patriarch."

Valentinian III. allowed the same result to be obtained by means of a previous formal "compromissum" or submission to arbitration.

None of these constitutions, however, in the least degree compel the resort to the ecclesiastical tribunal, unless the matter in question be of an *ecclesiastical* nature, not even though the defendant be a clerk.

So the emperor Marcian (Cod. I. iii. 25) speaks of an episcopal audience for clerks who are sued at law, but gives the plaintiff the power of choosing the lay tribunal.

The 67th Novell makes provision for the mode of trial, which is to be summary.

There being the power of resorting to the arbitration of the bishop, the church compelled by threats of censure every clerk at least to resort only to the tribunal of the bishop. Among other canons on this subject may be cited that of the council of Chalcedon (can. 9) which orders that any clerk who shall have a dispute with another clerk shall not go before the secular tribunals, but shall plead his cause first before his bishop, or before such person, with the consent of the bishop, as both parties shall choose to decide the question.

The 9th canon of the 3rd council of Carthage orders that any bishop, priest, deacon, or clerk, who has a civil matter in dispute, and brings it before the secular tribunals, shall lose all that he gains by the sentence of the secular tribunal, or shall be deprived of his office. There are also canons of the 4th council of Carthage to the same effect.

The 79th Novell (cap. i.) gives the *fori privilegium* for the first time. It provides that any one having a cause with any of the venerable holy men (the monks) or the holy virgins, or any women living in nunneries, shall go before the bishop. The bishop is to send to the monastery and to provide for the appearance of the defendants before him, either by the intervention of their abbots or of agents (*responsales*) or otherwise. He is then to try the cause; which is on no account to come before the secular judges.

The 83rd Novell, which has been already

referred to,<sup>a</sup> extends the privileges. Any one having a pecuniary cause against a clerk is to go before the bishop,<sup>b</sup> who is to decide summarily without writing. His sentence may, however, be put in writing. There is to be no recourse to the civil tribunals; but the main object of the Novell is to avoid long delays and pleadings, rather than to change the tribunal which is to adjudge.

The 123rd Novell puts the privilege on a firm basis. Clerks, monks, deaconesses, nuns, and ascetic women, are to be impleaded before the bishop. The lay judge is to execute the bishop's sentence, if there is no appeal. But either of the parties may appeal within ten days to the local lay judge. If he decides in accordance with the bishop's judgment, the decision is final.

If the lay judge decides contrary to the bishop, his sentence may be appealed from in the regular way of civil suits.

If the bishop delayed to hear or decide on the cause, the plaintiff might go at once before the lay judge. This Novell expressly reserves all *ecclesiastical* suits for the sole cognizance of the bishop.

The capitularies of the Frank kings (lib. I. cap. 28) ordered all disputes between clerks to be settled by their bishop, and not by secular judges: while another capitulary (lib. vi. cap. 366) recites and enforces an edict, attributed to Theodosius, declaring that the sentences of the bishops, however declared, and apparently in whatever causes, shall be ever held inviolate. This edict was declared by Charlemagne to be binding over all parts of his empire.

The object of these laws also seems to have been to avoid prolixity of pleadings, technicality of procedure, and long disputes, distracting holy men from their proper avocations, rather than any supposed impropriety of secular judges exercising jurisdiction over clerks.

The constitution of the special court of his bishop for the clerk or monk, seems to have been considered by the secular authorities as a privilege given to him, which he might waive, the secular court having always the capacity to exercise jurisdiction over him, if the *privilegium fori* were not set up. But the canons and decrees of the councils and synods leave the clerk no option, forbidding him to sue, or to abstain from raising his privilege when sued, in the lay court.

The secular authorities seem to have retained nevertheless their view of this exemption as a privilege and capable of waiver. Gothofred (in Cod. I. iii. 33 and 51) cites a constitution of the emperor Frederic (apparently Frederic II.) strongly denouncing any assertion of jurisdiction by the lay judge in civil or criminal matters; but yet allowing the clerk to waive his privilege and submit to the jurisdiction.

The emperor Alexius Comnenus brought the matter under the general rule "*actor sequitur forum rei*" (Constit. Imp. 289, § 11).

*Jurisdiction over special civil causes.*—This is mainly the outgrowth of a period later than that prescribed for this work.

<sup>a</sup> Supra, p. 895.

<sup>b</sup> The text seems to say "archbishop," but this must be a mistake.

The jurisdiction over testamentary causes did not arise in Western Europe till the 12th century. It appears to have arisen early in the 12th century in England; not till the end of the 12th or beginning of the 13th century in France.

The only indication of testamentary jurisdiction in Eastern or Western Europe during the period of which we treat, appears in the commission given by the Christian emperors to the bishops, to take care that the wishes of the dead should be faithfully performed.

Charlemagne especially intrusted the bishops with the duty of protecting wards, widows, and paupers, and of seeing that no wrong was done to them. This led in time, but not during our period, to a sort of jurisdiction over all cases where a member of one of these classes was concerned.

Matrimonial causes, though infringements of the marriage vow were probably treated of with other matters of spiritual discipline, did not as involving formal legal rights or questions of property, fall to the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical tribunals till the 11th century.

Suits relating to ecclesiastical matters are in many of the Imperial Constitutions mentioned as unquestionably matters for the bishop's jurisdiction. The term "*ecclesiastical matters*" is vague, and probably varied at different times; but before the expiry of our period, causes relating to tithes and offerings were probably considered as coming within its meaning.

[*Authorities referred to for this article.*—*Corpus Juris Civilis, cum notis Gothofredi*, ed. Van Leeuwen, Amsterdam, 1663; Ayliffe, *Parergon Juris Canonici Anglicani*, ed. London, 1734; Van Espen, *Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum*, pars tertia; *Commentarius in Canones*; ed. Louvaine, 1753; Landon, *Manual of Councils*, 1846; Phillimore, *Ecclesiastical Law*, 1873.] [W. G. F. P.]

JUSTA. (1) [FLORENTIUS (1).]

(2) Martyr in Spain, at Seville, with Reia commemorated July 19 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adon. Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

JUSTINA, virgin, martyr with Cyprian the bishop; commemorated Sept. 26 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Bedae, Adonis, Usuardi); and Oct. 2 (*Cal. Byzant.*). [W. F. G.]

JUSTINUS. (1) The philosopher, martyr with Pergamus with Carpus the bishop, Papirius the deacon, and Agathonica, and many other women; commemorated April 13 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adon. Usuardi); June 1 (*Cal. Byzant.*).

(2) Martyr with companions, A.D. 142; commemorated June 1 (*Cal. Byzant.*; see Daniel's *Codex*, iv. 260).

(3) [SYMPHOROSA.]

(4) Martyr in terra Parisiensi; commemorated Aug. 1 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(5) Presbyter, martyr at Rome under Decius; commemorated Sept. 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Adon. Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

JUSTUS. (1) [FELIX (14).]

(2) Martyr in Spain at Complutum [ALCALA] with Pastor his brother under Decius (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*).

(3) Bishop of Lyons, "Natalis," Sept. 2 (*Mart. Adonis, Usuardi*): translation Oct. 14 (ib.).

(4) Martyr in terra Belvacensi (Beauvais); commemorated Oct. 18 (*Mart. Usuardi*). [W. F. G.]

JUVENALIS. (1) Bishop, confessor at Rome under Adrian; commemorated May 3 (*Mart. Usuardi*).

(2) Martyr on the Island Pontia; commemorated May 7 (*Mart. Rom. Vet.*, Usuardi). [W. F. G.]

END OF VOL. I.











